SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 23, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Gallinger	Nelson	Shively
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	James	Overman	Smoot
Burleigh	Johnson	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones	Page	Swanson
Clapp	Kenyon	Perkins	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Poindexter	Tillman
Colt	Lippitt	Robinson	Vardaman
Crawford	Lodge	Root	Weeks
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	White
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Works
Fletcher	Myers	Sherman	

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of illness.

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

CUCUMBER-DISEASE INVESTIGATION.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have read a telegram bearing upon an important matter pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *February 20, 1915.*

Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to secure special appropriation of $5,000 for cucumber-disease investigation by the Department of Agriculture. Cucumber diseases cost Michigan farmers $2,000,000 last year. Similar losses in Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, New York; not only the farmers but all the pickling companies are bearing enormous losses. It is not too much to say that entire cucumber and pickling industry in certain sections Michigan is in precarious condition, due to ravages of plant diseases. We need research by Department of Agriculture to cooperate with special State investigation.

G. H. COONS,
Plant Pathologist, Michigan Agriculture College.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Chair will indulge me a moment, I desire to say that it is my intention to offer an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill appropriating $5,000 for this purpose. I give notice to that effect now, and hope that the adoption of the amendment will be unanimous.

POST OFFICE CLERKS.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, I present telegrams from the representatives of 25 postal clerks of the Terre Haute (Ind.), Branch of the Railway Mail Association; 40 postal clerks of the Evansville (Ind.) Branch of the Railway Mail Association; 160 postal clerks of northern Indiana; and 300 postal clerks with headquarters at Indianapolis, all remonstrating against the proposed change from annual to biennial promotions in the Railway Mail Service. I ask that the telegrams may be printed in the RECORD, and, inasmuch as the Post Office appropriation bill has been reported and is on the calendar, that they lie on the table for consideration in connection with that measure.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall not object to this request, but I shall object to the consideration of any further subject until the Army appropriation bill has been disposed of.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRE HAUTE, IND., *February, 11, 1915.*

Hon. B. F. SHIVELY,
Washington, D. C.:

Twenty-five railway postal clerks oppose biennial promotion amendment to Post Office appropriation bill.

JAMES T. LASH,
President Terre Haute Branch, R. M. A.

—

EVANSVILLE, IND., *February 11, 1915.*

Senator B. F. SHIVELY,
Washington, D. C.:

Forty railway postal clerks of Evansville respectfully ask you to oppose the change from annual to biennial promotions.

C. E. JONES,
President Evansville Branch.

KENDALLVILLE, IND., *February 11, 1915.*

Senator SHIVELY,
Washington, D. C.:

One hundred and sixty northern Indiana railway postal clerks ask you to oppose change from annual to biennial promotions in the Railway Mail Service.

S. E. CRAWFORD,
President Elkhart Branch.

—

IRVINGTON, IND., *February 11, 1915.*

Senator B. F. SHIVELY,
Washington, D. C.:

Over 300 railway postal clerks, with headquarters at Indianapolis, respectfully ask you to oppose the change from annual to biennial promotions for the men of this service.

C. H. DILL.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment of the committee to strike out the proviso on page 70.

The amendment was, on page 70, after line 12, to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job 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 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.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the pending amendment proposes to strike out the language inserted by the House Committee on Military Affairs and by the House, which provides that no part of the appropriation made in the bill shall be made available; in short, for any attempt on the part of the Government to install what is known as the Taylor efficiency system.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have received a large number of communications on this subject and I should like to hear what the Senator from New Jersey has to say upon the matter. I can not hear a word that he is saying, because of the confusion in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, there is nothing new about this proposal. There is nothing new about this system which it is proposed to have installed in the Government arsenals, navy yards, and everywhere throughout the Government service. A gentleman named Taylor arrived at the conclusion that the laboring people of the United States are not working hard enough for the money that they get, and he has evolved the idea that by a system——

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, this is quite an important statement that the Senator from New Jersey is making. Many of us are interested in it, and I do hope that we can have order so as to be able to hear him.

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. There is so much conversation going on in the rear of the Chamber that I can not hear a word the Senator is saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be a vain hope to obtain absolute order.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made a report upon this subject at one time, and I will take the liberty of quoting from that report.

First, I will say Mr. Taylor had arrived at the conclusion—he says so very frankly in one of his pamphlets—that there is a mistaken notion abroad in the land on the part of laboring people to the effect that industrial establishments are run more or less for their benefit. He desires at the outset to have that notion corrected, and he calls their attention and the attention of manufacturers in general to the fact that industrial establishments are not run for the benefit of laboring people, but that they are run solely for the purpose of producing dividends for the manufacturers.

And once that proposition is laid down and admitted, then I admit that Mr. Taylor is absolutely correct, and that a system such as he has devised is admirably fitted to bring about the result he seeks, which is the production of dividends for manufacturers at the expense of the bones and tissue and the lives of the people engaged in those manufactories. This is the reverse of the proposition which we have so often advocated on

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the floor of the Senate and other legislative bodies in the country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, still, as near as the Senator from New Jersey is to me, I can not hear him. I wish there might be order in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator will have to suspend until the Senate is in order. There is complaint about the inability of Senators to hear him.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, for a great many years there has been more or less in effect what is known as the eight-hour law. In certain departments of the Government it has been altogether in effect. Under certain circumstances when work has been done by contract for the Government it has been partially in effect. Under other circumstances, by the decisions of various heads of departments, the law has been nullified.

Recently the National Legislature enacted a law which was intended to put an end for all time to these matters of construction by various heads of departments and make the United States Government as an employer an eight-hour employer. It was then said that when the Government of the United States became an employer it should be the best sort of employer that there was; that it should set a standard and should be an example to other employers throughout the United States. It was largely for that reason and not because of the great amount of manufacturing that the Government did, and not because of the great number of men who were involved, but because of the value of the example which was to be set by the Government of the United States as an employer, that the eight-hour law was passed.

Now, for the reverse of the proposition. Mr. Taylor is finding difficulty in turning the laboring people of America into cogs of the various industrial machines. He is finding difficulty in having the most hard-hearted manufacturers in the United States regard the laboring people simply as raw material, to be purchased in a certain way, to be carried on the cost sheets at so much per head. He is having difficulty in having other manufacturers absolutely eliminate the human equation. His idea and the idea of such manufacturers as he has succeeded in enlisting under his banner is to have the United States Government install the Taylor efficiency system, under which a stop watch is held on a man, the number of steps that he takes between a pile of pig iron and the place where he finally deposits it is to be counted. A strong, vigorous man is taken as the standard, the day's work is set, and every other man who comes into that establishment is set to perform the task that was set by this physically fit man working at top speed, and unless he is able to do that he goes into the discard.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has thought over the suggestion which was made informally last night as to dividing the amendment. I think quite a number of Senators are disposed to agree with the Senator from New Jersey regarding the stop-watch proposition. As to the premium feature, however, of the amendment there seems to be a difference of mind. Some of the employees seem to want to retain that system. I have received a good many hundred letters both ways from employees of arsenals and other Government institutions in Philadelphia.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that I have thought over that suggestion, and I thought favorably of it to this extent, that if I could not get enough votes to defeat the whole system we would be glad to welcome those who are in favor of abolishing the stop watch. But I speak from experience, and in my opinion the premium system is worse than the stop-watch system.

Mr. PENROSE. I have, I suppose, seven or eight hundred letters purporting to be from employees of the Frankford Arsenal and other military and naval institutions in Philadelphia advocating the premium system. On the other hand, I have a number against it.

Mr. HUGHES. I have not any doubt that is so. I have no personal knowledge of the facts, but it is stated to me by a man in whom I have confidence that the petition filed, referred to in the debate yesterday by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], was obtained by the officers of the Frankford Arsenal practically under duress.

Mr. PENROSE. That may be. I do not know about that.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the Senator allow me just a word?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I think from all the evidence I have there is not the slightest ground for that. My reason for thinking so is because the employees who signed that petition again wrote me asking that they be allowed to come down here or to send a delegation here to present the matter to the Committee on Military Affairs. I made that request of the committee on their behalf, but as the committee decided to strike out the House provision it was not necessary for them to come down. So, if those men were acting under duress, certainly they were acting very strangely when they requested me to arrange for their appearance here and to advocate the elimination of the House provision.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one more word, and then I am done?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I am not opposed to this amendment as it stands, but I confess that I am in some confusion as to the real wishes of the employees in Philadelphia, at least, where several thousand are employed in manufacturing munitions of war, as to whether or not they want the premium system. I make the inquiry of the Senator from New Jersey, who I know is in close touch with those conditions, to get information, as much as anything else, although I am prepared to vote for the whole amendment if I can be persuaded that the whole amendment is wanted by the employees.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, there is not any doubt in my mind as to what those who are informed at the Frankford Arsenal, at every other arsenal, and at every navy yard throughout the country, want. They are now operating under a system which is sufficiently drastic, in my opinion, and which offers abundant opportunity for intelligent management to develop the highest kind of efficiency.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question right there?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the attitude of the Department of Labor and what is the attitude of Government officials who supervise this work and under whom these men are employed? What position do they take in regard to it?

Mr. HUGHES. I will say that every committee that has examined this proposition has either condemned it or refused to favor it. There is not a single line of any report of any committee in favor of it. It has been investigated on several occasions, it was investigated by the Committee on Education and Labor, of which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] at that time was chairman; it has been investigated by the Committee on Labor on the other side of the Capitol, the present Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, being chairman, and both those reports condemn the Taylor system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me that the department ought to give us some expression of opinion about a matter of this kind.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. In answer to the question of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], I will say that I have here the last report of the Chief of Ordnance, which deals with this subject somewhat in extenso, and I shall presently call the attention of the Senate to his observations, which are very practical.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, at the Watertown Arsenal there is now established the following system for determining the efficiency of men engaged in work in that establishment——

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit one suggestion?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I think it ought to be stated to the Senate that that arsenal is the only one, so far as I am informed, that has the Taylor system or the stop-watch system. It does not prevail at the Frankford Arsenal, as I understand.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that, so far as this goes, it contains no provision for premium payment.

Mr. PENROSE. No.

Mr. HUGHES. It contains no provision for timing or stop watching, but it does contain a great many provisions under which any intelligent job manager can determine the efficiency of men under his control. They are given figures for attendance; they are given figures for sobriety, for cheerfulness, and for ability. They are given a mark for their habits.

Habits: In estimating habits, consideration should be given to sobriety, integrity, subordination, cheerful and zealous obedience to orders and regulations. Frequent tardiness and drunkenness on duty will be made the subject of special inquiry. A deduction of 10 points for every absence after Sundays, holidays, or pay days for each day or part of day without having previously obtained leave therefor will be made, and a deduction of 10 points will be made for tardiness in getting to work after reporting.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would the Senator, in a few words, explain definitely and precisely what the stop-watch system is? What does it require of the workingmen?

Mr. HUGHES. I will try to do that. I am proceeding in a ragged sort of way. This is the way Mr. Taylor explains it:

For example, a workman has been doing a piece of work in 190 minutes. After painstaking study of the job and of all the means of saving time, the man is carefully instructed as to these means, and is told that for every minute saved, within, say, 120 minutes, he will be paid for half a minute at his regular rate, in addition to his regular daily pay; and that it is thought that he can do the work in 72 minutes, for which time the increase over his regular pay will amount to 33⅓ per cent.

I think, perhaps, the paragraphs I shall now read will best answer the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. This is also from Mr. Taylor's "Manual of Shop Management":

"His first step was to place an intelligent, college-educated man in charge of progress in this line. This man had not before handled this class of labor, although he understood managing workmen. He was not familiar with the methods pursued by the writer, but was soon taught the art of determining how much work a first-class man can do in a day. This was done by timing with a stop watch a first-class man while he was working fast. The best way to do this—in fact, almost the only way in which the timing can be done with certainty—is to divide the man's work into its elements and time each element separately. For example, in the case of a man loading pig iron onto a car, the elements should be: Picking up the pig iron from the ground or pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking with it on a level (time per foot walked). Walking with it up an incline to car (time per foot walked). Throwing the pig down (time in hundredths of a minute), or laying it on a pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking back empty to get a load (time per foot walked)."

The problem of inducing the employees to work at the pace required is solved, first, by offering a bonus or premium to those who succeed, and if this does not get results other more drastic means are used.

It is the business of the shop disciplinarian to see that a system of discipline is in vogue and enforced that is adequate to induce everyone to make sure that his part of the work comes in on schedule time. The system of discipline advocated by Mr. Taylor consists of—

1. Lowering the man's wages.
2. Laying him off for a period of time.
3. Fining him all the way from 1 cent to $60.
4. Discharging him.

It is also regarded as a good plan to continually keep enough men on hand so as to be able to discharge a workman every now and then for failing to continue at the pace required, because of its moral effect on the rest of the workmen.

When the system is first installed the high speed can not immediately be attained. It must be worked up to gradually, and therefore the kind of bonus system used is as drastic as the degree of perfection to which the system has attained will permit.

This is all from Mr. Taylor.

The gradual acceleration of the speed at which the workmen labor is accomplished by the premium and bonus above referred to, the system of discipline, and by the gradual elimination of the workmen who are unable to keep up to the rising standards of performance.

I think I can safely say that it is admitted by everybody, by the proponents and opponents of the Taylor system, that the bonus or premium system is a necessary part of it. Without that the stop-watching amounts to nothing and without the stop-watching timing system the bonus or premium system amounts to nothing. For example, he says—

The system of bonuses now in vogue at the Watertown Arsenal, where the Taylor system has not yet reached an advanced stage—

They have got the camel's nose under the tent at the Watertown Arsenal, as this gentleman frankly admits. He is right about it, and I have no occasion to believe that he is anything but absolutely honest and fair in all his statements, because this is his business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am not informed on this subject, and I am asking questions for information. I will ask the Senator if this system has been installed in other manufacturing establishments and arsenals?

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator refer to Government establishments?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I refer to those operated by private parties.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; as nearly as I can gather this system has been installed in about 200 manufacturing establishments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I inferred so from some letters which I have received.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; I understand, in the first place, they established it in the Bethlehem Steel Co., where they managed to get a crew of select men together, who were, each one, able to carry 300 tons of pig iron over a given distance in a day; which is something like an increase of 300 per cent. Of course, it was a terrific strain on the men; they had to be carefully picked and selected; but the effort was made to establish that as the standard of what a man should be able to do in a day.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, as the Senator from New Hampshire has asked the question, if I may be permitted, I should like to say that the Taylor system, so called, is nothing new at all. The Taylor system is simply a new name for a process which has existed as long as manufacturing has been carried on as a corporate operation. It arose at a time when the manufacturing of articles in factories first began, and it arose from the necessity of finding a basis upon which to fix the rate of wages. The Taylor system is an attempt to fix those wages more scientifically, more accurately, and more justly to the employee, and to avoid the constant friction which arises in manufacturing establishments from the failure to fix rates of wages on a scientific basis.

In its latest development, as it is referred to here, it is an attempt to study the activities of working men to see if by examining them in detail and finding out just how long it takes a man to perform each one of a series of complicated operations it may not be possible to teach him to perform them more scientifically, in that way making him a more efficient workman, making it possible for him to accomplish more, and therefore earning more, and also to avoid the constant friction in factories which comes from mistakes made by the managers and operators of them in using a wrong basis upon which to fix the prices at which men are paid.

The whole thing comes back to about the condition in which we find Mr. Ty Cobb. In playing baseball Mr. Ty Cobb steps up to the plate and with a single swing is able to send the ball out into left field, to the great delight of the people who are in favor of the Detroits and often to the disgust of the people who are "rooting" for the Washingtons. I do not suppose it causes Ty Cobb any more effort to send a ball into left field at a single stroke of the bat than it does some other less experienced man to bat at the ball and miss it; but because Ty Cobb is accurate, is trained, and has skill in that matter he is paid ten, twelve, or fifteen thousand dollars a year, or whatever it may be. Now, there are men in the factories who have that same accurate eye, who have that same experience and same skill in swinging a hammer, perhaps, and they are worth more to their employer, to the manager of the factory, than a less skillful workman, just as Mr. Ty Cobb is worth more to the manager of a baseball team. It seems only reasonable that the Ty Cobbs of the factories should receive compensation in accordance with their skill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, there does not seem to be any disagreement between the opponents and the proponents of this proposition. As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has said, there is nothing new about the Taylor system. There is nothing new in it, at least to any man who comes from an industrial town. Perhaps it is called by a new name, but since factories were established, and since it became important to make money out of them, there has been an attempt made to squeeze everything that there was in the way of production out of the main element in manufacturing, and that is the human element. Within my own experience and in my own town I have known a system to be in operation which was even cleverer in some respects than the Taylor system. They did not bother with having a man with a stop watch timing the number of beats that a loom made, timing how long it took a man to thread a shuttle, how long it took him to change it, how long it took him to throw back the cards to get the proper place in the pattern. They eliminated all that. When a new job was started up they sent a man in and gave him a loom or two looms, as the case might be, and they paid him secretly four or five dollars a week more than they paid anybody else. Then they provided him with a certain preparation, the favored preparation, as I recall, being cod-liver oil and whisky, so that a man could key himself up—"stimulate himself" is the term that Taylor uses—to such an extent that he could do more work than any normal human being could do in the same time, and at the end of a week or two he drew his regular pay, and the wages of other operatives were based on the amount that appeared in his envelope, no one except the manager knowing about the four or five dollars he received in addition for the extraordinary effort that he had made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator does not mean that the employers provided whisky for the men?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know who provided the whisky, but there is not any doubt that it was done.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator if it is not a scientific fact that the taking of that whisky, while it may have spurred the man on to increased efforts for a little while, had its reaction and made him less capable of performing labor a short time afterwards?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know. As to that I can not say of my own personal knowledge. I am speaking now of the pacemakers. It was understood that that was the favorite mixture or preparation of the pacemakers in the mills. There might not have been very much whisky in it; it might have been more cod liver oil than whiskey. I am not familiar, as I have said, with the component parts of the preparation, but that there were pacemakers who did stimulate themselves with alcohol, and, in some cases, as I recall, even with cocaine, there can not be any question.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, possibly the inquiry I am about to make had better be submitted to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], but perhaps the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] can satisfy my mind on the subject. I should like to know how long this stop-watch surveillance of an employee continues? It seems from what has been said by the Senator from Rhode Island the purpose of it is to ascertain the employee's fitness and efficiency. If that be so, I would suppose that his capacity might be determined within a reasonable time, and that the continuance of that sort of thing would be entirely unnecessary and unjust.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, I will endeavor to answer the question; or does the Senator from New Jersey desire to answer it?

Mr. HUGHES. I will answer by saying that, of course, the timing by the stop watch continues only until the standard or unit time for a particular process is determined, and then it ceases. As soon as it is determined that a man should make a certain number of castings or produce a certain quantity of a certain kind of work in a certain time, the necessity for timing him ceases, although Mr. Taylor suggests that there ought to be some way whereby it can be made apparent to the operative at every stage of his work whether or not he is catching up or losing. That would not necessarily involve timing.

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

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator referred to the fact that in a silk factory the question of production by a weaver depended upon his being stimulated by artificial means.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not say that.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. HUGHES. No. I do not want to get involved in a controversy of that sort. I have seen questions like that lead to one or two days' debate in this body.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that the person who can produce the most yards from a loom is the person who can keep the loom running all the time; and that is not by any strength that he may have; it is due to his ability to keep his ends of the warp straight and not let them get tangled. The hardest work I ever put in on a loom in my life was the first warp that I ever wove, and the least that I ever produced in a day was upon that first warp. And the result was that before I got halfway through with the weaving of the 800 yards warp it was so tangled that I had to have somebody come and help me out with it. It did not take very long, however, for me to learn, the same as others, to keep it straight, and when it was kept straight I had the easiest work in my life. The very best weaver there is in any mill in the world is the person who has the least work to do, and lets the loom run, and knows how to keep it going. There is no need of any stimulus being offered to any weaver in order that he may get out more yards from the loom. It is not true.

Mr. HUGHES. Which shows that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." The Senator was weaving on a broad silk loom undoubtedly; was he not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the first loom I ever wove on was weaving linseys and running a couple of narrow looms.

Mr. HUGHES. If the Senator knew anything at all about weaving, he would have understood my question, which he has already misunderstood.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not woven thousands and tens of thousands and millions of yards without knowing something about it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a distinction in the mind of anybody who pretends to be a silk weaver, or there ought to be a distinction, between broad silk and ribbon looms. They are the two great fundamental divisions.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, there is a difference between the two.

Mr. HUGHES. Was the Senator a broad-silk weaver or a ribbon weaver?

Mr. SMOOT. I say, there is a difference between broad looms and ribbon looms.

Mr. HUGHES. And the Senator was a broad-silk weaver; was he not?

Mr. SMOOT. I was a broad-loom weaver; yes.

Mr. HUGHES. A broad-silk weaver or a broad-loom weaver. I was speaking of ribbon looms, which, as the Senator knows, are entirely different. The ribbons vary in width, and there may be 50 or 60 of them abreast, running along a great batten, each of them fed by a small quill, and the necessity existing for the quill to be changed every time it runs out, so that the number of stoppages is a hundred times greater than on a broad-silk loom, depending entirely upon the speed with which the weaver gets from one of those little ribbons to the other to change the quill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the principle is exactly the same.

Mr. HUGHES. Why, the Senator was never more mistaken in his life.

Mr. SMOOT. The question of changing a bobbin in one loom is no different from the question of changing a bobbin in another, and the weaver becomes proficient from the practice that he or she may have. Some weavers can weave all their lives and never become proficient, and others can take it up very quickly and it becomes second nature to them.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the Senator is possessed of about as much misinformation on that subject as anybody I have ever come in contact with who pretended to be a weaver. I will say to the Senator that there could not be anything more fundamentally different than broad and ribbon loom weaving. I come from a town where as much silk is woven as in any town in the United States, and where for a time, until a very short time ago, more silk was woven than in all the rest of the United States put together. The difference between broad silk and ribbon weaving is so great that for a great many years the broad-silk man was not permitted to work on a ribbon loom and a ribbon-loom weaver could not work on a broad-silk loom, and that distinction is to a great extent preserved to-day. The operatives in that town are known as broad-silk weavers and ribbon-loom weavers; and when the Senator says that the changing of the shuttle and the work on the broad-silk loom is practically the same as the changing of the bobbin and the work and operation of a ribbon loom, he simply shows to everybody who knows anything about the subject that he knows nothing at all about it. I do not want to continue that discussion any further.

Mr. SMOOT. I said the principle was the same, and I maintain it. I am perfectly willing to admit, of course, that I do not know as much about manufacturing as the Senator from New Jersey. I filled every position there is in the mill, from the worker to the superintendent. I have been in those mills, and I have woven millions of yards; but, of course, I do not know as much about it as the Senator from New Jersey does.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the subject under discussion?

Mr. HUGHES. The ability of the Senator from Utah to weave.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The relative capacity of the two Senators to spin.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator, out of the little knowledge that he has of weaving, took occasion to make an absolute statement to the effect that a statement I made to the Senate of my own personal knowledge was untrue, which, as the boys say, is "going some."

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HUGHES. Nevertheless, I repeat what I said before, that weavers were habitually stimulated; that there were a class of weavers known as pacemakers, and that the rate of speed at which a man worked made a great difference in the amount of his production, and before Mr. Taylor was born they were stimulating men. Before Mr. Taylor was heard of they were attempting to set a day's work for men and women and children which they could not possibly perform except when they were at the very height of their powers. The industrial system was based on the theory, so far as it could be put into effect, that a day's wages was to go to a man who could produce at the top of his powers, taking no account of those who were coming to that period, no account of those who had passed

that period, no account of those who were not in the full possession of all their faculties; and that struggle is going on in this country to-day. There are private manufacturers, scores and hundreds and thousands of them, who care nothing about the men who produce their wealth. There are a great many manufacturers in this country who have no interest in the men or the women or the children whom they employ.

I am glad to admit, and glad to be able to state, that that particular class of manufacturers is rapidly falling into the minority in this country. I think the great bulk of the manufacturers of this country do take an interest in the people who work for them. They are enlightened to such an extent that they know that to a greater or less extent the well-being of those who work for them is their well-being; but I am convinced that if it were possible to introduce in a majority of the manufacturing establishments of the United States this system known as the Taylor efficiency system, which subordinates every consideration to the consideration of making dividends, the condition of the working people of the United States would be that of virtual slavery, and instead of the whip-lash there would be the goad of striving to make money enough to feed and clothe those dependent upon the employee.

When the Sage Foundation made their investigation of conditions existing in the city of Pittsburgh—and I am not trying to get a rise out of the senior or the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, but simply stating a fact with which they are undoubtedly as familiar as I am—they found that in that great center of population, with immigration from all quarters of the world pouring in, the rate of wages in many lines of industry was based upon the ability of the single man in lodgings to support life. It seems to me that so far as the combination of wages and effort is concerned, you do not need any Taylor efficiency system to get any better results from the manufacturer's standpoint than that—the rate of wages at which the single man in lodgings was able to support life. The industrial conditions in certain lines in that city were such that no man dared to get married; that no man was able to support a helpless or aged parent or an infirm sister or brother. A sick relative, or sickness existing in his own case, or any one of the thousands of things that you and I know are likely to happen to any man at any hour or any minute of the day, threw that man as a factor out of the industrial life of that great city.

I am against this proposition, root and branch. I am one of those who believe with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who a day or two ago said that for some time to come he expected to be sympathetic and lend a favorable ear to the claims and demands of the laboring people of this country, citing the figures which showed the average wages received by the laboring people of the United States. The strongest indictment that can be drawn against this great Government of ours is the indictment that can be drawn with reference to its treatment of its laboring people.

Look at Germany, look and England and France and the other great nations of the world, the attempts that are being made, the time and thought and patient study the statesmen of those nations are giving to the welfare and well-being of their people, and contrast it with the few petty, futile little things that we consider for them in bodies like this in this country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is interesting. Does the Senator from New Jersey mean to say that the laboring men of Germany and England are better off than those in this country?

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator knows me better than to think I would make any statement like that on an occasion of this kind. I will say this, though, and I think the Senator is bound to admit it—and I am not going to make any statement which is going to give rise to a tariff controversy.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. HUGHES. But I say, as I said before, and I think the Senator will admit, that the various European Governments do much more as Governments for their people than our Government does for our people. The Senator has not heard of any old-age pension bills being introduced in this or any other legislative body, I am sure; and yet the Senator knows that there are old-age pension systems in force in various European countries. The Senator has not heard of any national insurance systems being put into effect here, the object being to indemnify the common laboring people of the country against sickness and death and accident; and yet he knows that there are such systems in various European countries.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true, and those matters are being agitated more or less in this country at the present time, but my opinion, though it may not be worth much, is that our people do not need those helps as they are needed in European countries.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator may be right about that. I am sure I hope he is. I think, however, the statement I made a while ago can not be controverted, namely, that the National Government of the United States does less directly for, pays less attention, and gives less consideration as a Government to, its laboring people than any civilized country in the world; and now here we are debating this proposition!

I venture to say that not one one-hundredth of 1 per cent of the manufacturers of the United States would put this system into effect in their factories. For humanitarian reasons alone I believe they never will get a much greater percentage than that. I do not think they can get a higher percentage than that of manufacturers in this country who regard the people who labor for them, the people who help them create their wealth, simply as so much raw material to be used when the occasion requires it, and then to be discarded.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, surely the Senator does not look upon the employers of labor in that light, as being men who look upon the laboring men merely as raw material?

Mr. HUGHES. I have said that. That is just exactly what I said.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am seeking information from the Senator from New Jersey, who knows much more about this subject than I do; but I know there are establishments in New England which treat their employees with the greatest possible consideration, and in which there never has been a strike, which have written me in favor of striking out this provision in the bill. I confess to a great deal of ignorance on the matter myself, and I am seeking enlightenment. I want to do what is right in reference to the matter as between the employer and the employee, which I have always tried to do. No matter what other people may have thought of my words or my votes, that has been my purpose. I may not have accomplished much, but I have tried to do that.

Mr. HUGHES. I have not any doubt of that. Surely nothing I said would lead the Senator to think I made any contrary statement.

There is a tremendous propaganda going on in favor of this Taylor system. I have no doubt the National Manufacturers' Association takes a deep and active interest in that system. I have no doubt that there is a considerable number of manufacturers who believe that their interests are wrapped up in the interests of the men who are in favor of this system—men who, like the Senator, have not given very much study to it, do not understand the details of it, and have not a clear idea of what the conclusion is bound to be if such a system could be put into effect in a majority of the manufacturing establishments of the United States, which I here predict is absolutely and utterly impossible. You might have done it in Russia at one period of its history; you might have done it in China; but, in my judgment, it never has been possible and it never will be possible to do it in the United States of America.

The point I am trying to make, however, is this: I am against the Taylor system. The laboring people of the country, those of them who understand it, are uniformly and almost without an exception against it. I think the principle involved in it is bad, whether you seek to enforce it by means of the Taylor or any other system.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey how he accounts for the fact that the workmen of the Frankford Arsenal, to whom this amendment is directed, and who ought to know what the effect upon them is, appear here opposed to the amendment and in favor of the system as applied to the Frankford Arsenal?

Mr. HUGHES. I will explain that to the Senator. There is nothing new about that. I will say to the Senator there never has been a time when an employer or foreman or superintendent of a factory could not get signatures to a petition. This letter is signed by three or four girls whose wages range from $1.60 to $2 a day, and they pretended to speak for five or six hundred highly paid mechanics in the Frankford Arsenal.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. Do I understand the Senator from New Jersey to say that the statements of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] in regard to this matter are absolutely incorrect? He is represented as saying that personally he knows some 400 people there——

Mr. HUGHES. I do not think the Senator made any such statement as that.

Mr. LIPPITT. It may be that I misunderstood him.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has the petition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to say to the Senator that there is a petition signed by some 300 or 400, although I have never counted them. I have the petition in my hand.

Mr. ROOT. I can not hear the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I say that the committee when it acted on this matter had before it the petition signed by 300 or 400 employees of the Frankford Arsenal. I have not counted the number, but they must run up to about that.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator it has been stated in the House hearings on various occasions that gentlemen in favor of installing this system have used coercive measures to get the employees to sign a petition saying that they were in favor of something they were not in favor of. When this petition was filed and the employers of the Frankford Arsenal understood that it was afoot they met and adopted a resolution which I understand the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is in possession of in favor of the House provision. At least I was so informed by the secretary of the Senator this morning, and I assume at some period of the debate the Senator will put in that petition.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, as I have already stated, I am in receipt of several hundred communications on both sides of this question. I hold in my hand two samples of communications, of which I received several hundred sent separately through the mail. I took it that there could not be a great amount of coercion in these epistles. I will read what one of them says. I want it understood that I am not speaking against this amendment. I am seeking light and information. If the Senator will permit me to read it, it says:

THE FRANKFORD ARSENAL ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 28, 1915.

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The committee named below, representing 400 employees of the Frankford Arsenal, earnestly protest against the legislation in the Army bill depriving us of our premium rate of compensation, which was established at this arsenal over five years ago to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned. The enactment of this legislation means an annual loss to us of about $44,972. You are requested to use your utmost endeavors to have this legislation struck out by the upper House of Congress or so modified that we will not be deprived of our increased earnings under the premium system.

Then, also under a separate cover, together with 500 other communications, a committee of women employees of the Frankford Arsenal have requested my "assistance in an endeavor to correct a hardship placed upon them by the proviso in the Army appropriation bill now before the Senate for action." They say:

Inclosed find typewritten copy of the same. In their behalf I appeal to you for your assistance and investigation of their grievance. The proviso affecting the arsenal employees, if enacted into law, will be a positive hardship upon the skilled and machine-operating men and women employees. The rate of wages put into effect last Monday, through orders issued by Gen. Crozier, are to the effect that machine operators making cartridge shells, their wages will be reduced to $1.20 and $1.16 per day, respectively, thus denying to them an increase of their daily wage earnings by constant application to their work of at least 25 to 60 cents per day. The piecework as heretofore in vogue is to be discontinued, thus very materially reducing their earnings.

They suggest that if a rate of wages per day is to be adhered to, that a sum of $1.52 be paid per diem to the machine operators and a proportionate increase to the skilled employees, thus equalizing the wage question and granting to them at least a living amount of wages.

I have taken this liberty of acquainting you with their protest and request, believing that you will give this matter your attention, as this condition affects in the neighborhood of 500 employees, mostly residents of the Frankford district.

Thanking you in their behalf for any assistance you may render, and wishing you continued success.

That is a sample of many hundreds which I have received through the mails separately against this amendment. I only read it for the information of the Senate and the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. I understood the Senator——

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator mean against the Senate amendment? I so understood the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. Then, to be entirely fair with the Senator, I have a copy of a communication from Washington, from Thomas B. Carroll, general organizer, stating that these communications were sent under more or less influence and duress. That is the situation, as far as I know.

Mr. HUGHES. I saw the statement in the House hearings, I recollect, in which it was pointed out that of 12 men who had taken some action, such as coming down to Washington to complain of this system, 5 of them had been dropped from the service. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that these gentlemen want the Taylor efficiency system installed, and they are ready to go to any reasonable length to get it installed. They think they are doing a good thing, and they do it in a mild way; but they adopt coercive measures toward these people. They frighten them and adopt measures that are worse than we understand ordinarily when we speak of coercive measures. They frighten them by threatening them that they will receive less wages than they are now receiving if they do not fall in line with the management. So far as this proposition is concerned, they point out to them that the first thing that will happen will be that they will lose their bonuses, which, of course, means a practical reduction of salary for them, although nobody has any objection to adopting a piecework system at these plants. It is quite within the power of the gentlemen who have submitted these communications to put these other people on a piecework basis and pay them so much for each piece they produce. That is entirely different from the bonus of a premium system, and is perfectly satisfactory to everybody concerned, because it gives the Government a fair return for a fair day's wage. There is no difficulty involved. The best manufacturers in the United States do not have this system and are able to protect themselves.

I noticed in the hearings that the Government was manufacturing various products, tools, and implements at a cost of one-third and one-fourth and as low as one-fifth of the market price in addition to having a short work day and paying fair wages.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator unduly, but I was rather interested in his last remark that he has no objection to the work being done by the piece.

Mr. HUGHES. No; I have not.

Mr. LIPPITT. But that he does object to the provision in this bill by which a premium bonus is to be paid for good work.

Mr. HUGHES. Not for good work; for fast work.

Mr. LIPPITT. Well, a premium for piecework. The whole basis of piecework, of course, is a premium paid to the employee who can do the most work. He gets off 10 pieces and he gets one price, and he gets off 5 pieces and gets one-half that price.

Mr. HUGHES. But the premium system is entirely different from that.

Mr. LIPPITT. The premium system, I understand, is based upon establishing a minimum wage.

Mr. HUGHES. I will read the premium system, which is very interesting. I will read it for the benefit of the Senator. I do not think he clearly understands it or I do not think he would be in favor of this proposition.

For example, a workman has been doing a piece of work in 190 minutes. After painstaking study of the job and of all the means of saving time the man is carefully instructed as to these means and is told that for every minute saved within, say, 120 minutes—

Now, they have taken 70 minutes off this. He has been doing a job in 190 minutes, and they are going to say the minimum is 120 minutes. We have watched your work, we have followed you through your daily operations, we know how many steps you take going from this pile to that pile, we know how long it takes you to stop to pick something up and bring it to a certain place. We have done all that and know more about it than you do. You have been taking 190 minutes to do this. You must start at 120 minutes, and as an inducement to you all the time you save under 120 minutes you will be compensated for at the following increased rate.

Mr. LIPPITT. How much is the Senator reading and how much is he interpolating? I would be very glad to have the Senator read it, but he is interpolating so much that I do not really know what he is reading.

Mr. HUGHES. I will read it and give the quotation marks.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask what the Senator is reading from?

Mr. HUGHES. I am reading a quotation from Mr. Taylor's pamphlet on the subject of shop management, the very question involved here.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is the Senator reading from Mr. Taylor's pamphlet or is he reading from a document?

Mr. HUGHES. It is taken from the report of the Committee on Education and Labor by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A Senate document?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; a Senate document.

Mr. LIPPITT. What is the number of the document?

Mr. HUGHES. Report No. 1175, Sixty-third Congress, second session. I will just quote it straight throughout:

For example, a workman has been doing a piece of work in 190 minutes. After painstaking study of the job and all the means of saving time, the man is carefully instructed as to these means, and is told that for every minute saved, within, say, 120 minutes, he will be paid for half a minute at his regular rate, in addition to his regular daily pay; and that it is thought that he can do the work in 72 minutes, for which time the increase over his regular pay will amount to 33⅓ per cent.

So here is a man who has been doing a certain amount of work in 190 minutes under the Taylor efficiency system.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not think that the advertisement and the somewhat boastful statement that Mr. Taylor and the sup-

porters of his system have made in order to induce people to adopt it ought to be taken as a foundation for legislation on the important subject of rewarding working people for efficiency. Mr. Taylor, as I understand it, is an enthusiast upon a certain method that he has devised for improving the efficiency of the working people. Now, improving the efficiency of the working people is a very important subject. It is a very important subject from the standpoint of the workingman. It is simply another name for education. It is also a very important subject from the standpoint of the community at large, who are entitled to have their work performed as efficiently as possible. It does include, as the Senator from New Jersey has been pointing out, certain possibilities of oppression, and of course every decent man wants to guard against that side of the subject. On the other hand, every progressive man must be in favor of improvements in mechanical and commercial methods, and those improvements would be favored whether they consist of mechanical improvements in machinery, in devising new attachments, or in radical changes in the principle of machines, or whether they consist in showing men how to be more efficient and in rewarding men for efficiency.

The essence of this system, as I understand it, is simply that it is an attempt to give to the efficient man a little higher reward than the inefficient man gets. So if that is the principle, and that is the way I understand it, I am in favor of that principle and I do not want to see anything done that will break it down.

That statement of Mr. Taylor in regard to his system is somewhat an exaggerated advertisement of it, it seems to me. Mr. Taylor's system has not been generally adopted in manufacturing establishments, but the principle on which the Taylor system is established is as old as are manufacturing establishments.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I agree in the main with everything the Senator from Rhode Island has said, but I think he is in error when he states that there is no attempt to adopt the Taylor system as a whole in manufacturing establishments. There has been an attempt, a fairly successful attempt, in some places, and a very strong effort is being made to get it into the Government establishments. There is absolutely no excuse for a bonus system or a premium system of this character, which I understand is the character of a premium system that is in vogue, unless it is intended finally to adopt the Taylor system. It has no place in any manufacturing establishment which does not intend to go the whole way. In my judgment, these gentlemen intend to go the whole way, and it is my purpose and the purpose of the legislation which came over in the House bill to prevent it.

The Senator is a manufacturer and knows how to determine the efficiency of men. I want to call his attention to the system that is now in effect in the Watertown Arsenal. I do not know whether the Senator was here when I referred to it before or not, but they have a most comprehensive, complex, and intricate method of determining the daily and monthly and annual efficiency of the employees of that institution. There is absolutely nothing left to chance. There is not the slightest difficulty in any ordinarily intelligent man knowing just who are the efficient men in the establishment.

I will quote from the report of the committee of the House of Representatives, No. 403.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him just at that point?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to interrupt the Senator unduly, and I feel almost as though I ought to apologize for the extent to which I have gone into it, but what this bill says is—

> 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.

Mr. HUGHES. Exactly. They can raise his wages.

Mr. LIPPITT. That is the broadest possible negation of the right of the Government to reward skill and industry. It is not limited in any possible way. It says, in effect, it shall be the principle of the Government of the United States that no workingman, however efficient he may be or however skillful he may be, shall receive any reward for that efficiency. I can not conceive that to be a good principle for this Government to adopt. It says nothing about the Taylor system.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator knows very well that he does not pay a bonus in his own plant. Without knowing anything about it, I venture to say the Senator pays no bonus in his own plant. He is believed to be a humanitarian employer, and I will venture to say that he pays no bonuses or premiums in the plant with which he is connected or in which he is interested. He may have a profit-sharing plan, he may give certain men a certain profit.

Mr. LIPPITT. In the industry with which I happen to be engaged, in textile manufacture, we have the piecework plan, not that there is any difference——

Mr. HUGHES. There may be a head of a department here and there——

Mr. LIPPITT. Not that there is any difference between a piecework plan and a bonus plan in principle.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a great difference.

Mr. LIPPITT. That is something I am not able to understand.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not in favor of piecework. I know it is the tendency of piecework to reduce wages and to crowd production. I know the tendency of the work is to produce more and pay less, because it does not always continue the same character of work. The job changes and a new price has to be set. A new day's work has to be estimated. It is the gradual tendency of piecework to increase production and lower wages. I know that, but piecework, bad as it is, is infinitely preferable to this iniquitous bonus or premium system.

I want to quote now from the committee of the House of Representatives, No. 403, Sixty-second Congress, second session, a report made by the present Secretary of Labor and concurred in by William C. Redfield, now the Secretary of Commerce, and John Q. Tilson, then a Representative, a Representative-elect now from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. My attention was attracted to a statement by the Senator condemning piecework. Is the Senator opposed to piecework as a principle?

Mr. HUGHES. As against this proposition I am in favor of it; but I will say to the Senator the theory that a man who does the most work gets the most money under the piecework system sounds beautiful, but my experience has been that it does not work out well. The net result of it is that, as under the Taylor system, the day's work is finally based upon the ability of the high-class man. The man does not get any more in the end; his wages are finally driven down. The only difference is that he is doing more work for the same wages and the people under him on the piecework system, not so skillful as he, do not get enough on which to live. That is the practical operation of the piecework system. I have seen it a thousand times; and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. GALLINGER. Doubtless the Senator knows infinitely more about that than I do; but we have piecework in the Government Printing Office here.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUGHES. No, sir; the piecework system, as operated in the Government Printing Office, works all right. The piecework system could be made to work all right if every employer was as beneficent as an employer as is the Government and as I want it to continue to be as an employer. In this instance I would have no objection to the piecework system; I am asking for it in preference to the premium or bonus system. I want them to put it in operation at this plant, rather than the system which is sought to be put into operation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not follow the Senator from New Jersey. We all remember the old gentleman in Maine who was "for the prohibitory law, but 'agin' its enforcement." I do not understand how the Senator squares himself with the declaration that he is against the piecework system, and yet is for the piecework system.

Mr. HUGHES. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not misunderstand me. I will try to state my position over again. I will suggest to the Senator, as a matter of personal experience, that the best system under which working people can work—and I am not talking about the manufacturers, the owners of plants, the men who are in business frankly for the purpose of making money and producing dividends—but, so far as the laboring people are concerned, the best system is the system which this committee reported in favor of, and which I was about to read when the Senator interrupted me. With his permission, I will now read it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will listen to the Senator.

Mr. HUGHES. It is as follows:

> Ordinary intelligent management under any system could eliminate it entirely, or at least reduce it to the point where it would not be a serious hindrance to production. Because there are some loafers is no reason why the remainder of the workmen should either be compelled or induced to work up to the very edge of the breaking strain. There is need for production at the lowest cost, but no economic necessity can justify requiring workmen to speed up to the highest point which they can continue from day to day and from year to year, even without injury to their health and strength. To place workmen in a position of that kind is to put them in the position of a beast of burden which is required to go on from day to day performing a given task.
>
> * * * * * * *

Stop-watch time study should not be made of workmen without their consent, or any conditions be imposed upon them by authority which imply any indignity; piecework may be introduced where the work to be performed is a continuous duplication, but with the express understanding that piecework rates shall not be cut unless the conditions of production are materially changed.

That is the difficulty all the time. The conditions of production are materially changing. Very seldom is a man engaged on work which is work of continuous duplication. Every time a change is made advantage is taken of the stimulating effect of the piecework system with the man. He has disclosed himself as being able to do a certain amount of work, and advantage is taken of that fact. When the next day's job is started his maximum is taken as his minimum. As I said to the Senator, in ordinary industrial affairs the piecework system is a bad system for the man who toils. This committee goes on and says:

In other cases the rate should be a straight day-wage rate at the highest prevailing rate for a similar class of work in the neighborhood where the Government work is to be performed, except that by mutual consent bonus and premium work may be introduced.

The situation pictured by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] need not affect the mind of any Senator here, because it is quite possible to meet the wishes of the parties concerned in this matter. A piecework system can be established, which will give to those people who have petitioned the Senator precisely the same rate of wages which they are now receiving for the same amount of production. So what difficulty is there involved? We will establish a system and we will put an end to this continuous effort on the part of the officers at the various arsenals and navy yards, who have not as much sympathy as perhaps they might have with the civilians there employed and treat them as the hardest-hearted manufacturers in the United States treat their employees.

I ask the Senate, in all seriousness, to let the House language stand in the bill. It only applies to this appropriation bill; it will only be a law during the life of the bill, until July, 1916. In the meantime the Senate will have an opportunity to make further investigation, if it so desires, and, in the end, I hope Congress will enact substantive legislation which will prevent the recurrence of these discussions.

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] in the course of his address made some remarks about wages in the Pittsburgh district, which I feel I can not allow to pass without something in the nature of a reply.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Pennsylvania does not understand me as personally making that statement? The Senator is as familiar with the work of the Sage Foundation Commission as I can be. I saw the statement in a Philadelphia publication.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand, Mr. President, that the Senator referred to the report of the Pittsburgh survey made by the Sage Foundation, and did not state it as either of his own knowledge or as his belief, except as based upon that publication.

I have read that rather extraordinary report, Mr. President, though I had temporarily forgotten that it contained what he said about wages. In fact, I do not now recollect to have seen that particular statement in it; but I have no doubt it is there, as the Senator from New Jersey says so.

The report of the Pittsburgh survey made by the Sage Foundation was made in the very earliest days of that foundation. It is based on information gleaned by a lot of inexperienced young people entirely unfitted for their work, and is brimful of the grossest kind of inaccuracies.

With regard to the statement referred to by the Senator from New Jersey, that wages in the industrial establishments of Pittsburgh are based upon the lowest amount that one man, living in lodgings, can live on, I say that if that statement is contained in that report it is absolutely and entirely untrue.

Mr. President, I am not here to defend the present wage system. In competitive business men will pay for a certain kind of work the wages their competitors pay, and no more; and so long as selfishness is the guiding principle of human life every man will get as much work as he can for as little money as he can, but that the manufacturers in the industries of Pittsburgh get more work out of their men for less money than manufacturers in any like industries in other sections of the country I *say is not* true.

I say further—and I say it without fear of contradiction—that in no industrial district in the United States or in the world are higher wages paid for like work than are paid in the great industrial center in which I live. The only exception I will allow to that statement is that, perhaps, in some of the mining regions of the West, where living is extraordinarily high, higher wages are naturally paid than in the East, where it does not cost so much to live. The truth of my statement is proved and will be plain to anybody who visits the district and will examine into the matter and ascertain the facts concerning the immense and constantly growing deposits in our savings banks, the amounts being deposited in the postal savings bank in that district, the enormous sums of money that are daily remitted to the countries of eastern Europe by these men who, as it is said, only receive for their labor enough wages to keep them alive from day to day.

I can not stand here, Mr. President, and hear the great community which has given me a home since my infancy slandered in this way. The masters of industry in Pittsburgh pay just as much for like work as the same kind of employers pay in any other part of the country, and infinitely more than is paid in any part of the world outside of the United States.

Before I sit down I want to refer in a very few words to another matter connected with this proposed legislation. I am informed by the employees of the Frankford Arsenal that—

The premium system was introduced about five years ago, and the tasks were assigned to the men and women without any supervision by a time watch, as such time study has never been introduced in the arsenal. The capacity of the various machines was known, and it was not difficult to assign a task which would be fair to the employee and fair to the Government.

Further, they say:

Your attention is particularly invited to the fact that the task for a day was based upon seven hours' running of the machine, leaving to the employee one hour of the eight for washing, relaxation, going to the toilet, etc. In other words, out of every hour 15 minutes were given to each employee. The employee's task was therefore under such circumstances fixed at seven-eighths of the capacity of the machine, which practically amounts to making the working day one of seven hours instead of eight.

In other words, Mr. President, as practiced in this particular arsenal, the capacity of the machine is fixed at what it will normally and naturally do in seven hours. Any employee working eight hours and producing seven hours' work is given his or her day's wages, and for anything more than that task which they can produce from this machine they are paid one-half of the proportion of the day's work. It is a system that satisfies them all. They want it continued. They are using the extra wages they obtain in this way to pay for the little homes which they have bought and to procure for themselves better means of living. The opposition does not come from inside the arsenal; it comes from the outside.

Now, one word more. Mr. President, in my life I have given some study and thought to the question of differences between employer and employee. I have been an employer of labor myself; I have had differences with the men whom I employed; and as a result of my experience and observation I want to say that the differences between employer and employee, as a general thing, are usually traceable to two unreasonable kinds of men—on the one side, the employer whose sole object is to get as much out of his men for as little as he can and, on the other side, the workman who seeks to give as little in the way of labor for as much money as he can get. If you could eliminate these two classes labor difficulties would be very rare. I am glad to say that, with greater study, with greater intelligence, and with a more liberal spirit throughout the land and throughout the world, the unreasonable employer is fast disappearing. I fear not that the unreasonable employee is coming to the front, but I fear, to be perfectly plain, that the efforts of some of the great labor organizations are rather in the direction of encouraging the unreasonable employee than of inciting him to give a reasonable amount of day's labor for a reasonable compensation in the shape of day's wages.

Now, it seems to me that this system specifying a reasonable amount—and I do not believe that anybody will charge that the superintendents of the Government arsenals will be unreasonable in fixing tasks for a machine—I think that this system by which a given task is set for a machine so that seven hours' reasonable work can be done in eight hours and offering an inducement to the industrious and skillful and efficient workman to work up above that by paying him a bonus for his extra work is so reasonable that I feel if I were to vote against such a proposition I would be recreant to my duty as a representative of my State.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I feel somewhat like apologizing to the Senate for taking up any more of its time in the discussion of this bill; but inasmuch as I am one of the members of the committee who voted to strike out the provision, I think it my duty to give the Senate some of the reasons which actuated me in so doing.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I voted to strike out this proviso, primarily because I do not think

it has any legitimate place in the bill. The fact that its consideration has exhausted more than a day of our valuable time should be a conclusive illustration of the soundness of this objection. Shortly after I entered the Senate the President vetoed the sundry civil bill for the sole reason that it contained a proviso of similar character, forbidding the use of any moneys appropriated in that measure for the prosecution of any labor or farmers' organization under the antitrust acts. The succeeding bill contained the same proviso, and the President approved that bill, notwithstanding his expressed disapproval of the proviso itself.

Mr. SMOOT. That was another President, however.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. This illustrated, to my mind, the vicious nature of provisos or riders or additions to measures designed for other or general purposes so vividly that I have, in so far as my committee work was concerned, voted to eliminate similar provisions wherever they occur.

If it be true that all of the injurious results that have been detailed must follow from the establishment of the so-called efficiency system in Government operations, then it is of sufficient importance to be made the subject of a bill dealing solely with that proposition. We can then discuss it upon its merits, and without reference to its effect or its influence upon matters which, as in the present instance, are directly associated with it, and which may stand or fall upon the opinion of Congress and the President with regard to that one provision. That is not right, Mr. President. The Army bill is a great supply bill. The purpose of it is to equip the War Department for the ensuing year, without reference to differences of opinion as to whether it goes too far or not far enough. This industrial question is injected into it and made a part of it, which necessarily distracts very largely from the consideration of the merits of the principal measure. It is a custom sanctified by age and made respectable by usage, but it is nevertheless one which ought to be corrected whenever possible, and objected to wherever an objection can be entertained against it.

I therefore voted against it as a piece of proposed legislation foreign to the general subject matter of the bill, one designed to distract attention, and which has distracted attention in its ultimate consideration from the merits of the measure itself.

Another of my reasons was that those who are affected by the proviso appealed to the Senate committee to strike it out. I think that the views of those who come under the influence of, or are affected by, the provisions of a given law, especially if they express themselves with any unanimity, ought to know something about its operation. It is they to whom we should look for the purpose of determining whether, in its operation, it has produced the evil effects which it is declared are inseparable from the system or whether it has had the opposite result.

I do not recall that any written protest against the practice was laid before the committee during its consideration. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] appeared, asking to be heard in behalf of some of his constituents who desired to see the proviso stricken out. The discussion which followed made it unnecessary for him to go to that trouble, as the committee, or at least a majority of those present, felt that the proviso should be stricken out, among others, for the reasons stated.

I believe thoroughly in the doctrine of efficiency. I am aware of the fact that a system baptized by that name may be put to an untoward or an injurious purpose, just as any other system or any other scheme of legislation may be. On the other hand, without efficiency there can be no such thing as progress; and if efficiency is to be tabooed, especially in the line of Government operation, why should we educate our children? The ambition of every man is to give his child a better position in the world than has been afforded himself—a laudable ambition, a noble ambition, the ambition upon which our educational system is founded, one which has been productive of the most marvelously beneficial results, and which constitutes the foundation of our growth and of our progress. We ought to be able, therefore, to guard against the abuse of any system if it contains elements of inestimable value to our community life as well as to our individual life without discarding the system itself, and I think that can be done.

If it can be shown to me that a superintendent of any of our governmental institutions is using what is called the efficiency system for the purpose of speeding up men unduly, for the purpose of weeding out those who are unable to meet the strain placed upon them by their increasing tasks, or is using it even unconsciously toward the end which it is claimed it must surely reach, I would be one of the first to demand the removal either of the system or of the superintendent, or possibly of both. Until that is made to appear, however, I do not believe the Congress of the United States should set its seal of disapproval upon a system which, so far as it has been carried, seems to have been successful, to have commanded the applause and the support of those who work and carry on their operations under it, and who seem to have so far benefited financially from its operation as to be able, by their increased income, to secure sufficient savings to begin the purchase of a home.

If I remember the petitions correctly some of the signers are in that very interesting period between the attempted acquisition of a home and its final payment, a position, Mr. President, in which all the apprehensions of a man who is dependent upon his daily labor are naturally aroused and who will strain every effort to see to it that the home is secured during the period of time given for its payment.

Now, if that is the condition of many of those people it is fair to assume that this same condition exists among the workmen in our other arsenals and Government manufactories, for if it were not, we would have been apprised of the circumstances before final action was taken upon this matter.

When, therefore, Mr. President, with a unanimity of request that is remarkable—I will not say unusual, but it is really remarkable—the employees of one of these great institutions protest against this measure and request Congress to continue its operation, it seems to me it is our duty to do so. It is very easy to appoint a committee or to have the Secretary of War through appropriate agencies inquire into and investigate any charge of oppression, of injustice, and of wrong which may at any time be the outgrowth or which may be suspected to be the outgrowth of the operation of this system.

I can not speak at large but as far as my knowledge goes of Government employees and officials they are not an overworked body of men and women. They are the best paid employees among all who work for their living in the United States. Their hours are shorter. Many of them have combined into organizations some of which are strong enough to enable them to make not only requests but demands for certain legislation or protests against legislation which they do not desire.

Until we are informed at least by hearsay of the alleged pernicious results of this system as applied to the arsenals or other institutions which are under the control of the Department of War, I think we should go upon the testimony laid before us and strike out this provision.

Something has been said, Mr. President, about the mechanical features of the system. It is declared that men are subject to be timed in a most arbitrary and unjust manner and their work speeded up and paid for upon the basis of efficiency of the highest as shown during the period of these arbitrary intervals. Such a system may be an unwise and an unjust one. No man likes to be held to the fraction of a second in the performance of any task. I am inclined to think that if a stop watch was held upon the Members of the United States Senate, especially during a period of active or obstructive debate, there would be a greater protest against it than will ever arise from a labor union. Hence I will not assume that there is any particular danger of attaching this stop-watch system to the body to which I have the honor to belong.

But if it be true, Mr. President, that these incidents of an efficiency system are obnoxious or injurious, I can not doubt that the authorities will see that they are either corrected or done away with. Until something of that kind appears I do not think the Government of the United States can afford to interfere with an efficiency system which is in process of experiment, and which, so far as the experience of those affected by that process are concerned, seems to have been both beneficial and satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this House provision, which the committee of the Senate proposes to strike out, contains two very distinct propositions, one prohibiting the stop watch or other time-measuring device and the other prohibiting bonuses. They are so distinct that I think the amendment ought to be divided, and at the proper time I shall ask that it be divided.

Mr. WARREN. May I call the Senator's attention also to the first part of the proposed proviso, which penalizes a foreman, a superintendent, and so forth? As they are officers of the Army commissioned and under the discipline of the Army, does not the Senator think that that also should be separated?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. In the naval appropriation bill there is a similar provision, but it does not contain this provision about the officers, and it can be taken out here perfectly well.

Mr. President, I have received scores of letters against the House provision, both in the Navy and the Army bills. They are all, without exception, from employers of labor. I have received very little from the men who labor—from the employed. I have received one or two letters from those not

employed in the arsenal and this letter from the men employed in the arsenal at Watertown:

23 CHARLES STREET,
Auburndale, Mass., February 16, 1915.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LODGE: We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Massachusetts and the representatives of the employees in the different departments at the Watertown Arsenal, under the War Department, respectfully urge upon you, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and through you the Senate of the United States, to support the clause on page 50 of this year's naval appropriation bill which aims to curb the objectionable features of the "Taylor system of shop management" and similar systems by prohibiting the time study of workmen and the premium system in Government shops.

We further urge you to support an amendment of the clause that will give it the effect of permanent law.

Woodworking department, E. P. Gingras.
Pattern-making department, James B. Cummings.
Paint department, H. A. Gildersleeve.
Foundry department, J. R. Cooney.
Machine department, F. H. Holway.
Smith-shop department, W. A. McArthur.
Yard laboring, P. Killride.

Yours, respectfully,

MAURICE W. BOWEN,
Chairman Representative Committee.

Those men are men of good standing in their communities, as well as in the arsenal, and I think their views are entitled to the same consideration as the views of employers outside.

The subject was new to me. I have never been an employer of labor, nor have I ever been employed in any of the industries, and I look at it entirely from an outside point of view.

About the system of bonuses instead of a straight system of piecework I am not able to speak with any confidence. I have not made up my mind; I do not know enough about it. I think the piecework system, which is largely used both in private establishments and also in Government departments, is a fair system. However it has worked, it is certainly a fair system in theory, for I believe the better man, the man of self-control, the man of sobriety, the man of industry, the man of thrift, the man of skill, is entitled to the higher wages which those qualities give him.

But the first proposition about the time measure, the holding of the stop watch over a man, I can not accept. It seems to me false economically, and I do not believe that in the long run it will lead to any good results.

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 the great inventions of our time, owing to steam and electricity, we have carried speed to such an extent in all 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 they can possibly tell on 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 that I was trying to buy. I wanted to know his quality; 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 the stop watch to test a horse who 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 that 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 apply the stop watch to human beings may tell how fast they can work, but it can tell nothing of the quality of their work.

Mr. POMERENE. Nor how long they may work.

Mr. LODGE. Nor how long they may work. A horse may be very good for a short spurt and absolutely worthless for a 4-mile race. It is a poor test. It is a promoter of the idea that the one thing to do is to turn out just as much as we can just as fast as we can. That has gone through everything in this period of ours. It has deteriorated style, it has deteriorated literature, it has deteriorated art. It is deteriorating manufacture.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am seeking information on this point. I had supposed the quality of the work was fairly well standardized; that is, that this speed system, or whatever you call it, was for the purpose of producing a greater amount of a given quality, of a certain kind. I suppose all the work is subject to inspection.

Mr. LODGE. That may be all true; but I do not think it affects the argument I am trying to make, and that is that speed is neither a test of a man's capacity nor a test of the quality of the work he will turn out. It is merely speed; it is merely quantity.

Look back over the history of any of the great arts. For instance, there was a Venetian painter, Luca Giordano. He was known popularly as Luca Fa Presto, because he worked so fast; he covered acres of walls and acres of canvas with pictures of a certain technical cleverness. But one Madonna painted by Bellini outweighs them all to-day in price, in beauty, and in every quality. But under the stop-watch system nobody would have employed Bellini; they would all have employed Luca Giordano.

Mr. President, may I take one more illustration from the art of painting? The total production of Rubens is something enormous. The mere quantity, the opulence and fertility of his inventions, and his capacity for work are in themselves great qualities. He painted many very great and splendid pictures, and yet Leonardo Da Vinci, all of whose pictures can be put in a small room, painted one which was stolen from the Louvre the other day, and that alone will outweigh the whole of Rubens's productions, and Rubens was a very great painter too.

It is the same way with books. When I was a boy—and I suppose there are some still here old enough to remember that period—there were two very popular writers, Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth and Ned Buntline, who poured out countless books. They had the highest possible speed and wonderful facility, but three or four novels of Hawthorne are a possession of literature to-day and the others have vanished. Speed is not the only thing in art or literature, and it is not the only thing in manufacturing. There quality is needed too.

I do not believe, Mr. President, in a system of 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 the 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.

The result of this is that all your Government shops are in constant agitation. It does not seem to be any answer to say that union labor is opposed to this system. That is only putting it off one step. It does not follow that because union labor is opposed to it it must be good. The men are restless for whatever reason; there is incessant agitation; they resist; they object to it; they do not think it is fair.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he does not think in the argument which he has just made he has overlooked the mechanical facilities of the individual. I think a great deal in all these things depends upon the mechanical property, the use of the hands, which some people possess to a very high degree and others do not. An illustration of that is found in the ordinary operation of sewing. A fast sewer is usually a good sewer, whereas a poor sewer is very slow and makes a bungling performance at last.

Mr. LODGE. It does not prove because persons work slowly that they work badly.

Mr. DU PONT. Not always.

Mr. LODGE. As a rule, some of the best work in the world and the most enduring has been done slowly. That does not follow any more than it follows that because work is done fast it is done well. It may be done well. There are men who combine excellence of production with rapidity in working.

What I am contending for is that this stop-watch test is mere speed and nothing else. The only thing that it is attempted to show in this way is how fast a man can do a given piece of work. It does not make any matter what the result is, but how fast can he do it, so that it will pass muster at the end. Of

course, if he spoils it, that is another thing, but how fast can he turn out a given thing, some part of the lock of a gun or some part of a cartridge or something of that sort. How rapidly can he turn it out, how rapidly can he move the heavy pieces of iron that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] pointed out? It is quite possible to arrive at a standard of efficiency without putting on a stop watch. A great deal of efficiency, a great deal of standardizing is done without that. There is plenty of work which is done with the highest efficiency where no stop watch is used.

Now, in a military force, in an army or navy, or a semimilitary force like the police, it is absolutely essential that the unit should be sacrificed if necessary to the organization. To attempt to turn an army or a navy into an educational or a manufacturing establishment is to lose sight of the only purpose for which it exists, the military purpose, and is to destroy it as a military arm. But when you come to the organization of manufacturing, I think we should hesitate long before we undertake to sacrifice the unit to the organization.

Great results have been obtained in the efficiency of manufacturing without stop watches and time measures. Certainly most great and successful manufacturing establishments succeed in getting a perfect standard of efficiency without resorting to the stop watch, without working one exceptional man to the top of his bent and then establishing that as a standard other men must live up to. Efficiency is determined not by one short heat. Efficiency is determined over a period of time and many things enter into it besides speed.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I do not believe in that part of the system which involves putting a time measure on the men in our Government shops.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was going to ask the Senator, prompted by a remark he has just made, this question: Is it a fact that under this so-called Taylor system, or the equivalent of it, the work of the most efficient is made the standard?

Mr. LODGE. I dare say they average it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wondered about that, because it would seem to me to be wrong to take the most efficient man, the marvel, and make him the standard.

Mr. LODGE. No; I suppose they average it. I do not know on what system it is done, but they average the time that ought to be used. Then they pay the most efficient man the bonus. But I believe the efficiency can be reached in other and better ways. I do not believe that it is good policy for the Government in the Government shops connected with the naval and military establishments to harass men with this thing.

Now, I have heard it said here that in Watertown there was much of this that was abandoned. I do not know how that is. The Senator from New Jersey said that they have a very complex system at Watertown.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; they have a system that nobody is complaining about, a system which enables an intelligent superintendent to know just the degree of efficiency attained by every man, woman, or child in the plant. That is, of course, in effect now. They have a system of grading and give values and figures for sobriety and integrity and lack of tardiness. In various ways they are in position to rate them, and do rate them, in accordance with their efficiency. There is nothing to prevent them from putting this work now on a piecework basis. The point that I make is that piecework is not an ideal basis, and in private industrial establishments the tendency of piecework is to lower wages and increase production. I do not think it is a good thing. I do not think anyone thinks it is a good thing.

But that is not the tendency. At the Government plants they are more generous and more humane, as a general proposition, than they are in private plants, and the evils which apply to a piecework system in a private plant are not present in a Government plant. Everything that the proponents of this proposition are contending for—I mean now my opponents—can be obtained by this piecework system.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I was contending.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the way I understood the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The efficiency is secured in other ways. I asked the Senator the question about the Watertown Arsenal because these men, representing every branch of the work, some of whom I have known for many years, who are eminently good citizens and reputable men, occupying positions of trust there, have all united in protesting specifically against the "time study," as they call it. I do not believe that these men desire to cheat the Government or to give the Government other than a thorough and fair eight hours' work a day. They are anxious to keep their places, and certainly would not seek to injure the Government. I suppose it may seem very strange, but I think the opinion of these men is just as much entitled to consideration as is that of employers generally, who want the Government to maintain this system.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Massachusetts is undoubtedly familiar with the fact that Gen. Crozier and other officers who are in charge of various plants have been insisting for years that they are manufacturing at a cost that compares favorably with the prices charged by outside establishments. It has for years been their boast that they have brought their plants to such a state of efficiency and have such a high class of labor that they can furnish a great many articles which the Government uses sometimes at a cost away below the cost at which they are furnished by private plants, sometimes for one-third of what private plants and corporations charge the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I know that has been asserted and that the Taylor system is a comparatively recent introduction. Those arsenals—there are two in my State—had been brought to high efficiency before the Taylor system was ever introduced.

Mr. HUGHES. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LODGE. And it is the same, I think, in the naval workshops.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the stop-watch time study, wholly apart from the question of what one side or the other wants. I think it is that confusion which runs through all our modern production—stimulated thereto by the great inventions—that confusion between speed and quality, that quantity rapidly turned out can make up for quality. It never can. I do not mean to say that there are not cases where speed and quality have been combined, but I do say that a mere test of speed does not test quality. I think that to assume to say that we are going to improve upon any manufacture by merely finding out how fast a man can move a piece of iron or turn out a portion of a gunlock is an absurdity on its face.

This worship of speed—mere speed—in manufacturing and in every other function of life is repellant to me. In addition to that, I do not believe in applying this to workmen. I do not believe that the manufacturing force is a military force; I do not believe the unit should be overlooked in the organization. I do not know that any inhumanity has arisen out of it, but I do believe that efficiency can be secured and the men who deserve the higher ratings can get them under more humane methods than are proposed in this system.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not believe that the God of humanity breathed the breath of life into man that he should live to work, but that he should work that he might live—a very wide difference. I feel, and I think we shall all agree, that the problem of our civilization to-day is to lighten the burdens of mankind. I feel that the Taylor system, so called, would tend to make a mere machine of man. I believe it is absolutely uncalled for and utterly out of line with our thoughts of progress and the advancement of this age, and utterly un-American. My experience is, as an employer of men—and I have employed many of them—that workmen are not all loafers nor "snides," as some are called, but that the great majority of them are honest, well-meaning citizens and a benefit to the human race.

I believe this proposition is utterly un-American and unjust. I believe it is cruel and inhumane. A stop watch, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said, is used in a horse race. Yes, it is; and I first knew of a stop watch in that way. I have never owned one, however, and never want one. But a stop watch is used in another way. They use a stop watch at a prize fight, and they are very important, so I am told, for men who engage in a pugilistic encounter.

I believe in treating workmen as though they were human beings, and not as though they were mere machines. The whole effort in this proposition is to run men to the degree of a machine. I have received, and doubtless other Senators have as well, hundreds of letters from workmen the country over, protesting against the stop-watch system, the holding of a stop watch over a man, as, in one instance, Mr. Taylor has said, so that when a workman is shoveling you shall gauge by a stop watch just how long it takes to shove his blade of the shovel into the earth or into the sand or other material, and then just how many seconds transpire between the time of the filling of that shovel and the tossing of it over to the receptacle or other place it is designed to go. I do not believe that God, in His edict that we should earn our bread by the sweat of our face, ever designed or devised that mankind should be narrowed down

to that miserable sort of mechanism. I do not believe that in this day and in this age this system is necessary; and it is not necessary, certainly, in this great country, which has been blessed beyond parallel with wealth, with climatic conditions, and with other things that should tend to make better the human race.

I have received many letters on this subject. I have to-day received letters from Newark, of workmen and machinists, dated February 17. I have another dated the 21st. All these men protest, and thousands of others have protested, against this unfair, ungenerous, and un-American system.

Whatever private men may do to eke out more wealth from the toil, the blood, the sweat, and the energy of their workmen in private establishments we may not be able to control; but do not let it, I say, ever be said that the Senate of the United States or the Congress of the United States has adopted a system whereby an employer or a foreman or a boss may stand over workmen holding a time watch to see the amount of time that shall be expended in order that each one of these workmen may make a standard for wages and for higher efficiency. The need does not exist. Humanity, civilization, justice, and wisdom, I feel, also protest against the adoption of this horrid system.

Mr. ROOT and Mr. WORKS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have been greatly puzzled to know what I should do in dealing with this subject. I have no technical, no practical knowledge of it. I must depend on what others may say about it, and then be guided by what I regard as just principles that should control the action of the Government in dealing with its employees.

I am greatly in favor of any system that tends to increase the efficiency of the employee rightfully and justly, not only because in that way he is made more helpful to his employer but because it is an advantage to himself. He is enabled in that way to secure better wages and to find a higher place as an employee.

I do not like, in the first place, the manner in which this question is presented to the Senate. The Government should deal with a question of this kind directly. It should lay out a policy for itself in dealing with its employees. This provision is simply one providing that a specific appropriation shall not be applied to a certain purpose if the superintendents or officers in charge of the work are enforcing the so-called Taylor system. If the Government believes in adopting the Taylor system, let it be adopted. On the other hand, if the Government is opposed to it, it should provide in direct terms that it should not be applied to its own employees.

I have no sympathy whatever with any system that tends to reduce the most efficient employee to the level of the inefficient one; and that, I am afraid, is being very largely done under the rules and regulations of the labor organizations. I think it is a vicious system.

I have no sympathy, either, with the effort to control the work and the conduct of an employee by constant surveillance of him, or watching over him while he is doing his work. It is a species of slavery that ought not to be allowed in this country. The stop-watch system, as has been very well said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], tends mainly, if not entirely, to speed and not to real efficiency. Indeed, I think it has the contrary effect. The man who is induced to overwork and to look simply to the quantity of material that he may turn out, is more likely to do poor work than is the man who is allowed to take his own way and work as it is natural for him to work.

I would not see much objection to the other provision of the bill if it were a direct provision to allow the efficient man a premium for the work he does, provided the hours of labor are limited. So long as the hours of labor are limited to eight a day a man can hardly be overworked. A stimulant of that kind is not likely to do any great harm, but my mind revolts against the other idea of watching over him with a stop watch every step he takes, every piece of work he attempts to do.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Senator from California, as is the case with a great many other Senators, does not seem to make any distinction between a premium system and a piecework system. I have said that I am perfectly agreeable that the work at Government yards and arsenals shall be placed on a piecework basis, and that will result, as the Senator desires, in rewarding the man who does the most work; but that is entirely different from the premium system, and it is to that system that I object. The trouble is that we are discussing things about which to a large extent we agree. If the Senator will get the distinction clear in his mind between a premium system and a piecework system, he and I would not have much difficulty, I think.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am not very likely to do that, because in my judgment there is very little difference between the two. Where a man works at piecework, of course it is to his interest to turn out just as many pieces as he can, whether they are good, bad, or indifferent. It is precisely so with respect to the premium system, which allows him additional wages for the increased or added amount of work he may be able to turn out. In principle there is very little, if any, difference between the two.

Mr. HUGHES. The difference is that, to start off with, it would be possible under the premium system to make the minimum for the day's work. For instance, as I cited a while ago, 190 minutes was arbitrarily given for a certain task. The number of minutes to be consumed in performing that task was reduced to 170, and then it was said that for every minute saved out of the 170 a half minute's wages would be paid. Surely the Senator can see a distinction between that and a straight piece price. I will assure him, at any rate, that there is a vast difference, and that it is the whole question involved in this controversy.

Mr. WORKS. Well, Mr. President, I can see a very great difference between the piece-work system and the premium system where the amount of work that the laborer is allowed to do is limited. In that case there is a very great difference.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator misunderstood me. I said the number of minutes which were allowed for the completion of a certain task were limited. In the case I cited from Mr. Taylor's pamphlet 190 minutes had been allowed for the completion of a certain task. This time was reduced, as I recall the figures, to 170 minutes. Then the employee was told: "Hitherto you have been working 190 minutes to complete this task, now you can complete it in 170 minutes, but if you complete it in 169 minutes you will receive one-half minute's more pay." He takes an illustration from the Bethlehem Steel Co., where he finally left a gang of workmen doing 300 per cent more work than they had been doing when he took charge of them. That was a class of work into which the consideration of quality did not enter at all; it was merely transporting pigs of iron from one part of the plant to another. Under the premium system he had forced those men up to a production which he himself admitted the ordinary man could not have done, and a day's work in that particular line of industry becomes so onerous and so burdensome that only the very flower of the physical manhood of the plant could hope to engage in it. What became of the others? We can not base our industrial system on the capacity of men in the very flower of their physical manhood and strength; we must take into consideration the frailties and imperfections of the human organism. Youth and age are to be taken into consideration as well as the prime of life.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey if he knows of any employee in these establishments whose wages have been reduced?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know of any employee whose wages have been reduced; but I do not know of anything in my remarks that would call forth that inquiry.

Mr. ROOT. That was the inference that I drew from the Senator's objection to taking the very flower of the whole body of employees as the standard, as I understand it.

Mr. HUGHES. Probably the Senator and I misunderstand each other. I was citing an instance which was given by Mr. Taylor with reference to the Bethlehem Steel Co., a private corporation. The Senator misunderstood me. I probably did not make myself clear.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the piece system may be made objectionable either by requiring that a certain piece of work shall be done within a limited time—which is one side of it—or by requiring that only a certain amount of work shall be done within 24 hours, which is another side of it. The one tends to crowd out the inefficient man and to prevent him from working at all, while the other tends to reduce the efficient man, who can do a greater amount of work during the day, to the level of the inefficient man. They are both objectionable—one about as much so as the other—but I was talking about a straight piece system that contains no such limitations or restrictions.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I shall try not to take up an undue amount of time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Nelson	Shively
Bankhead	Gronna	Norris	Simmons
Brady	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	James	Owen	Smoot
Burleigh	Johnson	Page	Stephenson
Burton	Jones	Penrose	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kern	Perkins	Swanson
Chilton	Lane	Pittman	Thomas
Clapp	Lewis	Poindexter	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Pomerene	Tillman
Culberson	Lodge	Ransdell	Townsend
Dillingham	McCumber	Root	Warren
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	White
Fall	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Williams
Gallinger	Myers	Sherman	Works

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is absent on official business.

I am also requested to announce the absence from the city of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] on official business.

Mr. HOLLIS. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the particular matter regarding which I desire to say a few words is the provision included in the Army appropriation bill as it came from the House, which I will take the liberty of reading, as it is very brief. After provisions for the Field Artillery and for ammunition and other ordnance supplies occur these words:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time measuring device, a time study of any job 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 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.

That provision has been stricken out by the Senate committee, and the question before the Senate is, Shall we sustain our committee in striking out the provision, or shall we reverse the committee by leaving the provision in the bill?

I will say at this point that the provision which our committee has stricken out was not put into the bill by or upon the report of any committee of the House, but was put in on the floor; so that both committees of both Houses who have had the opportunity to study and maturely consider the subject were against the provision now under consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has been reported favorably by other committees, both of the Senate and of the House.

Mr. ROOT. That I do not know. All I know is what the committees have done about this bill. I shall presently refer to other things that have been done upon this subject, which, to my view, would constitute a far more satisfactory way of dealing with it than this provision, which undertakes to withhold pay from any officer who undertakes to pay any premium or to use any time-measuring device to fix a basis for paying premiums.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. Would the Senator care to call attention also to the fact that it was put in at a time when the bill was being passed under such conditions as forbade any extended debate on the provision?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have not personally inquired into that subject. I have been so informed.

The practice at which this provision is aimed is but an example of an attempt to apply, in the manufacturing establishments of the Government, a theory or method of dealing with Government work which appeals to me as being wise and just; that is, the practice of endeavoring to pay wages in such a way that the best, most industrious, alert, and effective workman will be paid more than the dull, slow, indifferent, and ineffective workman. The question whether or not that is a wise thing to do lies at the bottom of this whole discussion. The answer to that question, to my mind, necessarily leads to an answer to the question raised by the action of the committee in striking out this provision. I have no doubt about it, sir. I have no doubt that it is highly desirable that men in the Government employment and men everywhere shall have prizes given to them for those qualities which make for efficiency, for growth development, and enlargement of power. I believe that to be one of the essential and vital qualities of American development—that our system, industrial and social, affords opportunity for ambition, for industry, for alertness, for courage, for hope.

I sympathize from the bottom of my heart with the men who, in labor unions, are endeavoring to better their conditions. I think they are proceeding in accordance with the true methods of a free Republic, and I sympathize with them a hundred times over rather than with the men who come running to the Government to help them. They are helping themselves. But, sir, there is one tendency of organized labor which has always seemed to me to be most unfortunate and injurious, and that is the tendency to prohibit any man from rising in his effort and his efficiency above the standard of the lowest; the effort to level down to the lowest grade instead of the effort to lift up to the highest grade; the effort to prevent men who work with their hands from having any incentive to their ambition; the effort to put a dull level before all the young men of America who are to work with their hands, and forbid them to rise above it. It is contrary to the whole spirit and genius of American life; and the whole opposition to this system, unless it be criticism of details, is based upon that theory, that the best shall be like the worst, that ambition shall have no hope. I do not believe in it.

Sir, what is called the efficiency system is one method of attempting to apply to Government employees in the manufacturing establishments of the Ordnance Department the plan of grading wages according to efficiency. There are several different ways of doing that. The first and simplest is piecework. I have great interest in this subject, because 12 or 15 years ago I was engaged, as head of the War Department, with the Chief of Ordnance who is reporting to us now on this subject in extended discussions with the men of the Rock Island Arsenal about the simple method of applying the plan I have spoken of to that arsenal through the method of piecework. The labor organizations were very strongly opposed to that, and it gave us great trouble and great solicitude; but it was finally disposed of upon the general proposition that the people of the United States were the greatest labor organization in the world, and that we represented that organization. Accordingly in the Rock Island Arsenal so far as piecework was practicable it was continued, and the men who did the most got the most, and the men who did the least got the least; and now I learn from the Senator from New Jersey that piecework, 12 or 15 years after that controversy was ended, is not objectionable.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether, in dealing with that matter, there was any limitation upon the amount of work that an employee might do, or any time limit within which he must do it?

Mr. ROOT. There was no time limit. That is, the hours of labor were fixed.

Mr. WORKS. Oh, yes; I am not speaking about the hours of labor, but the quantity of work—that if a man did a certain quantity of work he must stop work within the eight hours?

Mr. ROOT. No; there was no requirement that he should stop work, as I remember. I would not be very certain about my memory as to details, for it is a long time ago.

That is one way of applying the principle of paying the most money for the most work; but, sir, there are many kinds of manufacture to which it is impracticable to apply the piecework method, because each one of many men is engaged, not in making a piece, not in making a thing you can count, but in doing certain things which contribute, together with the things done by many others, to a product. The so-called efficiency system is but a method of undertaking to apply the method of piecework to that kind of production. The way of doing it is to ascertain by observation what number of operations contributing to a product which includes operations by others, and which therefore can not be called a piece to be paid for by the simple piecework system, will be normally performed by this contributor to the product, what number by that contributor, what number by a third contributor, and what number by

a fourth contributor, getting the normal number of operations, and then taking that normal number as the standard, and giving extra compensation to a man who does more than that.

In the course of the ascertainment of the standard there has to be a time measurement. It is no more a time measurement, however, than the application of the eight-hour day is a time measurement.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. One moment. A stop watch, or a measure of time within the terms of this provision—that is, a time-measuring device—is used to tell when men begin work in the morning and when they end it in the afternoon, and it is necessary for the application of the law which prohibits their being at work over a specified number of hours. The measurement of time is essential, as I understand, to the fixing of the standard; and when the standard is fixed that ends it.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the Senator is falling into the same error that several Senators on his side of this proposition have fallen into, and is confusing the piecework system with the premium system. They are just as different in practical effect, however alike they may appear to be in theory, as two things can possibly be.

There is no practical difficulty, although the Senator thinks there is, in applying the piecework plan to various incomplete operations; and I should like to lay down the broad general proposition that the piecework system is infinitely easier to put into effect at any part of a manufacturing plant, at any stage of the production of a product, than is the Taylor efficiency system. The difference between the piecework system, if the Senator will permit me, and this efficiency system or premium system is that under a piecework system the worker gets all the profit of his additional work. The premium system is devised to give him only a part of it, to rob him of a part of it, as in the case of the illustration that I cited only a little while ago, where 190 minutes had been the standard time for the production of an article. It was reduced arbitrarily under this system to 170 minutes, and then they said to the workman, "For every additional minute that you save under 170 we will give you half pay," so they divided the profits of the time saved between the plant and the man.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I accept what the Senator from New Jersey says; but let me point out that the difference to which he points is merely a difference in the way of applying the system, and that would be met by a provision, if you think it is a wise and a just provision, that all the advantage shall be included in the premium. As it is now, the advantage is divided between the workman and the Government. The Government, by the increased efficiency brought about by this system, gets its work done at a lower cost and the workman gets a higher pay for his work.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I should like to be assured of the correctness of the statement of the Senator from New York that the stop-watch or other system of keeping time applies only to the time of going to work and the time of ceasing work. There would be very little, if any, objection to that; but, as I understand, the stop-watch supervision over the given employees goes much further than that. It measures in time each step of his work during the day, which I think is intolerable.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the stop watch is used only in the study for the purpose of establishing a standard, and that it does not continue with the workman after the standard is established. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROOT. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to confirm in the strongest terms the statement of the Senator from New York. The idea seems to prevail in the minds of some Senators here that the purpose of the stop watch is to find that a man can do a piece of work in perhaps 70 minutes, and then for an overseer with a stop watch to stand over that man day by day and see that he never exceeds that time. That is not the purpose of it at all. The purpose is simply to study the time that can be reasonably and efficiently taken in performing certain operations, and then to fix the rate of pay on the basis of that time. When the study is over the stop watch is never used.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WORKS. It might relieve my mind on this subject if the Senator from Rhode Island would give us some idea as to the time for which this study is pursued. I presume there is no fixed time for all workmen; but certainly he might give us some idea with respect to it, as he is a manufacturer himself.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from New York is speaking now. When he finishes, I shall try to say a word or two on the subject.

Mr. WORKS. Very well. If the Senator will cover that subject later on, I shall not interrupt the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. My understanding is that it continues for a very short period, long enough to establish an average. The Chief of Ordnance refers to the subject in his report for 1912 in these words:

> The time study affords the most accurate measure yet devised for determining the just quantity of work that should be performed without overexertion and the premium system is one of the means by which this just quantity of work can be adequately paid for. The combination of the two secures increased earnings to the competent workman without a corresponding decrease to the less competent, a positive and material step forward which it would seem should meet with general approval.

You will perceive that the language of this provision is not aimed at the surveillance or supervision of the workman with a stop watch. It is:

> 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.

That is the sole object, the sole function. It is as a Senator said to me the other day: "I was mayor of the city in which I live at one time, and I undertook to find out what the street-cleaning people were doing and by observation to ascertain how many square yards of street the average man kept clear during the day, and then made that the standard to which the street cleaners were required to conform."

I do not see, sir, how there can be any basis obtained upon which you are to differentiate the compensation of the effective and the industrious as compared with the ineffective and the indifferent unless you are permitted to observe and record the facts for the purpose of fixing a standard, and when you have that standard fixed all you have to say is that any workman who goes beyond it shall receive a premium. That is all there is to this, as I understand it.

I was much impressed, sir, at the time when we were having this old controversy about piecework in the Rock Island Arsenal, by a sense of inability to get at what was just and right in regard to the clerks in the departments. The system under which our clerks are employed contemplates a gradual moving up from the low places and lower salaries to the higher grades, and at this very time there was great complaint of favoritism and unfairness in the promotions. I was giving great thought to it, but there was no way that I could see by which we could get away from reliance upon the heads of divisions. These clerks are all working in divisions, and the promotions, when there are vacancies in the upper grades, are determined by the heads of divisions. It was all so vague, however, it all permitted so great an element of personal liking or disliking, of the personal feelings of the head of the division, that I have always carried a feeling that there is injustice done, because there never was any definite and certain standard upon which the efficiency of the clerks in those divisions can be ascertained; and without fixing a definite standard you are delivered over to personal likes and dislikes, or else you have to abandon entirely attempts to compensate the most efficient and useful beyond the least efficient. So that from the beginning of the attempt upon the part of our Ordnance Department to get at a definite and certain standard upon which they could offer rewards for merit to their workmen I have looked at it with great interest and great hopefulness, and I have kept along with it from the beginning in sympathetic conversations with the Chief of Ordnance, wishing him Godspeed in a work which I think is not only for the benefit of our Government by the production of its manufactures at a moderate and reasonable cost, but for the benefit of the workmen in the Government manufactories by giving them incitement to ambition and hope. This, I am sure, is necessary for the improvement and development of men who work with their hands, just as it is for men who work with their brain.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Can the Senator tell me whether the Taylor system, so-called, is anywhere in vogue in the departments to-day?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not like the use of the term "Taylor system." The effort that I am describing was begun in our Ordnance Bureau long before Mr. Taylor was generally known. What is generally described, I think, as the efficiency system—that is, the system of endeavoring to get a normal aver-

age standard and paying a premium for going beyond that—is in use in varying degrees in practically all the manufacturing establishments of the Ordnance Bureau.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If that is true, what will be the effect of the adoption of the House provision?

Mr. ROOT. The effect of the adoption of the House provision will be twofold. In the first place, it will largely increase the cost of production by the Government, and it will result in giving to the Government a very much smaller quantity of ammunition and ordnance stores for the appropriation that we make. It will result in the good workmen, the best workmen, the ambitious and the energetic workmen, having the heart taken out of them and being reduced in their compensation to the level of the indifferent workmen.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Can the Senator state whether the workmen employed in these concerns are asking that this change be made?

Mr. ROOT. The only thing I know as to that is the papers produced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which show that in the Frankford Arsenal there are 400 who signed a paper asking for the continuance of the system, objecting to the House provision, and the fact that in addition to the signing of that paper they applied to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania to get them a hearing before our Senate committee in order to urge that this House provision should not remain in the bill.

In his report of 1911 the Chief of Ordnance says:

About three years ago the department began to devote attention to the subject of scientific management as applied to its manufacturing operations. Previously to the last fiscal year the subject has been considered more as an experimental detail of shop management, but it has now assumed sufficient importance to justify a reference to it in this report.

That is to say, we go back, then, to 1908, when the Ordnance Bureau took up this subject of endeavoring to differentiate payments and get a standard upon which to differentiate payments. The Chief of Ordnance continues in this report of 1911:

It is unnecessary here to attempt any detailed description of the principles of scientific management or the particular application of those principles which constitutes the "Taylor system," since both have been the subject of extensive discussion in the public prints and have been very fully described in various treatises. It may be said, however, that the principles are no new discovery, nor are they claimed to be such by the advocates, and that the many details have been the subject of special and laborious attention for many years. One of the basic ideas is the application of educated and scientifically trained intelligence to those operations of manufacture which were formerly considered either as of too small importance to attract such attention or as belonging entirely to the practice of a trade, and were therefore left to the judgment or choice of those immediately and practically connected with the operations; that is, the workmen and foremen.

He says also in this same report:

When the claims made by the advocates of scientific management first attracted my attention the question of the efficiency of existing shop methods was naturally raised in order to estimate the probable value of a change. It is believed that the shop methods in effect at the different arsenals were fully abreast of the best general practice in private industries of the same nature. While therefore the general conditions would compare favorably with commercial practice, in those arsenal shops engaged in the manufacture of small arms, ammunition, etc., where the work consists of turning out large quantities of the same pieces, the necessity for closely coordinating the successive operations and for eliminating delays had been more evident than in general machine-shop and jobbing work, more study had been given the subject, and as a result the methods there were highly developed. It may be said, in fact, that those shops have had scientific management for years and do not, therefore, appear to afford as wide a field for improvement as might be found in the others.

You see, Mr. President, the application of this method does not result merely in ascertaining how long a time it takes to do a particular thing or how many times a workman can do a particular thing during his day's work, but it ascertains how useless labor can be eliminated, how useless operations can be eliminated. For example, here is one thing which I recall as having been developed by the application of this principle: A skilled workman had been in the habit of going himself to the other end of the room to get something that he needed in his process, and going back; whenever he wanted the particular article he would go and get it and take it back. An observation of the proportion of his time taken up by doing that led to putting a helper on, an unskilled one, perfectly competent to fetch and carry, and the fetching and carrying enabled the skilled man to apply his time and effort to doing the thing that he alone could do. The result was an immediate decrease in cost and an immediate increase in the skilled laborer's compensation. It was very much as if a trained, skilled lawyer were to undertake to copy his own papers in the operation as it was before the observation, and very much as if the skilled lawyer had a typewriter to copy his papers for him as it was after the operation.

The Chief of Ordnance, in the same report of 1911, says:

I may also say that one of the earliest publications upon "scientific management" was a work entitled "The Cost of Manufactures and the Administration of Workshops," by Capt. Henry Metcalfe, an officer of the Ordnance Department, published in 1885.

Then he proceeds to say:

As a result of consideration given the subject, the probability that the general machine-shop and job-work practice might be materially improved by the methods of scientific management seemed great enough to warrant a practical trial.

That is eight years ago.

With this object I directed, something over two years ago, the trial at the Watertown Arsenal, Mass., of some of the elementary features of what is known as the Taylor system, with the intention of testing out these features thoroughly and determining their value before proceeding further.

The test of those features has continued and it has produced some very interesting results.

In the report of the Chief of Ordnance for 1912 he gives a schedule showing how the compensation of the workmen in the Watertown Arsenal had been affected. It appears that from August, 1911, to June, 1912, the pay of molders had included the percentages of premiums which I will now read; that is to say, the pay of the molders had been increased by premiums to the following extent:

August, 1911, 14 per cent; September, 25.8 per cent; October, 22.6 per cent; November, 25.1 per cent; December, 22.5 per cent; January, 1912, 27 per cent; February, 17.6 per cent; March, 26.9 per cent; April, 30.8 per cent; May, 32.1 per cent; June, 29.4 per cent.

The pay of machinists during the same period at the same place had been increased—July, 23.8 per cent, August, 19.2 per cent, and so on down to June, 1912, 30.7 per cent.

The Chief of Ordnance summarizes these figures as follows:

The net result of these figures may be more significantly summarized by the statement that 153 men received during the last fiscal year a total of $6,938.43 more than they would have been paid except for the time study and premium features.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask if the Senator knows whether that was without the increase of the hours of labor?

Mr. ROOT. According to my understanding—and I am sure I am right—it was without any increase of the hours of labor and it was without any decrease of the pay of a single employee in that arsenal. It was not extra work. It was work done within the limits of the hours fixed, with the same hours of labor and the same pay to those who did not get premiums, but it was only that these young Americans entitled to opportunity, as all of us are, had it given to them and they utilized it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. How about those who did not get the extra pay? Did they have to work any harder?

Mr. ROOT. They had to work no harder. Nobody had to work any harder. No one had his pay reduced and no man was compelled to work any harder. It was only the compulsion of his own hope and ambition that he wanted to improve his position in life and to benefit his family and to educate his children and to buy a home.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether any of the men who did not earn the premium got any less pay on account of the premium being earned?

Mr. ROOT. They did not. No man got less pay. This is not merely a discriminating system, it is an efficiency system. The Chief of Ordnance very justly says:

These very substantial increases earned under the premium method, without complaint of undue or disagreeable exertion, can hardly be regarded by any unprejudiced person as other than a distinct improvement in the industrial position of the workmen concerned, who must have been enabled thereby to live better and to obtain for themselves and their families advantages not previously enjoyed. It is difficult to believe that these men and those dependent upon them really favor a legislative prohibition of the premium feature, which would deprive them of their new comforts and compel a return to their former scale of living. I do not believe it, but by evidence gathered on the spot, as well as by the above considerations, am convinced that a free expression of opinion by the employees of the Watertown Arsenal, if it were possible to receive it, would be strongly in favor of a continuance of the system.

The reduced cost of production—

He says—

at the various ordnance establishments, due to the improved methods of manufacture and to the premium system, as previously outlined, will continue to be realized from year to year. These savings were made with practically no reduction of wages of employees; on the contrary,

there were a large number of increases in day wages at all the arsenals, and the earnings of those on a piecework or premium basis were increased considerably.

Then he says:

Due to the existence of these savings for the current fiscal year the estimates for the next fiscal year have been reduced, thus giving the most practical expression to the results obtained. The savings amounted to over $240,000, which was used to increase the amount of work done and material manufactured under the various appropriations from which the savings were made. The estimates for the manufacture of small-arms ammunition during the next fiscal year have been reduced by $150,000 below the current appropriations, but for the reduced sum just as much ammunition will be procured as would be possible under the present appropriations at the prices of a year ago.

Mr. President, I could well understand if some of these employees were to come here and say, "The Chief of Ordnance is not dividing this advantage fairly"; if they were to come and say that he is utilizing this increased efficiency in such a way as to give the Government too great a share of the advantage and to give us too small a share of the advantage. I should say, if that complaint were made, we ought to investigate it thoroughly, and, if it were found to be well taken, we should require that a fair distribution of the advantage should be made. But no one is claiming that. No one is claiming that any injustice has been done or that any injury has been wrought or that any oppression has been practiced in any of these establishments; but they read from a pamphlet by a theorist who has been writing upon this subject and speculate what might happen if what he says were to be applied.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has heard of any complaint being made of favoritism given to employees in the matter of paying these workmen.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have not heard of any such complaint, and it is quite certain that if there had been any it would have appeared in the course of this discussion; it would have been produced before these committees. The real difficulty I apprehend would be not that the application of this system has wrought any injury, not that it has resulted in any unfairness, not that it has not been beneficial both to the Government and to the workmen, but that it is a little more difficult for labor to deal with; that is to say, if there were abuses under it it would be a little more difficult for them to deal with those abuses than it is with a straight-out day's wage. The simplicity of a day wage certainly, where every workman receives so much, makes it easy for the workmen to deal with it. They can get together and pass resolutions that they ought to have 50 cents a day more, and they can resolve to strike if they do not get it, and everyone, they and the public, can all understand it perfectly well. This business is a little complicated and there is apprehension, and it was voiced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], that it may lead to unfairness, not that it has done so. But, sir, we ought not to abandon a method which so greatly increases our industrial efficiency, which is so beneficial both to the Government and to all the taxpayers of the country and to the workmen who are engaged in the work, which affords opportunity and incitement to industry and alertness and activity and ambition. We ought not to undertake to stigmatize or to penalize our officers for employing it, because it is possible that it may be more difficult some time in the future to prevent abuses. No one can deny that in all human affairs abuses are possible, but we certainly can deal with any abuses in these arsenals. If any employee in any arsenal comes to our committees and says, "We are being unfairly treated," or if any labor organizer or leader outside of the arsenal comes and says that the laborers in this arsenal are being unfairly treated, does anybody doubt that our committee will be ready to require that the abuses be remedied? There is no practical danger of it. The Senator from New Jersey himself but a short time ago told us that the employees in our Government establishments are treated with a larger generosity and greater fairness than in private establishments.

Mr. HUGHES. That is right, and I should like that to continue. I want to say to the Senator that it has been charged in the hearings before one of the committees, I can not recall which one now, I think before the House Committee on Military Affairs, that men were discharged, driven out of the service because they complained against the attempt to install this system. It was charged in the hearings that men who had complained against the installation or the attempted installation of the system, who had shown themselves antagonistic to it, had been separated from the service.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if any man has been discharged from a Government factory for exercising his right of free speech, then the officer who discharged him should be held to account, and it ought to be proved. But you have no right to interfere with the wise and just and effective conduct of our Government operations by saying that there had been a charge made, and not proved, that somebody was prevented from objecting.

Mr. HUGHES. It seems to me——

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

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. HUGHES. A far as I have been able to gather, everything the Senator desires can be obtained by the use of the piecework system in these cases. I did not hear everything the Senator said, but as far as I have been able to gather there is absolutely nothing in this language that came over from the House which will prevent the installation of the piece system; unless the Senator really wants the efficiency system installed in full, I do not know what objection there can be to this language.

Mr. ROOT. The objection to this language is that it destroys the old system that the Government officers are attempting to work out, and which, up to this time, has been worked out with such beneficial effects.

Now, let me go on to refer to the last report of the Chief of Ordnance in 1914. He says:

At the Watertown Arsenal the time study and premium features have been extended during the last fiscal year to branches of the establishment which had not previously enjoyed them and the amount of premium work in most of the individual branches has been increased. The following figures relate to the month of August, 1914:

He gives the number employed on premium work, the average premium over and above the regular pay expressed as a percentage of the latter. I beg the attention of the Senators present to this. These are the increases in pay brought about by this premium system to the kinds of workers during the month of August last:

	Number employed on premium work.	Average premium over and above the regular pay expressed as a percentage of the latter.	Percentage of all the work done which was performed under premium.
Molders	11	29.27	77.51
Machinists	167	28.18	54.30
Machinists' helpers	29	28.08	12.98
Laborers	29	22.03	9.62
Carpenters	8	29.50	18.59
Blacksmiths	5	20.59	13.93
Teamsters	5	26.87	98.59
Blacksmiths' helpers	6	19.29	12.40
Carpenters' helpers	1	31.43	.31
Screw makers	1	34.16	100.00
Chippers	1	42.01	27.79
Furnace helpers	1	23.11	2.09
Steam-hammer drivers	1	27.01	3.41
Skilled workmen	1	23.16	18.19
Masons' helpers	1	28.06	35.51
Molders' helpers	3	65.38	1.74
Painters	2	10.10	11.81
Skilled laborers	2	22.74	19.79

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the report anywhere give the proportion or percentage of men of each particular class who attain to a premium, who have had their wages increased; what proportion of the total employed in each class got more wages and what proportion remained as they were before? That may not appear in the report from which the Senator is reading; I do not know whether it does or not; but the Senator may come to it later on. I did not intend to disturb him.

Mr. ROOT. I have not examined the report to ascertain that fact. I do not see the statement here, although it doubtless may be found in the report, as to the number who did not work on this plan.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether or not there is anything in the report showing the total amount of money that was distributed during the year in the shape of premiums or bonuses?

Mr. ROOT. I read that from the preceding report. I do not see any such statement in this report. This report only undertakes to give the figures for the month of August, while the preceding report gave the figures for a long series of months and gave the totals. The Chief of Ordnance says:

It thus appears that during that month the 11 molders, for instance, worked, upon the whole, 77.51 per cent of their time upon premium work.

It would probably be impossible to separate them and say so many men worked on premium work and so many did not, for the premium method has been applied only to parts of the work. They are extending it gradually from time to time to other parts of the work, but I suppose the simpler cases have this application made first.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. ROOT. In a moment, and then I will yield. Let me finish this sentence:

And that during this time they earned, over and above their daily wages, a sum which amounted, as a whole, to 29.27 per cent of such wages. As their regular wages vary from $3.04 to $3.68 per day, they thus earned, during 77.51 per cent of their time, an extra amount per day varying from about $0.90 to $1.10.

Now I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to say to the Senator that if he will turn to the report of the Chief of Ordnance for 1912 he will find that that report sets out in detail the increases in the day rate and the increases in the monthly wage of the men of the different classes.

Mr. ROOT. I am obliged to the Senator from Oregon for that suggestion. With regard to the month of August, which the Chief of Ordnance produced in the report for 1914 to illustrate the working of the system, he says:

Under this system there was paid to eight foremen, during the month of August, a sum averaging about 10 per cent of their regular wages. Including this last sum, the total amount which was paid out in premiums at the arsenal during the month of August was $2,657.29, and the total amount of time which was spent in work under the premium system was 26.25 per cent of all the working time at the arsenal during that month.

That is to say, that a little over one-quarter of all the time was employed on premium work. He deals with the charge that "this system involves the undesirable speeding up of men, stimulated by reward and punishment, to their resulting physical, mental, and moral detriment." He says further:

When this charge was first made, at the beginning of the practice of the system in the Ordnance Department, it was speculative only and based upon estimates of the practice which were adduced from the reading of the writings of the advocates of the system, and it could be met only by arguments to the effect that these writings were misread and that the department had no intention of inflicting any of the evils apprehended on the workmen. The features objected to have now been in practice at the Watertown Arsenal for something over three years, and in examining the charge of disadvantage to the employees we are no longer required to deal with speculations and premises, but can appeal to a rather extensive experience, which only needs investigation for its interpretation. An investigation worthy of the name—

I ask especial attention to this—

An investigation worthy of the name has been made by one body only, a special committee appointed by the House of Representatives about two years ago, while the practice of the system in this department was still quite new. This committee visited Watertown Arsenal and other establishments and took a great deal of testimony, which was printed in three rather large volumes. As a result of this extensive investigation the committee did not find, and did not say that it found, anything to the disadvantage of the employees in practice anywhere in the Ordnance Department. It stigmatized certain practices as undesirable, but did not state it found these practices in existence at any of the arsenals, and there is no difficulty in joining heartily in its statements in regard to them. It reported that the whole subject was at that time too new for definite conclusions in regard to it to be made, and it recommended that there should be no legislation by Congress upon the subject at that time.

Some time after the submission of this report of the committee Congress, in August, 1912, created the Commission on Industrial Relations, of which the membership was appointed and confirmed about a year later. Following the recommendation of the Chief of Ordnance the subject of the practice of scientific management at the arsenals of the Ordnance Department was taken up by the commission, which now has it under examination. It has taken considerable testimony, but has not yet personally investigated any of the arsenals.

He further says:

Since the Commission on Industrial Relations has been especially created by Congress to give attention to such questions as this one; in view of its careful selection by the President and confirmation by the Senate, and of the expense which the country is incurring in maintaining it, it seems strongly to be desired that Congress shall not take action upon a subject to which the commission is devoting an important share of its attention, until after it shall have received the report and recommendation of this body which it has created as its agent.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be almost folly, without wishing to be disrespectful to any action of another House, it seems to me to be quite beyond reason that where our officers are engaged in what is certainly a praiseworthy effort to make their labors in behalf of the country effective, to secure efficient service in our great manufacturing establishments; where there is a prima facie case of benefit, so plain in its effects, as I have detailed; where a committee of Congress made an investigation two years ago and said that the experiment had not gone far enough to reach a conclusion; where we have appointed a commission to do this very thing, and they are engaged in investigating the actual working of the system, that we should go on and throw it out of the window, without evidence and without waiting for the report of this commission.

Mr. President, we can not expect faithful service from our officers, employees, and agents if we are going to treat them in that way. We can not have officers thinking, contriving, and laboring to produce good results in the great manufactures in which the Government is engaged if we are going to treat them in that way; we must encourage them; we must show appreciation of all efforts to improve Government processes; and we must not turn them down without evidence, or we will have inefficiency and indifference, opening the door to graft and corruption.

So, sir, I hope the Senate will stand by its committee and refuse this premature, prejudiced action contained in the provision which the committee has reported to strike out.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I should not take the time of the Senate to discuss this question if I were not familiar with it and familiar with its history. The Watertown Arsenal, where the Taylor system was first installed, is located about 3 miles from my home. At the time the system was undertaken at the arsenal I was representing a district in the House of Representatives, and that arsenal was located in my district. Most of its employees were my constituents; therefore I am not only familiar with the arsenal but also familiar with what has taken place there during the last five or six years, during which the system has been used.

It seems to me, even after the very full discussion which has been indulged in here, that there is considerable misunderstanding in the minds of most Senators, as to just what the Taylor system means, though, if I may judge by the attendance here now, I do not think what I may say will have any particular influence upon that condition.

The stop-watch discussion has been worked overtime, in my judgment, and the subject has not been adequately understood by some of those who have discussed the question. That was the part of the system to which the men at the Watertown Arsenal objected when it was first installed; and undoubtedly the stop watch was used at that time, although not in the manner which many Senators seem to think. It was used to develop the different items in the completion of a process, to determine why it was that one man was able to complete the work on a piece of material more quickly than another.

It is a very simple thing for us to understand that if a man picks up a piece of material without turning and puts it in a lathe he will accomplish his work very much quicker than he will if he has to turn and pick it up and put it in a lathe. A stop watch was used on two men who were doing the same work; one of whom was taking 50 minutes to accomplish the work and the other 40 minutes. I am simply using this as an illustration. Then the officer attempted to find out why it was that it required one man 25 per cent longer time to accomplish the result than it did the other man. Very often he found that it was due to the place where the material was located, whether or not a man handled it twice before he put it in the lathe, and what he did when the material came out of the lathe—whether he placed it with one motion or whether he carried it some distance and took two or three movements in so doing.

It was a very simple thing to try to develop what these different items cost in time, not with the intention of speeding up the men at all, but with the intention of eliminating those movements which did not contribute to the value of the result. That has been the primary and the principal use of the stop watch in connection with this service; and it has not been used for the purpose of speeding men up to any considerable extent, if at all. The only connection between speeding up men and the stop-watch application is that it is used to try to determine what is a fair day's work or a fair hour's work for a man to do, and to use that as a standard.

The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] illustrated it by the time it requires to clean a piece of street. For instance, one man will do it in 50 per cent less time than another. Perhaps he is an unusually active man, and it would not be fair to make that the standard for all men; but by testing several men a fair basis can be arrived at, so that it might be determined in dividing up the streets in a city how much space should be allotted to each man as a fair day's work.

We have heard a great deal said about the efficiency of operation and management. I recall that last fall the Secretary of Commerce came to Massachusetts and said, among other things, that one reason why we had a tariff, in fact the only reason he could see, was because the manufacturers of New England were not manufacturing efficiently; that they were not using modern methods; that in some cases they were not using modern machinery; and that we were not able to compete with the principal nations of Europe because we did not have modern methods and modern machinery. The Taylor system and other systems similar to it are simply designed to enable us to compete successfully with other countries in the efficiency of management.

This question ought not to come up on an appropriation bill; in my opinion it has no place in an appropriation bill; but it is a question that should be considered on its merits, and the results which have been obtained from it should be used as a

basis for our action, rather than statements which have not been carefully scrutinized and examined.

The system has been in operation at the Watertown Arsenal for five or six years. When it was first installed I had a great many complaints from the men employed there; and in one case the foundrymen, I think, struck, although they only remained out about one day; but at any rate there was a great deal of criticism on account of the methods used. As has been stated here to-day, committees have examined the results. The most thorough examination made was by a committee of the House of Representatives, which consisted of the present Secretary of Commerce, the present Secretary of Labor, and Representative Tilson, of Connecticut. They made this investigation after the system had been in operation for two or three years, and said at that time that there were not sufficient reasons for legislation which would take this system from the arsenal. They said, in effect, that it should have a longer time of probation, and that after it had been thoroughly tried a suitable conclusion could be reached.

While the Watertown Arsenal is not in the congressional district in which I live at this time, but is represented by the author of the provision which we are considering, yet as time has gone on I have had less and less complaint from the workmen at the Watertown Arsenal, and I find, on examination, that I have not had a single complaint from any workmen for the last year. It is possible that they are sending criticisms of the workings of the system elsewhere; but I think there is no reason why they would not send their criticisms to me, if they had any to make. I have had within the last three weeks letters from three or four workmen, with one or two of whom I am personally acquainted, who have expressed satisfaction at the workings of the system in such terms that I think it may be of value to read them into the RECORD. The first one is dated January 27:

BRIGHTON, MASS., *January 27, 1915.*

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: No doubt you have received a number of letters regarding the bill to abolish the so-called premium system at the Watertown Arsenal. I wish to add a word to what has already been said. I have worked as a machinist seven years at the arsenal and know the conditions before and since the installation of the Taylor system, and there has never been a year when so great an amount of work has been produced as our commanding officer's report will show. The men have been able on the extra money earned to live in better homes and to dress and enjoy life better. I have heard of no one that has been injured by a "stop watch," nor from overwork. The few agitators (shop lawyers) that caused this bill to be sent to Congress are to be found in every shop and factory in the country. I earnestly request that when this bill comes before your honorable body, the United States Senate, that you will try and see this matter in the light that the thinking men of the Watertown Arsenal do.

Yours, respectfully,

JAMES A. MACKEAN,
154 Bigelow Street, Brighton, Mass.

It is noticeable that the writer says the "shop lawyers," who, I presume, he classes as agitators, are the ones who are disturbed about this condition. The thinking men who are working under its provisions are not disturbed, but are satisfied with it. Here is another letter:

Somerville, January 27—

Somerville is about 5 miles from the arsenal—

In view of the fact that the Army appropriation bill has passed Congress unopposed—

He means the House of Representatives probably—

and unamended so as to seriously affect the conditions under which the employees of the Watertown Arsenal—of which I have the privilege of being one—work, I hope it is not too late to express my views in regard to the matter. There has been some opposition made by a few self-constituted labor leaders who take it on themselves to regulate matters to suit themselves without any consideration or regard for the rights of others. The officers in charge of this arsenal are fair, upright men, and I am sure would welcome any suggestion that would in any way benefit us without making a national issue of it.

Hoping when your honorable body meets you will give it due consideration and get matters adjusted to agree with the large majority who are perfectly satisfied with conditions as they now exist.

Respectfully, yours,

JAMES MCFARLAND,
90 Prospect Street, Somerville, Mass.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it true, as I am informed, that at the Watertown Arsenal the system has already been abolished?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not so understand.

Mr. HUGHES. I call the attention of the Senator to this notice, published at the Watertown Arsenal under date of January 25, 1915:

Memorandum: In compliance with instructions from the Chief of Ordnance, all time studies will cease; also all premium payments except such as shall have accrued at the time of this notification.

C. B. WHEELER,
Colonel, Ordnance Department, Commanding.

Now, it seems that action was taken after all these magnificent results had been achieved.

Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, it would seem from the date which the Senator has given us that the action taken by the Chief of Ordnance must have been taken after or at about the time the Army appropriation bill was acted on by the House of Representatives, and he may have considered, in view of the action taken by that body, that it was best to suspend what the House evidently desired should be suspended until the Senate had acted. I did not know that that had been done.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say that he may have been influenced in his decision by two accidents which occurred, which were directly attributable to an attempt on the part of one of the men to work under a stop watch and of the other to follow a man who had worked under a stop watch.

Mr. WEEKS. I have read the testimony about those accidents, and I do not think the Chief of Ordnance was affected in his action by the testimony.

Here is another letter dated December 10, 1914, and reading as follows:

A copy of the inclosed is now in the hands of Mr. Chipman, the gentleman who, if I am correctly informed, is going to represent some of the employees of the Watertown Arsenal for the purpose of abolishing the premium system. As I have the honor of being one of your constituents, I earnestly request that you use your influence in opposing any legislation that would interfere with said system as applied at this place.

It seems that this gigantic move to abolish the system is backed by some outside selfish crew, the malicious intent of which my deluded friends are not aware of.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN DRISCOLL,
Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

John Driscoll is a resident, I think, of Brighton. Mr. Chipman is an organizer of efficiency methods, a resident of Cambridge, and writes that he is representing 221 of the machinists employed in the Watertown Arsenal. There are 666 men, or about that number, employed there. Not all of them are affected by the operation of this provision, so that Mr. Chipman undoubtedly represents a very large proportion of the men employed at the Watertown Arsenal who are affected by the provision. This is the letter that Mr. Driscoll writes to Mr. Chipman:

Mr. MINER CHIPMAN,
Brattle Building, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Recognizing your well merited and extensive influence in matters pertaining to scientific management, and if I am correctly informed, you are going to represent the employees of this arsenal in Washington in the near future for the purpose of abolishing the premium system. If by some unforeseen chance you should be successful in abolishing the premium system you will be instrumental in doing a gross injustice to the rank and file of the employees of this place.

While men in this and other places of this kind are always very willing to express their honest opinion in private, but owing to petty influences are not willing to go on record or be quoted, that is one reason why the men of this place will have to suffer in silence both financially and otherwise if you are successful.

Because a few men in this place tried the system once or twice and did not win is no reason why we should be denied the right to try because we did win.

There were 349 employees of this place who signed a petition to abolish the system. If the number who did not read that petition and consequently did not know what they were signing, together with the number who signed it just to be agreeable, were deducted from the 349, there would be nobody left but the framers. It is proven beyond a doubt that after three years' experience with the premium system the conditions here are far better than any place of the kind in this country.

As this is a very serious matter it is respectfully requested that you take a horizontal view of the conditions here as they exist before proceeding further.

Very truly, yours,

JACK DRISCOLL,
Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Mr. Chipman wrote me on the 12th day of February a letter which, in effect, asked if he could obtain a hearing before the Military Committee of the Senate. It happened that the bill had been reported by the Military Committee, and therefore of course he could not obtain a hearing; but among other things he said this:

To explain my reason for asking this, I would say that I have been retained by 221 of the workmen at the Watertown Arsenal "to act as their counsel in the matter of their petition for the abolishment or change of the Taylor system of shop management as in operation at Watertown Arsenal."

Evidently he supposed that the Taylor system was in operation at that time, February 12.

An analysis of the written replies by three workmen to a sheet of some 30 questions reveals—

1. That the workmen lay upon the names "Taylor system," "stop-watch system," "premium system," or the ideas conveyed by these names, the blame for all the injustices they have suffered instead of placing the blame where it belongs, on the inefficiencies of the management in carrying out the details of the system in operation.

2. The workmen feel, as I do, that this is an economic question, and to attempt to solve it roughshod by legislation is the wrong way to go about it.

3. They are opposed to the amendment to the Army appropriation bill providing for the practical abolishment of time study and premium in Government shops during the life of this appropriation.

As I represent them and have their authority "to represent them before congressional committees or otherwise," I would like to be heard by the Senate committee having in charge the Army appropriation bill, in order to present to them the facts in my possession showing the attitude of the workmen and the reasons why this amendment, if allowed to pass, would have a detrimental effect on those affected, rather than the beneficial one which the exponents of the amendment presumably look for.

May I ask your kind offices to place this information in the hands of the chairman or some member of the committee?

As I said, the hearings had been concluded, and therefore nothing could be done for Mr. Chipman, who represents so many of the workmen.

I have had, in addition, a large number of letters from manufacturers in Massachusetts. They are much too numerous and too long to impose on the RECORD; and yet they are so unanimous in tone and give such substantial reasons for the retention of this system that it is a pity they can not be examined by all Senators before coming to a conclusion.

I have in my hand a letter from Mr. S. E. Thompson, a very well known consulting engineer, relating to the subject, and I want to read one or two extracts from his letter.

I note in the daily papers that Representative DEITRICK's bill to prohibit time studies with stop watch has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Labor, and that Gen. Crozier has been criticized for favoring such methods. I fear that the insignificance of the measure will permit its passage, whereas if the actual effect of the bill were expressed, which is to prohibit all reductions in labor costs in Government work, the House and Senate would arise in a body to vote it down. The fact is, as I indicated in my former letter, the prohibition of time studies strikes at the very root of all progress toward reductions in costs of Government manufacture, improved methods of operation, and increase of wages to the workingman.

Manufacture has reached a stage where machinery has been so perfected that in many cases further increase in output is impossible except through the study of elementary details to eliminate unnecessary operations of the machines and the men. This can not be done without time study with the stop watch. It would be as reasonable to expect a builder to make an estimate of the price he would bid to build a house with no detail plans but simply photographs of somewhat similar houses of known cost as to expect to lay out work for men in an economical manner with no time studies.

I have never done any work for the Government, but am interested because the bill will prove a setback to labor in general and to manufacturing interests of a private nature as a result of the Government precedent.

My statements are not based simply on theory or hearsay, for I have personally proved the effect of time-study methods and have found invariably that the workmen were ready and even eager to adopt methods and rates of pay determined by time study. It is the outsiders who are not earning the extra money who invariably make the trouble wherever there is criticism. In one plant I am now advising we are reducing labor and manufacturing costs 25 per cent, while increasing pay of operatives even a larger amount than this.

My reasons for opposing the bill are:

1. It will prevent future reduction of cost in Government work.
2. It will prevent normal increase in the wages of Government operatives.
3. It will prevent the indirect benefits due to improving methods of management, because these can not be obtained without time study of men and machines.
4. It will prevent the Government from successfully competing with private contractors and thus curtail the amount of work that can be done by the Government.
5. Finally, it will take the matter out of the hands of the Industrial Commission, already engaged at large expense to the Government in taking testimony all over the country on this very matter, and will forestall their report.

I have here also a large number of instances that have been taken from the testimony given not only by Gen. Crozier but by other employers relating to the results obtained. In very many cases the cost of the article has been reduced as much as 40 per cent, while the wages paid to the workmen engaged in its construction have increased an equal amount. It is not at all unusual to find that a man who was obtaining $2.80 a day has been able to earn $4 a day, and in one case a workman who was receiving $3.12 a day was able to earn $5.06 a day under this system. I want to put just a few of these into the RECORD, simply to illustrate the point which I am now making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM REPORT OF FORMER CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF THE TAYLOR AND OTHER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

[Mr. Godfrey, pp. 1846–1847.]

FAVORABLE RESULTS OBTAINED FROM SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AT TABOR CO.

The first plant under scientific management with which I was connected was the Tabor Co. I had full opportunity there to see all books and figures, and nothing was more impressive to me than the fact that the Tabor Co., with approximately the same number of men and machines as were used under the old system, was turning out three times the production; that it was giving 73 per cent higher wages to workmen; that it had made a 25 per cent reduction in the selling price of machines, thereby producing so much saving to the consumer. Moreover, that this company, which had lost money before the introduction of scientific management, were now and had been making a good profit; that from the condition of a strike and inharmonious relations before the introduction of scientific management there had come about the friendliest of feeling between management, workmen, and outsiders.

To take a single example, there was one line which referred to the drilling of a cylinder, that had to be drilled in a certain position and then set up and be drilled again. It cost $1.10 to set that up and drill it for the second operation. In the new design a drill was designed which could do that drilling with the first operation. The drill cost was, I think, approximately 10 cents, so that a dollar was saved on every single one of those lots going through, and those machines are absolutely in incessant demand.

[Mr. Taylor, p. 1404.]

APPLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT TO YARD LABOR AT BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.

At the end of some three and a half years we had the opportunity of proving whether or not scientific management did pay in its application to yard labor. When we went to the Bethlehem Steel Co. we found from 400 to 600 men at work in that yard, and when we got through 140 men were doing the work of the 400 to 600 men, and these men handled several million tons of material a year.

We were very fortunate to be able to get accurate statistics as to the cost of handling a ton of material in that yard under the old system and under the new. Under the old system the cost of handling a ton of materials had been running between 7 and 8 cents, and all you gentlemen familiar with railroad work know that this is a low figure for handling materials. Now, after paying for all the clerical work which was necessary under the new system for the time study and the teachers, for building and running the labor office and the implement room, for constructing a telephone system for moving men about the yard, for a great variety of duties not performed under the old system, after paying for all these things incident to the development of the science of shoveling and managing the men the new way, and including the wages of the workmen, the cost of handling a ton of material was brought down from between 7 and 8 cents to between 3 and 4 cents, and the actual saving during the last six months of the three and one-half years I was there was at the rate of $78,000 a year. That is what the company got out of it; while the men who were on the labor gang received an average of 60 per cent more wages than their brothers got or could get anywhere around that part of the country. And none of them were overworked, for it is no part of scientific management ever to overwork any man; certainly overworking these men could not have been done with the knowledge of anyone connected with scientific management, because one of the first requirements of scientific management is that no man shall ever be given a job which he can not do and thrive through a long term of years. It is no part of scientific management to drive anyone. At the end of three years we had men talk to and investigate all of these yard laborers, and we found that they were almost universally satisfied with their jobs.

[Mr. Taylor, p. 1485.]

APPLICATION OF S. M., AT RENAUD AUTOMOBILE WORKS, FRANCE.

The machine shops in this country have not taken the pains to use those slide rules as they should. They are not used to the extent that they ought to be. I may state, however, that I had a recent visit from the owner of the Renaud Automobile Works, the largest automobile works in France, together with M. de Ram, the young French engineer who personally became interested in the art of cutting metals some years ago, and in our system of management, and who put this system into one of Renaud's departments. These two men came over to this country especially to study our system (scientific management) and the art of cutting metals, and assured me that in those departments in which they had introduced the art of cutting metals and our system of management that they had much more than doubled their former output. They said that they were going back to France to spend any amount of money and any amount of effort to get it in as fast as possible in their entire works. The warning I gave them before they left was this: "You have been at it three years. Do not expect to get through with it for five years, because you will not. It will take you more than five years before you will get through the entire process of putting our system in."

[Mr. Adams, pp. 1638, 1639.]

I think you will find that people are more or less conservative; that follows just as much in a machine shop as anywhere else. When this thing was started in the machine shop nobody wanted to take it up. So we took in two of the younger men and explained to them what it was, and asked them to go on it. They went ahead, and they averaged 40 per cent more than the men around them. The third man who wanted to take it up was an old German named Joe ———, who had been with the company, I think, 15 years. He was over at Midvale 15 years before that. After he came in others came in in small groups. They would ask to be put on that kind of work. From that time on there was no opposition. The last men we put it on were the gear cutters. That work depends on the number of gears he is cutting. He worked a long while to get that established, and one man increased his rate 67 per cent. In the machine shop, if we do not put a piece rate on now we have a much harder kick, because a man, instead of working daywork, wants the chance to make that much more money. We pay the men an hourly rate equal to the highest hourly rate of wages paid in different machine shops around the city for that kind of work. The piece rate is 35 per cent above that.

The CHAIRMAN. What process, if any, is used to speed the workmen up in the handling time?

Mr. ADAMS. We do not speed them up; we make a time study of actions, all the movements can be divided into the small elements which make up the whole. We will take a time study on a man, and we give him a 35 per cent bonus while we are doing it, and we stand there with an open watch. We will say it is a very small operation, drilling a hole in a small pin. Put in the pin, pull down the head of the machine, and start the machine; we take the time on each one of these motions, and then we take the time for the whole. We then allow that time for the handling time of the job.

[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. 81.]

COMPARISON OF OLD AND NEW SYSTEM OF DRAWING MATERIALS FROM STOREHOUSE.

The saving is due to the fact that our bills of material now call for just the amount of material required to go into a carriage, and our system insures that only that amount of material can be drawn from

the storehouse. Under the old way there was no check to insure that no more material was drawn out of the storehouse than was specified, and we know that the bills of materials called generally for more material than was needed, and that frequently these requisitions were duplicated. So the net result was an overbuying of material for the Government.

[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 33⅓ 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. 1172.]

RESULTS OF CONSIDERATION OF DIRECT LABOR AND SHOP EXPENSES.

If we considered only the saving we made in direct labor and in shop expenses, the total saving on the job would be about $13,000—a little over 10 per cent of the cost of the first order.

[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 studies 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.

I will give you a few examples, and these are very late examples. They have all occurred since the visit of the committee to the Watertown Arsenal. The cost of molding caster wheels for shop trucks, a wheel not very large, has been reduced from $1.45 to 93 cents, making a saving of 52 cents in this molding job, which is 35.8 per cent of what the cost has been, and the saving to the Government in making the things at this rate has been at the rate of $7.22 per day. As to the effect on the man's pay, that was increased from $3.28 a day to $4.44 a day, which is an increase of 35½ per cent. That is a bench job.

[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 42½ per cent.

Mr. WEEKS. I have here a statement by the Boston Chamber of Commerce, which appointed a competent committee to examine what was being accomplished there and the result which would naturally follow the legislation if it were adopted. The report is unanimous that the provision should not be agreed to.

Here is an important letter from the Aberthaw Construction Co., a concern which has grown in the last 12 or 15 years from substantially nothing to a size where it now employs 3,000 men. The writer says:

We wish to call your attention to the rider attached to the Army appropriation bill which has just passed the House. This rider is designed to prevent any efficiency work with stop-watch time study in Government arsenals. It seems to us that if the Government discountenances this sort of work it will be increasingly difficult for employers to apply it to their own operations. As we have found that this sort of work is very important in our work, and as others have found the same thing in theirs, it seems desirable that nothing should be done by the Government to hamper the growth of efficiency methods.

I shall not read any more of these communications which I have received within the last two or three weeks, but they are all alike in tone and conclusion with those from which I have quoted.

I have also three or four communications from labor organizations not connected with the Watertown Arsenal, but located in other parts of Massachusetts, adopting resolutions in favor of the bill. I think I have five all told. I notice this sentence in one of them, which is worth consideration, I think, by the Senate:

We shall carefully scan the vote on this measure, and hope to find few in favor of it. If not, our vote at the next election of Senators will be a reflex of the vote taken on this and other measures affecting labor.

I read that because labor and capital sometimes in their exuberance and enthusiasm suggest that the action of Senators and Representatives may be affected by their votes in the future. Of course, any such statement as that coming to a man who has any red blood in his veins, from any source, would incline him to vote against the proposition favored by those who advocated it in such terms.

In a word, I want to say, first, that in my judgment an appropriation bill is not the place for such legislation as this. In the second place, I want to say that the Industrial Commission, which has been taking a large amount of testimony on this and kindred subjects, should be given an opportunity to complete its investigation and make a report before any action is taken. While I think perhaps I have as much knowledge of this matter as anyone who has discussed the subject, because of the proximity of the Watertown Arsenal to my home, I have no knowledge on which I would want to base my vote as to whether or not the efficiency system is altogether desirable or whether it might not be modified in some respects so that it would meet the criticisms of those who criticize it and at the same time be beneficial to the Government and to the employees; but this kind of legislation is always a boomerang when it is adopted without sufficient investigation and sufficient facts. I am going to vote to sustain the committee report because I do not believe action should be taken until the Industrial Commission has reported, and because I want sufficient facts on which to form my own judgment before final action is taken. We all know how difficult it is to change any action which has been taken by a bill passed through Congress. It is a great deal better to do it right in the first place and feel sure that we have sufficient facts on which to base our action, and not to jump at a conclusion and then find we have made a mistake and try to correct our course.

Therefore I hope the report of the committee will be sustained in this case.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall take but a few minutes on this subject.

I notice that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] placed in the RECORD the action of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. I will ask the Senator, as I have been out of the Chamber necessarily a great deal to-day on committee work, whether he or any other Senator has put in the RECORD the action of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States taken recently in this city?

Mr. WEEKS. I have not.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which held a meeting in this city very recently, consisting of 582 delegates, representing 293 commercial bodies located in 37 States, passed this resolution:

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America in annual meeting assembled urges the Senate and the House to reject the so-called Deitrick amendment to the pending bill which makes appropriations for the Army in so far as this amendment seeks to prevent the study of methods to increase industrial efficiency in manufacturing establishments of the Government and forbids additional compensation to employees as reward for improvement in skill and effort.

So far as I know, that resolution was unanimously agreed to by that great organization, which is interested in subjects of this nature, and it ought to carry great weight.

I have received a very large number of letters on this subject. I am not going to burden the RECORD with them, and will content myself with reading from only two.

The first letter is from a large manufacturing establishment in my State employing skilled workmen, an establishment where they never have had any trouble with their workmen or strikes of any kind. The treasurer of that corporation writes me as follows:

My attention has been called to the Deitrick amendment to H. R. 20347, the Army appropriation bill.

I understand that Congressman DEITRICK is from the district in which is located the Watertown Arsenal, where a great deal has been done in the way of increased efficiency. The amendment is so utterly wrong, so hopelessly uneconomic, and so bad in its effect that it ought to be vigorously opposed. The bill with this amendment went through the House without any opposition, practically, on the general principle, I suppose, of passing all such things up to the Senate, and in the Senate a vigorous fight should be made to have this amendment, which should never have been tacked on to a bill of this kind, defeated.

Undoubtedly your good attention has been called to this vicious amendment, and I earnestly hope that you will do everything possible to see that this amendment does not become a part of the appropriation bill.

This amendment strikes at the foundation of efficiency, which is the great byword at the present time and toward which everybody is working. The Government is spending large sums of money toward efficiency in agriculture, efficiency in the Postal Service, and in many other directions, and it seems wicked that a backward step should be taken here. Timing the operations in a shop does not mean undue pressure being brought to bear upon the workman. It simply means that a proper study should be made of a workman's operations to see how his work can be made more efficient, how lost time can be eliminated, and how the production per man can be brought up without his injury. All concerns who are working on this efficiency plan recognize that undue pressure on the man would be to defeat the one purpose they are after.

A different line of reasoning, but equally logical, applies to the premium or bonus plan. It enables the workman who takes advantage of his movements, who does not waste his time, who is interested in his own advancement, to have this recognized in his earnings.

Nothing can be said in favor of this amendment. It is a sop of the worst kind to the laborer's worst enemies. * * *

While the question in this particular case involves only Government arsenals, navy yards, etc., if it passes there it is liable to spread out * * * into State legislation, so that this is the time to kill it. If hours are going to be shortened and if wages are going to be increased it is economically certain that it can only be done by using the labor of the man to his own and to his employer's best advantage.

I shall not give the name of the gentleman who wrote that letter, but shall content myself by saying that he represents a large corporation, with skilled and contented workmen, hundreds in number.

A portion of another letter is written by Mr. H. S. Person, who is the director and professor of organization and management in the Amos Tuck School of Dartmouth College. Mr. Person is also president of the Society to Promote the Science of Management. He writes:

On behalf of the Society to Promote the Science of Management, as its president and on my personal account as a citizen of New Hampshire, I beg to express the opinion that the Deitrick rider to the Army appropriation bill, designed to do away with time study and bonus and premium payments in Navy and Army work, is a pernicious measure, harmful to industry, and I ask you to vote against said amendment.

I make the following points to support my request:

1. The whole matter of scientific management is now undergoing a most thorough examination by the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, and Congress should pass no measure relating to scientific management until said commission has reported.

2. Scientific management in the Government arsenal at Watertown has proved to be a conspicuous example of improved methods, reduced costs, and increase of pay to workmen, without more strenuous labor on their part.

3. The opposition to scientific management at the Watertown Arsenal and elsewhere has not originated among the laborers at said arsenal * * *.

4. There is great need for greater efficiency on the part of Government institutions, and to destroy what has been accomplished at the Watertown Arsenal would be to destroy an admirable example of what may be accomplished for greater efficiency among Government institutions.

I sincerely hope you will oppose this with all the means in your power, * * *.

Mr. President, considering the small amount of time I have had at my command during the last few days, I have looked into this matter as carefully as I could. I am aware of the fact that in certain quarters it is deemed hazardous for any man in public life to oppose anything that labor organizations, or, for that matter, individual laboring men, ask of Congress; but I have never refrained from expressing my views on those subjects, and in a recent election I ran the gantlet of vicious opposition from labor organizations, their contention being based upon the ground that I was not a friend of the laboring man. I have heretofore refuted that statement, and I repeat it now—that if there is anybody on earth who is a better friend of the laboring man than I am I do not know who he is, but I shall never endeavor to prove that fact by advocating any measure that my judgment and conscience do not approve.

Mr. President, after looking into this matter with a good deal of care and listening to the debates to-day as far as I could, I am fully persuaded that the proper thing for us to do is to stand by the recommendation of the committee and agree to the amendment which the committee proposes. I might occupy much time in discussing this matter if I saw fit to do so, but there is no Member of this body more anxious than I to see the business of the Senate pushed along as rapidly as possible, and for that reason I shall not say another word except to renew the suggestion that I sincerely wish the amendment of the committee will be allowed to remain in the bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. The subject which is now before the Senate is one in which the people whom I in part represent would naturally take a very deep interest, as they are largely engaged in manufacture. I had proposed, therefore, to discuss it at some little length; but the hour is already growing late, and I know there are several persons who are impatient to have the business of the Senate go on at this time, and whatever I might have said upon it has already been said by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] in the remarks they have made. While I might perhaps put the same arguments in different language and might perhaps use a few other illustrations and read different correspondence in order to illustrate the points which they have made, I should in the end be simply advancing the same arguments that they have so thoroughly covered in the remarks they have made. Therefore I shall not undertake to do it, but shall merely say that in the opposition which I feel it is necessary for me to make to the abolishment of these bonus systems where they are employed in the Government factories I am not so much governed by the first provision which is contained in the amendment that is under consideration, which provides for doing away with the stop watch or other time-measuring devices, as I am with the second provision, which forbids any part of the appropriations made in this bill being available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages.

That seems to me to strike at the very basis of modern industrial efficiency. I can not imagine a more unfair and more unwise system than that which would forbid to industrious and experienced and expert employees an opportunity to receive wages in accordance with their skill and with their diligence.

In Rhode Island we have in recent years seen a succession of operatives come into our State from foreign countries and of different nationalities. Within my own lifetime the nationality of the employees in our textile industries has changed two or three times. In each case this meant the training of new people. In many cases it has meant instructing in the art of textile manufacture the people who come from districts in foreign countries where such business is entirely unknown. I have often thought that we were somewhat negligent in meeting the full responsibility of the situation which was put upon the managers of industries of that kind in that we did not have a practical school for the purpose of teaching these people who were coming fresh to those industries the scientific and proper way of running our machinery. I have many times seen anxious and eager people come into the factories and fumble in their attempts to learn to operate the machinery and become nervous and anxious and discouraged and disheartened simply because there was not some proper and efficient system for preparing them with the knowledge necessary for their guidance in beginning to operate those machines.

Much of the Taylor system which has been discussed here to-day is in itself an attempt to find a scientific way of improving the knowledge of the operative in running the machinery that may be given to his charge, and, as an incentive to acquire that greater knowledge, to give him some compensation in the form of advanced pay. It seems to me that to abolish that system would be a great injury to the operative, it would do no good to anybody concerned, and I can not see my way clear to support any provision which has that purpose for its object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I really had not intended to say anything at all on this matter which has been discussed so much at length, but as chairman of the committee I feel it my duty to speak very briefly upon some of the motives which animated the committee with reference to this amendment.

In the first place, there was a petition presented by the employees of the Frankford Arsenal, to the number of about 300, asking the committee to strike out the House amendment. I am going to ask that that petition, with the names of the individuals who signed it, may be printed in the RECORD, be-

cause I understand it has been said that the people at that arsenal possibly either did not sign it or were induced to sign it by methods that were not entirely fair. I want that petition printed, and the names of those who signed it printed with it, in order that we may know hereafter whether the people who pretended to sign it existed in fact or not. I ask that it be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Even if there had been no other consideration animating the committee, this petition would have been ordinarily sufficient to have induced them to strike out the House provision in reference to this subject. In addition to that, the committee had before it a letter addressed by the Secretary of War to the President of the Senate under date of January 30, 1915. In that letter, after setting out at length the amendment which had been put in the House bill, and after explaining the purpose and effect of the amendment, the Secretary of War proceeds to say:

> This question has been agitated for some time past, and when brought to my attention I requested the Commission on Industrial Relations to carefully investigate the whole subject matter with a view to reaching a proper conclusion thereon. This matter is one peculiarly within the scope of the jurisdiction of that commission. Just what they have done as yet in the matter I do not know, but I feel very strongly that the reasonable course to pursue would be to await their action and determination. If, for any reason, the Senate does not feel inclined to accept this suggestion, I most earnestly request that a hearing be accorded upon the subject matter, so that all the facts and reasons which should be known to the Senate may be developed before the Senate finally concludes the matter.
>
> With a view of acquainting the Senate somewhat more with the details of the situation I have caused the Chief of Ordnance to prepare a statement, which accompanies this.

That letter was signed by the Secretary of War, and attached to it is a memorandum for the Secretary of War from the Chief of Ordnance. The report of the Chief of Ordnance sets out at length the memoranda taken from former reports on the work of efficiency. I ask that that report be published also in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I understand that this investigation that has been mentioned as having been set on foot by the Industrial Commission has progressed somewhat, and there ought to be a report made in the very near future. It seemed to the committee and it seems to me that a question of such large import, a question of such great industrial and economic importance, ought not to be acted upon here in the Senate after a few days of investigation.

It makes no difference what may be the individual views of the members of the committee, and I am frank to say the committee was somewhat divided on the subject. It would hardly be proper for me to say what the views of any particular member of the committee was, except, speaking for myself, I may say that I am in perfect harmony with legislation which has for its purpose the uplift of the laboring people of this country, and I think the record I have made in the Senate will show that to be true. But I shall not agree to settle within the few days that we have to consider this bill a great economic question, where the lives and fortunes of so many people are involved, without knowing a good deal more about the subject than I know about this or than it was possible for me to know as a member of the great committee of which I have the honor to be chairman.

It has been stated, and stated truly, that this amendment was placed upon the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives without very much investigation. It was not reported from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, and the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate did not have an opportunity to investigate it, either.

So this reason, amongst others, influenced the committee in striking out the House provision.

There is another thing, too, Mr. President. I differ somewhat from my esteemed friend from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] in reference to the effect of this amendment. If it goes into this bill and becomes a part of the law of the land, it will have the effect to wipe out every system that is in vogue in all the arsenals and other public institutions and industrial establishments of the United States. These systems, generally speaking, are all different. Some of them are the result of the evolution of years of study. It may be that the War Department is trying to get all of them on a basis approaching the so-called Taylor system, but they are different nevertheless. If I had the time I could point out the differences in detail in those institutions. The piecework system governs in some, the bonus system prevails in others, and a near approach to the Taylor system is in vogue in others. This bill would practically change the whole industrial and economic system that governs in these different public enterprises. Hasty action ought not to be had.

If there is any injustice in any of these department, that is a matter which can very easily be investigated upon complaint of the humblest employee. The Government has the power at any time to investigate every complaint; but, so far as the committee was concerned, there was not a single employee of any of these institutions before the Senate committee objecting to the striking out of this provision. As a matter of fact, they all petitioned for it. Some claim has been made with reference to the Watertown Arsenal, it is true, that in years gone by there was objection to the installation of the Taylor system.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator referred a moment ago to an expected report from the Industrial Commission. Has the Senator any information as to when that report may be expected?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no information on that subject. The Secretary of War in his letter has referred to it and informed us that progress is being made. I know the War Department is anxious to get at the truth of this matter, and if possible to evolve a system which will equalize any differences there may be. But there was some complaint of the Watertown Arsenal at one time. The complaints were not numerous and not general. They were fully investigated and reported upon. I find from the letters which have been presented here by the Senator from Massachusetts to-day that the employees of the Watertown Arsenal individually seem to be in favor of striking out this provision.

These are some of the reasons which governed the committee. It was not an expression of views by the members of the committee as to how they stood on this so-called labor legislation. It was a question with the committee largely as to their duty in acting upon this very great question hastily and without being sufficiently advised upon the subject.

I felt it my duty to say this much, and I call particular attention to these matters, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks.

APPENDIX 1.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 1, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I transmit herewith a petition of persons employed by this department at the Frankford Arsenal, in which they protest against the suspension of premium payments. Attention is invited to the indorsement thereon of the Chief of Ordnance, showing that premium payments have been suspended because of a proviso in the Army appropriation bill now pending before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which, if enacted into law, will prohibit such payments.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

(One inclosure.)

PETITION.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 28, 1915.

CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, United States Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned employees of the Frankford Arsenal, do respectfully enter our protest against the instructions received from you yesterday suspending all premium payments at this arsenal. We have been informed that your action is based upon legislation contained in the Army bill recently passed by the lower branch of Congress, and that therefore your action is out of respect for the views expressed by that body. Our reasons for protesting are as follows:

1. The premium system of payment was established in the manufacture of small-arms ammunition about five years ago, and that there was a complete understanding between ourselves and the management of the arsenal that there would be no reduction of the premium rates while the manufacturing processes remain the same. This agreement has been lived up to by the management and by ourselves and to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned.

2. We believe that this system has been eminently successful, because, according to published reports, the manufacture of small-arms ammunition at Frankford Arsenal presents a decided economy when compared with costs of the same ammunition procured from private manufacturers.

3. The premium earned by all the employees engaged in the manufacture of small-arms ammunition during the month of December, 1914, has amounted to $3,747.72, or to approximately $45,000 for the year, and therefore the abolishing of the premium system means an annual loss to us of approximately $45,000.

4. Many of us, based upon the premium system of compensation, have obligated ourselves to purchase homes, and if the premium rate is abolished it means the loss of our homes to us.

5. It is very probable that the branch of Congress which passed this legislation has 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 to 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 us to do.

We therefore ask you to submit this petition to the Secretary of War, with the recommendation that he transmit it to Congress for its consideration, and, we hope, favorable action.

Respectfully submitted.

Beulah M. Taylor, Charles E. Flynn, Elizabeth G. Lawler, Sara C. Painter, Tessie Horning, Lizzie Zismoser, Sadie C. Closer, Matthew D. Tierney, Elizabeth C. Mahoney, Magdalena E. Lange, Hattie McLean, James J. Toy, jr., Elsie M. Smith, Carrie C. Gear, Richard Wigfall, Harriet C. Brooke, Daniel Groom, Mary Neild, Albert M. Bates, Mary Murphy, Mamie E. Hughes, Anna L. Reichert, Frank Lafferty, Catherine McDeute, William Ganz, Edward S. Salmon, Frederick G. Everts, Charles F. Wager, Patrick Coleman, Louis W. Heck, Anna E. Caldwell, Harry G. Penn, John O. Clifford, Thomas Hitt, John Van Emburgh, Peter Elsesser, Joseph E. Hunsinger, Geo. W. Dungan, Jacob Sidders, John J. Gillespie, Clara A. Roth, Cora Dennis, Annie Staiger, Rose D. Kelly, George J. Lutes, Minie Geary, Kathryn W. Berans, Thos. G. Girard, Charles Heck, Thomas Murphy, Charles A. Lutes, John Baker, William C. Smith, Aloysius P. Lyons, Thomas Coady, John Kultacky, Thomas L. Gallagher, Emerson Harris, Frederick C. Fessmann, Andrew H. Hallowell, Thomas H. Hess, Frank J. Riegel, Charles E. Huebner, Harry F. Ward, Leopold Hunsinger, David J. Weischedel, Jacob Hahn, Annie Stanley, Alice E. Brennen, Mary Vandegrift, Elizabeth Gensheimer, Mary E. O'Brien, Lizzie Conley, Helen Daylor, Edward B. Vandegrift, George Baitzel, Mabel Gear, Francis Lord, A. F. Brand, Katie S. Hoffman, Joseph B. Moss, Carl Vogel, Charles Haar, Malachi Shanahan, Ella M. Hart, Catherine M. Bailes, Victoria E. Brehm, Bertha A. Oldfield, Marion P. Bayne, Florence Timmins, Amanda Boyce, Annie Jensen, Mary J. Hudson, Sarah McDevitt, Grace McCartney, Sophia Formosa, Ella Mullen, Fredericka McCulb, Nellie E. Scanlin, Elizabeth Deck, Ellie Stanley, Elizabeth Emmott, Bessie Bird, Margaret A. Kelsy, Marie Myers, Susannah K. Myers, Annie T. Nealon, Alma C. Tierread, Martha M. Gilfillan, Anna E. Herbert, Grace M. Carlin, Mary R. Ott, Margaret E. McPeak, Mary S. King, Katherine C. Field, Louisa C. Berger, Mary H. Casey, Sarah Schofield, Mary E. Davis, Lottie E. Jones, Elizabeth A. Cassidy, Anna M. Dunn, Bertha K. Roth, Anna D. Burke, Agnes E. Lentz, Ida M. Taylor, A. J. Woodworth, Ada Dewees, Mary Leddy, Helen M. Gain, William S. Robinson, Margaret A. O'Brien, Elizabeth Ewing, Emma M. Goodman, Stephen V. Shields, Alice P. Robinson, Emma P. Prief, Bessie A. Newnam, Julia M. Duryea, Anna Creighton, Annie M. Young, Ida M. Baker, Edna C. Batezell, Mary Wernle, Viola L. Llewellyn, Katie Splitt, Marion H. Edinger, Anna E. Armstrong, William R. Weniger, Joseph E. Ewing, Marion M. Place, Theresa M. Lynn, Lillie M. Yeager, Lizzie M. Smiley, Elizabeth Brand, Leedom E. Tomlinson, William H. Coil, Mary Mitchell, Martha McCreedy, Alma W. Webster Patrick F. Clark, Nan M. P. Sweeney, Cora Klotz, Matilda B. Warner, Frances R. Taylor, Carrie B. Pyott, Rosa A. Schuler, Matthew F. Cleary, George J. Sekula, Rose E. Kane, Jennie B. Hagner, Anna Brurein, Carrie Powell, Anna Heger, Helen E. Whelen, Mary Berger, Anna T. Dungan, Clara Wallace, Anna M. Ryan, Mary A. Kelly, Florence M. Edwards, Imogene A. Simon, Magdalen C. Yaegel, Susie McDevitt, Elizabeth J. Smith, Lulu H. Christopher, Florence E. Godshall, Herma Lange, Barbara Marlow, Rosie Hartman, Mary F. Reagan, Mary Devlin, Alice V. Cassidy, Ellie Farr, Florence A. Bush, Clara Beil, Frank A. Dufner, Thomas Hesson, Stanley P. Leedom, James McCormac, Charles Persh, Mae Donohoe, Anna Honeyford, Lilly Smilowski, Elizabeth G. Cassels, Mary M. Smith, Mary Mitchell, Margaret Devere, Mary E. Candy, Anna Janish, Mary I. Wheatland, Elsie J. Eckley, Amelia Strobel, Charles Hiller, jr., Charles Keifer, Nellie Gordon, Gertrude Tolbert, Margaret Brown, Blanche F. McKnight, Edward Green, John Jesberger, Charles E. McCort, John Shields, George S. Matthews, Hugh J. Bradley, Harry Smith, Clarence Holt, Daniel P. Shields, Florence H. Smith, Martie Vandigrift, Edith Haney, Mary Mackner, Violet Hartman, Mamie Zruestle, Mamie Deneen, Catherne Ryan, Elizabeth R. Hodgkiss, Elsie L. Brittain, Katherin R. Lawler, Frances E. Beck, Agnes P. Acker, Gretta M. Finley, Addie Altemus, Irene Holmes, Alice Cahill, Anna McCullough, Hilda A. M. Hacker, Bertha B. Buckwalter, Lizzie Ulmer, Emma M. Thompson, Agnes Griffin, Sarah L. Martindale, Rebe J. Murray, Laura Engelman, Mary Brownell, Minerva M. McLaughlin, Amy L. Smith, Mary Costello, Minnie M. Wagner, Elizabeth S. Foster, Sadie J. Bangaardt, Ellen D. Krier, Lillian M. Gavin, Katie Marshall, Mary M. Graf, Anna L. Lancaster, Sadie McMann, Mamie G. McGlynn, Susie F. McLaughlin, Emma E. Smyser, Annie Hiller, Edna M. Strunk, Elizabeth Glancy, Mary Macdonald, Annie G. Flynn, Mary M. Kilty, Edna V. Richards, Mary E. Howerth, Mary A. Burk, Laura M. Nield, Blanche Letterman, Nellie E. Raed, Mary Warnock, Ellie Carmody, Jessie E. Campbell, Laura T. Bauer, Agnes D. Focht, Martha E. Kroesen, Margaret E. McCartin, Emma Fischer, Edna Smithers, Katharine A. Cleggett, William A. Blaisse, Albert M. Barington, Joseph A. Brown, Joseph A. Messinger, Norman E. Disbaroon, James F. Diamond, Joseph A. Clark.

THE FRANKFORD ARSENAL ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 28, 1915.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The committee whose names appear below, representing 400 employees of the Frankford Arsenal, do earnestly petition you and your fellow colleagues of the Committee on Military Affairs to report unfavorably the legislation passed by the House prohibiting the payment of premium rates to employees of the Frankford Arsenal. The premium system of compensation was introduced at this arsenal over five years ago, to the mutual satisfaction of the Government and ourselves. We made an agreement with the management of the arsenal with respect to the premium rates established, and with the understanding that while the manufacturing processes remain the same there would never be a reduction in the rates so established.

Our earnings under the premium system have averaged $3,747.72 per month, or $44,972 annually, and many of us, based upon the increased compensation, have obligated ourselves to buy homes, and the loss of the premium system means the loss of many of our homes. We do not doubt the good intentions of those who proposed the legislation, but we feel, nevertheless, that a great injustice has been done us. You will see that under the proposed legislation, while we lose our increased compensation, there is nothing to prevent the Government from making us work as hard or even harder than ever, and without any reward therefor.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH B. MOSS,
HARRY F. WARD,
JOHN SHIELDS,
Committee.

ORDNANCE OFFICE, *January 30, 1915.*

To the SECRETARY OF WAR:

1. The legislation referred to in this petition is contained in a proviso of the Army bill (H. R. 20347), which passed the House of Representatives on January 22 and is now pending in the Senate. The language referring to the class of payments which have been suspended at the Frankford Arsenal is the following:

"* * * 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."

2. As the legislation is claimed by its proponents in the House of Representatives to be in the interest of the workmen who would be affected by it, I have considered it but just to all such workmen that they should have warning as to the effect of the measure in case it should be enacted into law. I have therefore given the same effect to the prohibition that it would have if it became law by directing that all premium payments, except such as have already accrued, shall cease at the arsenal.

WILLIAM CROZIER,
Brigadier General, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army.

APPENDIX 2.

[Senate Document No. 800, 63d Cong., 3d sess.]

TIME STUDY AND PREMIUM PAYMENTS.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF WAR RELATIVE TO A PROVISION IN THE ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL AGAINST TIME STUDY AND PREMIUM PAYMENTS AT GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENTS.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 30, 1915.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In the Army appropriation bill, H. R. 20347, which passed the House of Representatives on the 22d instant, there occurs the following legislation, added as an amendment upon the floor of the House:

"*Provided*, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job 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 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."

The purpose and effect of this amendment is to prevent scientific management in the branch of the business of the Government which is affected by it. Surely this is a subject matter of great importance and should be dealt with directly and only decided after careful investigation and deliberation. It was not relevant to any matter contained in the Army bill, was not brought up in the hearings before the committee in the House so that both sides might receive full opportunity to present facts and reasons, and did not and could not receive full consideration under the circumstances, and when the amendment as adopted was presented to the bill on the floor of the House. Under the circumstances I feel that it is my duty to call the attention of the Senate to the situation so that they shall not vote thereon in ignorance of the importance of the subject matter.

This question has been agitated for some time past, and when brought to my attention I requested the Commission on Industrial Relations to carefully investigate this whole subject matter wih a view to reaching a proper conclusion thereon. This matter is one peculiarly within the scope of the jurisdiction of that commission. Just what they have done as yet in the matter I do not know, but I feel very strongly that the reasonable course to pursue would be to await their action and determination. If for any reason the Senate does not feel inclined to accept this suggestion I most earnestly request that a hearing be accorded upon this subject matter, so that all the facts and reasons which should be known to the Senate may be developed before the Senate finally concludes the matter.

With a view of acquainting the Senate somewhat more with the details of the situation, I have caused the Chief of Ordnance to prepare a statement, which accompanies this.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

[Memorandum for the Secretary of War.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, January 29, 1915.

Subject: Legislation in bill H. R. 29347, against time study and premium payments at Government establishments.

1. The prohibition in this legislation relates to two features of the system of scientific management which has been in practice at the

Watertown Arsenal, Mass., for something over five years. The first feature which is prohibited, time study, is a method of determining by careful study the best manner and sequence in which a given piece of work shall be done, the most advantageous way in which its expeditious performance can be accomplished, and the time in which it can reasonably be expected to be done. Based upon the results of time study an instruction card is issued to any workman who may be engaged upon the work studied, and he is told that if he follows the instructions carefully and industriously he can probably do the work in the time which has been arrived at, and in that case he will be given a premium, over and above his regular wages, amounting to one-third of these wages, or a less premium for measurably approaching this time; his regular wages not being subject to reduction in any case, being fixed at the prevailing rate of the vicinity for work of like character. This payment of premium is the second feature which is prohibited by the legislation in the bill. No watch is held over a workman otherwise than during the time study mentioned, and no workman is subjected to any timing process for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is working industriously. Time studies are made only occasionally, and as information accumulates which is available for use in arriving at the time in which work can reasonably be done, its employment is of diminishing frequency. All allowances are made so as to insure that work shall not be expected at a rate which is irksome, or even disagreeable, to the workman.

2. There are other important features of the system of management which relate to systemization, orderly procedure, and efficient arrangement, not having relation to the care and attention which is expected from a workman or to any stimulus to industry upon his part; but the features now proposed to be prohibited are the only ones by which the workman is let in to a share in the economy which results from better management accompanying the system.

3. A monthly report is made from the Watertown Arsenal of the amount of work which has been done upon the premium system and the premiums which are earned thereon. The latest report which has been received, which is for the month of November last, shows that 33 per cent of all the work done at the arsenal in that month was in accordance with this system, and that the total amount of premium was $2,519.69. The shop in which were the greatest number of men who had premium work was the machine shop, and in this about 70 per cent of all the work done was on the premium system, and the average premium earned by the machinists for the time that they were working on premium jobs was 24.12 per cent of their regular pay. It will be observed that the premiums paid during this period were at the rate of about $40,000 a year, and as there are in the neighborhood of 600 employees at the arsenal, it follows that the wages of all were increased on an average by about $66 a year. Premium payments, but not time studies, are made also at the Frankford Arsenal, in Philadelphia, Pa.; and at that establishment these payments amount to about $45,000 a year. As stated above, these premiums are over and above the regular day wages of the employees, which are fixed by the rule that they shall be the same as those paid in the vicinity for work of like character, and which have not been diminished since the commencement of the application of the premium system of payment; so that the charge that this system results in a demand for higher speed on the part of the workman without any ultimate increase of wages has no foundation in the now well-established practice at these arsenals. I inclose a copy of the report from the Watertown Arsenal which is referred to in this paragraph, which shows the name of every workman who was employed upon a premium job during any part of the first 23 days of last November; the time which he worked upon such job; the amount of premium which he earned, and the ratio which this premium bore to his regular wages. There is also shown the average premium earned in each shop and the percentage of the total work in the shop which was done under the premium system. It appears that the total sum paid in premiums during these 23 days (19 working days) was $2,519.69; that the total number of employees who received premiums was 340; so that the average premium earned by each was $7.41, and the average daily premium $0.39 each.

4. The workings of the system, the economies effected, and the advantage to the workman are set forth in the reports of the Chief of Ordnance for the years 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914. The extracts from these reports for the years 1911 and 1912 which relate to this subject are published in an appendix to the report of the Chief of Ordnance for the year 1913, together with certain petitions of a number of the workmen at the Watertown Arsenal against this system, and the replies of the Chief of Ordnance thereto. A copy of this appendix is inclosed herewith, and there are also inclosed copies of the reports for the years 1913 and 1914. I invite special attention to these reports, as the subject can not be fully understood without knowing what is in them. They exhibit a high degree of advantage for the workman and such economy of manufacture for the Government that it seems inevitable that, if the economy is reduced, as it appears certain that it will be if the proposed legislation becomes effective, larger sums will be required for the operation of the arsenals.

WILLIAM CROZIER,
Brigadier General, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army.

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914.

MOLDERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
4	J. J. Flynn	18 0	$3.04	$54.72	$0.62	$55.34	1 38	28 35	5.71
5	J. F. Gatte	19 0	3.52	66.88	7.63	74.51	17 20	75 55	22.83
6	W. B. Danehy	16 4	3.28	55.76	14.37	70.13	35 3	122 25	28.63
7	J. Hicklin	18 0	3.52	66.88	19.37	86.25	44 2	140 50	31.27
8	T. Kane	19 0	3.52	66.88	18.70	85.58	42 30	134 10	31.68
10	G E. Lawson	19 0	3.52	66.88	20.69	87.57	47 2	141 55	33.14
11	J. H. Murphy	19 0	3.28	62.32	26.98	89.30	65 49	148 30	44.32
12	J. R. Cooney	18 7	3.52	66.44	11.38	77.82	25 52	98 20	26.31
15	J. Wilson	19 0	3.68	69.92	12.73	82.65	27 41	175 10	15.80
17	J. Pickard	18 1½	3.52	63.91	12.26	76.17	27 52	66 20	42.01
18	I. Goostray	19 0	3.68	69.92	12.95	82.87	28 9	177 20	15.87
	Total				157.68		362 58	1,309 30	27.05

Premium percentage of shop=362 hours 58 minutes÷1,309 hours 30 minutes=27.72 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 80.42 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MACHINISTS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
22	T. J. O'Connell		$3.04		$0.30	$0.30	0 48	8 25	9.50
31	G. F. Lincoln	19 0	3.04	$57.76	2.90	60.66	7 38	33 15	22.96
33	M. B. Hassett	18 7½	3.04	57.57	19.11	76.68	50 17	177 20	28.35
34	G. H. Rayne	18 4	3.04	56.24	2.72	58.96	7 9	19 35	36.51
35	A. C. Hydren	18 7	3.04	57.38	7.23	64.61	19 1	122 20	15.50
38	W. J. Cusack	18 5	3.28	61.09	18.91	80.00	46 7	110 0	41.92
39	J. Driscoll	19 0	3.52	66.88	14.65	81.53	33 18	111 0	30.00
41	T. J. Sheehan	19 0	3.52	66.88	22.71	89.59	51 37	138 5	37.38
42	H. W. Carlson	12 0	3.28	39.36	5.71	45.07	13 56	63 5	22.09
43	F. Carroll	17 2½	3.04	52.63	2.33	54.96	6 8	130 30	4.70
44	H. D. Roberts	18 6½	3.04	57.19	12.49	69.68	32 52	139 55	23.49
45	C. Hellquist	19 0	3.28	62.32	5.04	67.36	12 18	43 20	28.38
47	P. C. McGinnis	19 0	3.52	66.88	18.11	84.99	41 10	113 45	36.19
48	D. F. Mannix	18 1½	3.04	55.20	20.03	75.23	52 42	144 55	36.37
49	B. S. Ford	19 0	3.28	62.32	3.31	65.63	8 5	122 50	6.58
50	E. A. Petterson	19 0	3.52	66.88	7.59	74.47	17 15	75 30	22.85
51	L. E. Spellman	17 0	2.80	47.60	7.53	55.13	21 30	111 25	19.30
52	M. G. Cunningham	18 0	3.04	54.72	18.64	73.36	49 3	144 0	34.06
53	W. S. Clarke	19 0	3.04	57.76	1.05	58.81	2 46	15 5	18.34
54	A. E. Magnuson	18 7½	3.28	62.12	.88	63.00	2 9	8 0	26.87
55	M. S. Fowler	18 7	3.04	57.38	4.78	62.16	12 35	72 40	17.32
56	I. Carlson	17 5½	3.04	56.81	20.15	76.96	53 1	141 5	37.58
59	O. Borgstrom	18 7½	3.28	62.12	1.52	63.64	3 42	45 20	8.16
60	J. Anderson	19 0	3.04	57.76	18.63	76.39	49 1	145 25	33.71
61	A. Le Roy	19 0	3.04	57.76	4.15	61.91	10 55	89 40	12.17
62	P. H. Connell	19 0	2.80	53.20	.44	53.64	1 15	161 25	.77
63	P. Drew	19 0	3.04	57.76	8.49	66.25	22 20	136 35	16.35
64	C. R. Barlow	19 0	3.52	66.88	20.68	87.56	47 0	120 5	39.14
65	J. A. Forrest	19 0	3.28	62.32	19.28	81.60	47 2	156 15	30.10

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914—Continued.

MACHINISTS—continued.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
66	J. J. Henry	19 0	$3.28	$62.32	$17.47	$79.79	42 36	162 50	26.16
67	F. A. Holway	19 0	3.28	62.32	3.97	66.29	9 41	130 20	7.43
68	F. A. Bailey	19 0	2.56	48.64	0.19	48.83	0 35	8 10	7.14
69	S. G. Halberg	19 0	3.52	66.88	11.21	78.09	25 29	181 40	14.03
70	J. W. McDonald	18 0	3.04	57.76	14.07	71.83	37 1	131 15	28.20
71	A. F. Hansen	18 7	3.28	61.91	1.02	62.93	2 29	17 45	13.99
72	A. F. Nutting	19 0	3.04	57.76	5.00	62.76	13 10	114 55	11.46
73	V. Swenson	19 0	3.28	62.32	11.35	73.67	27 41	127 55	21.64
75	N. G. Gould	19 0	3.52	66.88	14.27	81.15	32 26	134 40	24.08
76	C. J. Murnane	18 7½	3.28	62.12	8.78	70.90	21 25	96 15	22.25
78	F. C. Gould	18 7	3.04	57.38	2.54	59.92	6 41	37 10	17.98
79	E. J. Fagan	19 0	2.80	53.20	9.07	62.27	25 54	111 55	23.14
80	F. A. Nugent	19 0	3.04	57.76	14.68	72.44	38 38	136 0	28.41
81	R. Smith	18 6½	3.28	61.71	10.12	71.83	24 41	194 10	12.71
82	T. Whitworth	19 0	2.80	53.20	12.82	66.02	36 38	140 30	26.07
83	C. J. Frechette	19 0	3.04	57.76	11.64	69.40	30 38	122 25	25.02
84	E. J. Waterman	19 0	3.52	62.32	20.36	82.68	49 40	136 50	36.30
85	do	19 0	3.52	66.88	30.04	96.92	68 17	150 25	45.40
86	L. Anderson	17 3½	3.04	57.57	.41	57.98	1 4	57 40	1.85
87	J. J. Coughlin	19 0	3.04	57.76	18.04	75.80	47 29	136 25	34.81
88	P. Gaffney	18 7½	2.80	53.03	9.17	62.20	26 12	139 30	18.78
90	E. M. Burns	17 0	3.28	62.32	9.66	71.98	23 33	59 15	39.75
91	E. L. Barker	19 0	3.28	62.32	8.82	71.14	21 31	70 30	30.52
92	M. F. Cheevers	19 0	3.04	57.76	12.32	70.08	32 25	148 10	21.88
93	F. B. Hardy	19 0	3.04	57.76	6.36	64.12	16 44	57 15	29.23
94	W. Jones	19 0	3.28	62.32	4.24	66.56	10 21	45 55	22.54
96	W. P. Cross	18 7½	3.04	57.57	.25	57.82	0 40	30 30	2.18
97	J. P. Larkin	19 0	3.04	57.76	.34	58.10	0 53	8 15	10.71
98	O. W. Collins	18 7	2.80	52.85	10.70	63.55	30 34	182 40	16.73
99	A. M. Fillebrown	18 6	3.28	61.50	20.51	82.01	50 1	143 45	34.79
100	J. V. N. Beeman	18 5½	3.04	56.72	18.01	74.73	47 23	120 5	39.46
101	O. M. Whittier	18 6½	3.04	57.19	.06	57.25	0 10	1 25	11.76
102	W. Barker	19 0	3.52	66.88	14.29	81.17	32 28	106 25	30.51
103	J. D. Finnegan	17 6½	2.80	49.88	2.25	52.13	6 25	123 30	5.20
105	E. Puhpal	17 7½	3.04	55.29	2.66	57.95	7 0	37 15	18.79
106	C. G. Lindstrom	19 0	3.28	62.32	3.51	65.83	8 33	104 55	8.15
107	W. M. Mullen	19 0	3.04	57.76	11.37	69.13	29 55	86 35	34.55
108	T. F. Mulrean	18 6	3.04	57.00	5.57	62.57	14 39	56 35	25.89
109	G. F. Glidden	19 0	3.04	57.76	13.90	71.66	36 34	85 25	42.81
110	J. B. Wiley	19 0	3.04	57.76	7.13	64.89	18 46	56 20	33.31
111	F. L. Hapworth	18 3	3.28	60.27	.....	60.27	.....	2 30	.....
112	J. A. Longfellow	19 0	3.28	62.32	11.41	73.73	27 50	85 10	32.68
113	T. Conrad	19 0	2.80	53.20	6.29	59.49	17 58	93 45	19.16
114	H. A. Brown	19 0	3.04	57.76	5.83	63.59	15 20	115 15	13.30
117	H. E. West	18 4	3.04	56.24	9.07	65.31	23 52	112 30	21.21
118	H. M. Silveira	19 0	3.04	57.76	4.52	62.28	11 54	101 10	11.76
120	F. J. Christensen	18 7½	3.04	57.57	10.84	68.41	28 32	111 0	25.70
121	A. B. Kendall	19 0	3.04	57.76	18.99	76.75	49 58	149 10	33.50
122	E. T. Doby	17 0	2.56	48.64	2.93	51.57	9 9	100 5	9.14
123	J. A. MacKean	19 0	3.52	66.88	1.36	68.24	3 6	11 30	26.96
124	J. J. Mitchell	19 0	3.28	62.32	6.93	69.25	16 54	133 10	12.69
125	J. Singleton	18 1½	3.52	66.88	22.00	88.88	50 0	127 0	39.37
126	K. A. Zander	18 6½	3.28	61.71	1.53	63.24	3 41	20 40	18.06
128	T. E. Farrell	18 7½	3.28	62.12	9.87	71.99	24 4	150 25	16.00
129	A. Swenson	19 0	3.28	62.32	9.46	71.78	23 4	112 40	20.47
131	E. A. Hanson	19 0	2.28	62.32	11.41	73.73	27 50	81 15	34.26
132	G. L. Lamkin	19 0	2.80	53.20	13.99	67.19	39 59	154 55	25.81
133	T. F. McGowan	18 3¾	3.04	56.15	9.49	65.64	21 58	128 5	19.49
134	A. L. Dow	18 5	3.04	56.62	15.50	72.12	40 48	159 55	25.51
135	S. W. Howatt	18 7½	3.04	57.57	8.09	65.66	21 17	81 50	26.00
136	M. J. Costigan	18 0	2.80	50.40	10.07	60.47	28 46	143 0	20.12
137	G. T. Johnson	19 0	3.04	57.76	3.60	61.36	9 28	59 40	15.86
138	A. M. Stirling	18 0	3.04	54.72	16.29	71.01	42 52	119 25	35.90
139	C. Hicks	19 0	3.52	66.88	12.61	79.49	28 39	184 10	15.56
140	O. S. Davis	18 0	2.80	53.20	7.40	60.60	21 8	152 55	13.82
141	P. W. O'Donnell	19 0	3.04	57.76	32.63	90.39	85 52	145 5	59.18
143	D. Friberg	18 2	3.04	55.48	.34	55.82	54	5 0	18.00
144	N. E. Parnell	19 0	3.04	57.76	13.10	70.86	34 29	146 45	23.50
145	A. S. Pearce	18 7	3.28	61.91	9.31	71.22	22 42	199 20	11.39
146	C. F. Carlson	18 7½	3.28	62.12	20.03	82.15	48 51	132 20	26.91
147	C. E. Norrby	17 0	3.04	57.76	.75	58.51	1 58	45 40	4.31
148	J. McFarland	18 7½	3.04	57.57	26.28	83.85	69 10	123 40	55.93
149	W. C. Fisher	18 1½	3.04	55.29	4.24	59.53	11 9	116 45	9.55
150	J. Gastonquay	12 3	3.04	52.82	13.06	65.88	34 22	96 30	35.61
152	J. A. Dirwanger	18 0	3.04	57.76	3.51	61.27	9 14	39 30	23.37
153	P. L. Lacey	19 0	2.80	53.20	.....	53.20	.....	149 45	.....
154	G. G. Downes	19 0	3.04	57.76	2.44	60.20	6 25	16 10	39.69
155	H. J. White	18 5½	3.04	56.81	12.56	69.37	33 3	151 55	21.76
156	F. F. Provost	19 0	3.04	57.76	42.26	100.02	111 12	165 35	67.15
158	R. T. Lorrey	18 7½	3.04	57.57	20.10	77.67	52 54	168 0	31.49
160	G. J. Frykman	18 0	3.04	54.72	14.33	69.05	37 43	140 5	26.92
162	J. T. Brown	16 4½	3.04	50.35	1.15	51.50	3 2	83 10	3.65
164	J. W. Brennan	18 0	3.28	59.04	3.13	62.17	7 38	131 25	5.81
165	B. C. Button	18 7½	3.04	57.57	19.27	76.84	50 42	151 30	33.47
168	W. J. Blake	18 6	3.04	57.00	4.65	61.65	12 14	41 30	29.48
169	J. F. Cusack	18 4½	2.80	51.98	17.73	69.71	50 39	149 30	33.88
173	A. A. Gillespie	18 7	2.56	48.32	.....	48.32	.....	48 40	.....
174	J. D. Regan	18 7	2.56	48.32	12.52	60.84	39 7	136 30	28.66
176	W. Edwards	16 6	3.04	53.96	18.15	72.11	47 46	153 10	31.19
177	J. Hughes	19 0	3.04	57.76	15.67	73.43	41 14	84 15	48.64
179	W. W. Carter	17 7	3.04	54.34	12.32	66.66	32 25	116 10	27.91
182	A. R. Linden	17 4	2.80	49.00	4.14	53.14	11 50	46 35	25.40
183	F. W. Rattek	19 0	3.04	57.76	11.26	69.02	29 38	136 30	21.71
184	N. B. Curtis	19 0	3.04 / 2.80	56.32	12.59	68.91	33 46	143 15	23.57
185	E. Hanf	19 0	3.28	62.32	5.77	68.09	14 5	104 35	13.47
186	E. F. Delaney	18 2½	2.80	51.28	8.20	59.48	23 26	92 5	25.45
188	C. B. Peterson	18 0	3.76	71.44	4.39	75.83	9 20	8 50	105.66
189	G. H. Major	19 0	3.04	57.76	7.88	65.64	20 44	73 30	28.21
190	J. F. Maguire	18 7½	3.04	57.57	1.12	58.69	2 57	52 20	5.64
191	P. J. Conrad	19 0	2.56	48.64	9.36	58.00	29 15	103 5	28.38
192	F. Grethe	18 0	2.80	50.40	2.25	52.65	6 26	52 15	12.31
193	F. O. Franson	18 7	3.04	57.38	29.10	86.48	76 34	204 0	37.53
194	L. Berlin	18 4	3.52	65.12	.86	65.98	1 57	87 25	2.27

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914—Continued.

MACHINISTS—continued.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
196	B. Hamilton	17 7½	$2.56	$45.92	$9.48	$55.40	29 37	145 20	20.38
197	J. C. Dieselman	18 7¼	2.56	48.40	3.03	51.43	9 28	38 40	24.48
198	T. H. Rogers	18 0	2.80	50.40	9.99	60.39	28 32	128 35	22.19
199	L. R. Strout	18 7½	3.04	57.57	4.29	61.86	11 17	74 5	15.23
200	P. Peterson	19 0	3.04	57.76	10.84	68.60	28 31	100 5	28.49
201	C. Hansen	19 0	3.04	57.76	8.52	66.28	22 25	217 5	10.33
202	R. J. Sylvia	18 3¾	2.80	51.71	.....	51.71	.....	38 50	.....
203	G. A. Bjorn	19 0	3.04	57.76	15.42	73.18	40 34	139 30	29.08
204	R. Williams	19 0	3.04	57.76	12.57	70.33	33 4	140 5	23.60
206	F. B. Cushing	14 2¼	3.04	43.42	.....	43.42	.....	82 40	.....
208	J. Bornstein	.....	3.04	.....	.....	.....	.....	9 5	.....
209	J. W. Herbert	18 4½	3.04	56.43	16.47	70.90	43 20	142 5	30.50
211	D. J. Roche	18 4	3.04	56.24	12.23	68.47	32 11	124 45	25.80
212	C. E. Gullbrand	19 0	3.04	57.76	.....	57.76	.....	36 20	.....
217	F. Mee	17 2½	2.80	50.05	10.13	60.18	28 57	89 5	32.50
218	M. J. Acton	19 0	3.28	62.32	.....	62.32	.....	152 50	.....
219	W. S. Jordan	17 0	3.04	51.68	1.33	53.01	3 30	23 25	14.95
221	S. C. Breese	19 0	3.04	57.76	2.10	59.86	5 31	41 10	13.40
222	A. P. Sehlin	18 7	3.04	57.38	10.01	67.39	26 21	108 45	24.23
223	F. McCluskey	18 7½	3.04	57.57	.19	57.76	0 30	23 20	2.14
225	E. W. Lindquist	18 4	3.28	60.68	27.09	87.77	66 5	138 10	47.83
226	M. J. O'Halloran	17 4	3.04	53.20	7.54	60.74	19 50	83 20	23.80
227	J. U. Junier	15 0	3.04	45.60	4.28	49.88	11 15	42 35	26.42
230	E. A. Willey	18 7	3.04	57.38	5.97	63.35	15 42	48 55	32.10
231	A. J. Harris	18 6¾	3.04	57.29	24.82	82.11	65 19	109 35	59.60
247	C. F. Roche	19 0	2.80	53.20	16.82	70.02	48 4	152 0	31.62
285	J. C. Albrecht, jr	19 0	2.56	48.64	14.71	63.35	45 59	152 5	30.24
287	J. Sjostedt	19 0	3.04	57.76	4.59	62.35	12 4	69 40	17.32
288	P. McDonnell	17 7½	3.04	54.53	5.62	60.15	14 47	94 50	15.59
290	P. Olson	18 0	3.04	54.72	7.54	62.26	19 51	134 0	14.81
316	C. A. Sherwin	19 0	3.04	57.76	1.98	59.74	5 13	113 0	4.62
318	H. H. Hermanson	19 0	3.04	57.76	13.19	70.95	34 42	128 50	26.93
319	J. A. Wylie	7 7½	3.04	24.13	6.66	30.79	17 32	77 10	22.72
329	H. H. Beaton	18 7½	2.80	53.03	4.73	57.76	13 31	49 55	27.08
330	G. W. Boulton	17 4½	2.56	44.96	8.01	52.97	25 1	147 20	16.98
331	A. Kanaan	18 0	3.04	54.72	10.75	65.47	28 18	130 50	21.63
332	A. O. Dion	18 0	2.80	50.40	.....	50.40	.. ..	28 30	.....
333	A. E. Peckham	18 4	2.80	51.80	13.73	65.53	39 14	134 20	29.21
344	W. J. Kelleher	19 0	3.04	57.76	6.28	64.04	16 31	142 55	11.56
346	W. H. Lynch	18 7½	3.04	57.57	17.04	74.61	44 51	198 35	22.58
347	G. Adamson	18 7	2.80	52.85	.49	53.34	1 24	58 10	2.41
348	F. Holzworth	19 0	3.04	57.76	8.18	65.94	21 32	72 0	29.91
354	L. E. Allen	19 0	3.04	57.76	2.77	60.53	7 18	34 35	21.11
358	J. E. Killion	18 7½	2.80	53.03	16.58	69.61	47 23	151 30	31.28
359	J. J. J. Connearney	18 0	2.80	50.40	2.86	53.26	8 10*	24 5	33.91
361	M. J. Lyons	18 2	3.04	55.48	.....	55.48	.....	25 35	.....
365	E. G. Lauterbach	17 7	3.04	54.34	6.75	61.09	17 46	125 35	14.15
366	A. Gohr	17 7½	3.04	54.53	19.48	74.01	51 15	160 35	31.91
	Total	.....	.....	.....	1,698.52	.....	4,417 58	18,312 15	22.98

Premium percentage of shop=4,417 hours 58 minutes÷18,312 hours 15 minutes=24.12 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 61.99 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MACHINIST HELPERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
232	E. P. Davis	18 7½	$2.24	$42.42	$3.55	$45.97	12 41	129 10	9.82
233	P. Kelly	17 0	2.40	45.60	3.51	49.11	11 42	30 45	38.05
234	M. Kelly	18 0	2.40	45.60	7.74	53.34	25 48	71 5	36.30
235	J. T. Lovely	18 4	2.40	44.40	.61	45.01	2 1	26 55	7.49
239	T. Murphy	18 4	2.00	38.00	1.30	39.30	5 13	13 35	38.40
240	G. A. Harper	18 0	2.00	36.00	1.39	37.39	5 34	32 55	16.91
242	J. Greene	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.88	39.88	7 32	58 55	12.79
252	E. Colligan	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.57	43.57	22 16	111 20	20.00
256	M. J. Clancy	19 0	2.24	42.56	2.17	44.73	7 44	77 55	9.93
258	T. Cunningham	18 4	2.00	37.00	1.28	38.28	5 7	39 50	12.85
270	W. F. Burke	18 7½	2.00	37.88	12.13	50.01	48 31	146 10	33.19
272	T. J. Wilson	18 0	2.00	36.00	7.66	43.66	30 39	58 15	52.62
275	B. F. Lord	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.99	39.99	7 58	70 35	11.29
277	J. A. Feeley	19 0	2.00	38.00	6.48	44.48	25 54	79 35	32.54
282	T. Quirke	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.03	39.03	4 7	23 5	17.83
292	E. F. Malloy	18 4	2.40	44.40	6.04	50.44	20 7	77 10	26.07
298	A. T. Leonard	18 0	2.00	36.00	2.56	38.56	10 14	73 20	13.95
309	J. H. Pomfrey	19 0	2.00	38.00	4.08	42.08	16 18	66 30	24.51
320	F. L. Hoppermann	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.38	39.38	5 31	18 10	30.37
322	B. W. Griffin	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.54	43.54	22 10	82 15	26.95
323	G. Cummings	17 7	2.00	35.75	3.11	38.86	12 26	125 10	9.93
328	J. J. Daly	18 5	2.00	37.25	.60	37.85	2 23	3 45	63.56
334	C. W. Horgan	18 7½	2.00	37.88	.44	38.32	1 45	36 50	4.75
340	E. L. Eadie	18 7	2.00	37.75	2.05	39.80	8 11	143 40	5.70
342	W. P. Gill	19 0	2.00	38.00	4.45	42.45	17 47	74 50	23.76
345	F. S. Frye	16 4½	2.00	33.06	7.07	40.13	28 16	81 55	34.51
352	O. H. Stead, jr	18 6¾	2.00	37.69	1.10	38.79	4 24	12 45	34.51
355	J. J. Flanagan	10 0	2.00	20.00	.71	20.71	2 50	8 40	32.69
357	A. Meassner	19 0	2.00	38.00	4.06	42.06	16 15	89 20	18.19
360	W. L. Greene	10 0	2.00	20.00	.....	20.00	.....	12 0	.....
368	T. J. Calnan	18 7	2.00	37.75	.94	38.69	3 46	15 40	24.04
	Total	.....	.....	.....	102.42	.....	395 10	1,892 5	23.34

Premium percentage of shop=395 hours 10 minutes÷1,892 hours 5 minutes=20.89 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 16.50 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914—Continued.

LABORERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
54	J. Connolly	19 0	$2.24	$42.56	$2.86	$45.42	10 12	27 0	37.78
2	P. McKenna	18 4	2.00	37.00	.38	37.38	1 31	4 25	34.34
7	C. J. Sullivan	19 0	2.00	38.00	.31	38.31	1 15	7 15	17.24
9	M. Gorman	14 4¾	2.00	29.19	6.85	36.04	27 23	65 35	41.75
10	R. Fallon	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.44	39.44	5 45	21 45	26.44
11	M. Farraher	19 0	2.00	38.00	14.14	52.14	56 34	158 15	35.75
12	S. O'Brien	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.20	39.20	4 48	17 10	27.96
14	P. Kilbride	18 0	2.00	36.00	13.59	49.59	54 21	151 55	36.78
15	J. H. Crowley	19 0	2.00	38.00	7.80	45.80	31 11	132 45	23.49
16	M. Tuohy	19 0	2.24	42.56	1.11	43.67	3 58	14 25	27.51
17	T. P. Hurley	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.83	43.83	23 20	91 0	25.64
18	J. Wasilec	19 0	2.00	38.00	4.28	42.28	17 7	71 25	23.97
20	I. Barnoth	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.67	43.67	22 41	92 45	24.46
21	M. Manning	18 0	2.00	36.00	3.01	39.01	12 3	57 15	21.05
22	E. Comba	19 0	2.00	38.00	2.59	40.59	10 22	45 20	22.87
25	N. R. Hodgens	19 0	2.00	38.00	2.91	40.91	11 38	48 30	23.99
26	J. J. Pettit	19 0	2.00	38.00	6.14	44.14	24 33	126 15	19.45
30	G. Di Luzio	18 0	2.00	36.00	4.28	40.28	17 6	69 15	24.69
31	A. Ward	4 0	2.00	8.00	.16	8.16	39	7 35	8.57
32	W. H. Smith	16 4	2.00	33.00	5.20	38.20	20 48	108 35	19.18
33	J. Meehan	17 6½	2.00	37.13	6.74	43.87	26 58	125 35	21.47
36	P. J. Scanlon	18 0	2.00	36.50	2.69	39.19	10 45	35 45	30.07
37	F. McGinty	19 0	2.00	38.00	7.30	45.30	29 13	71 25	40.91
38	P. Di Luzio	15 4¾	2.00	31.19	7.11	38.30	28 27	63 35	44.74
40	J. J. Britt	18 0	2.00	36.00	1.61	37.61	6 26	15 25	41.72
41	F. F. Maskell	18 0	2.00	36.00	1.64	37.64	6 34	18 5	36.31
43	J. Melams	19 0	2.00	38.00	11.13	49.13	44 30	152 0	29.28
48	G. Lattanzio	19 0	2.00	38.00	3.71	41.71	14 50	60 15	24.62
52	M. Lynch	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.23	39.23	4 54	17 5	28.68
53	F. J. Hughes	16 1½	2.00	32.38	5.53	37.91	22 6	108 20	20.40
54	C. Lyons	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.72	43.72	22 52	115 30	19.80
56	A. Di Tullio	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.60	43.60	22 25	94 35	23.70
60	T. J. Hooban	12 1	2.00	24.25	.13	24.38	30	27 35	1.81
63	W. H. Gregory	14 6	2.00	29.50	.....	29.50	.....	12 0	.....
67	M. Reilly	13 0	2.00	26.00	.70	26.70	2 49	11 15	25.04
68	J. E. Rogers	19 0	2.00	38.00	12.05	50.05	48 13	132 25	36.41
86	L. B. Frye	18 5	2.00	37.25	.67	37.92	2 40	8 0	33.33
3	S. Douglass	18 6	2.00	37.50	10.58	48.08	42 18	128 5	33.03
5	J. H. Sinton	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.48	39.48	5 54	31 35	18.68
8	O. L. Needham	18 0	2.00	37.00	.25	37.25	1 0	3 0	33.33
10	E. St. John	19 0	2.00	38.00	.16	38.16	39	7 35	8.57
88	M. McDermott	19 0	2.16	41.04	.09	41.13	21	1 25	24.71
	Total	.....	.....	.....	175.87	.....	701 39	2,558 55	26.15

Premium percentage of shop=701 hours 39 minutes÷2,558 hours 55 minutes=27.42 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 30.87 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

CHIPPERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
40	J. Lannon	19 0	$2.24	$42.56	$9.53	$52.09	34 3	137 45	24.72
41	J. F. Tovey	19 0	2.24	42.56	9.45	52.01	33 44	122 40	27.50
87	R. Lannon	19 0	2.48	47.12	2.19	49.31	9 3	19 25	36.31
88	J. Connolly	19 0	2.32	44.08	7.87	51.95	27 9	86 10	31.51
94	J. J. Madigan	19 0	2.24	42.56	6.31	48.87	22 32	99 5	22.74
92	J. J. Murphy	16 7½	2.24	37.94	4.81	42.75	17 11	56 25	30.46
93	T. Flanagan	18 0	2.24	40.32	6.41	46.73	22 54	98 25	23.27
96	M. J. Sullivan	19 0	2.24	42.56	5.54	48.10	19 48	81 30	24.29
98	F. E. Howland	19 0	2.24	42.56	8.61	51.17	30 45	95 25	32.23
312	N. Barry	18 7½	2.24	42.42	7.49	49.91	26 44	67 10	39.80
	Total	.....	.....	.....	68.21	.....	241 53	864 0	29.28

Premium percentage of shop=241 hours 53 minutes÷864 hours=28 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 48.03 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MOLDERS' HELPERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
39	G. G. Wright	18 7½	$2.24	$42.42	$0.86	$43.28	3 5	5 50	52.86
43	B. J. Harvey	17 3½	2.24	40.32	.13	40.45	27	25	108.00
45	J. P. J. Ryan	18 7½	2.24	42.42	6.52	48.94	23 18	19 5	122.10
46	M. J. Sheridan	19 0	2.00	38.00	5.89	43.89	23 34	19 20	121.90
47	J. Manning	19 0	2.00	38.00	.74	38.74	2 58	13 0	22.82
49	W. F. Cullinane	18 7½	2.24	42.42	3.01	45.43	10 46	32 30	33.13
60	C. Murphy	18 7½	2.24	42.42	3.78	46.20	13 29	40 30	33.29
68	J. Doherty	19 0	2.24	42.56	9.50	52.06	33 56	107 15	31.64
	Total	.....	.....	.....	20.43	.....	111 33	237 55	65.72

Premium percentage of shops=111 hours 33 minutes÷237 hours 55 minutes=46.89 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 5.87 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914—Continued.

TEAMSTERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
3	W. M. Costello	19 0	$2.00	$38.00	$11.13	$49.13	44 32	152 0	29.30
5	T. Leamy	18 0	2.00	36.00	11.39	47.39	45 23	143 55	31.65
8	P. Maguire	17 0	2.24	38.08	9.31	47.39	33 14	126 15	26.32
29	C. W. Beckwith	17 0	2.00	34.00	10.37	44.37	41 29	134 0	30.96
	Total				42.20		164 48	556 10	29.56

Premium percentage of shop=164 hours 48 minutes÷556 hours 10 minutes=29.63 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 97.92 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

SKILLED WORKMEN.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
79	A. Grealey	18 ½	$2.48	$44.80	$0.47	$45.27	1 30	3 0	50.00
80	D. Mahoney	19 0	2.80	53.20	4.17	57.37	11 54	31 35	37.68
27	J. O'Brien	18 0	2.24	40.32	.21	40.53	45	28 15	2.65
40	P. J. McGarry	19 0	4.00	76.00	.38	76.38	45	28 15	2.65
44	J. Tighe	18 0	2.24	40.32	1.15	41.47	4 7	36 15	11.36
45	H. O'Connor	18 0	3.28	59.04	6.43	65.47	15 41	55 40	28.17
	Total				12.81		34 42	183 0	22.08

Premium percentage of shop=34 hours 42 minutes÷183 hours=18.97 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 15.04 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BLACKSMITHS' HELPERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
22	P. J. O'Brien	13 6½	$2.00	$27.56	$2.06	$29.62	8 15	20 40	39.92
23	J. Kendall	19 0	2.00	38.00	.25	38.25	1 0	11 20	8.82
24	E. A. McDonough	19 0	2.00	38.00	4.34	42.34	17 22	62 25	27.82
25	P. Burke	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.13	39.13	4 31	23 35	19.15
26	M. O'Connor	11 0	2.00	22.00	1.23	23.23	4 55	19 45	24.89
28	J. Ryan	19 0	2.00	38.00	3.95	41.95	15 48	55 25	28.51
29	J. Hart	19 2½	2.00	39.59	.30	39.89	1 13	41 15	2.95
30	T. Balharry	8 0	2.00	16.00	2.95	18.95	11 47	36 30	32.28
31	D. Caponi	19 0	2.00	38.00	1.10	39.10	4 23	31 30	13.92
33	J. Gill	8 0	2.00	16.00	2.51	18.51	10 2	23 50	42.10
39	W. M. O'Brien	3 0	2.00	6.00	1.11	7.11	4 27	18 55	23.52
	Total				20.93		83 43	345 10	23.99

Premium percentage of shop=83 hours 43 minutes÷345 hours 10 minutes=24.25 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 22.01 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BLACKSMITHS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
2	W. J. Frost	7 0	$3.28	$22.96	$3.03	$25.99	7 24	24 0	30.83
4	W. Doherty	17 0	3.28	55.76	2.02	57.78	4 55	28 5	17.51
5	J. T. Mullen	7 0	3.04	21.28	3.07	24.35	8 5	33 10	24.37
6	T. Coleman	13 0	3.28	42.64	.41	43.05	1 0	3 0	33.33
7	J. W. Winch	19 0	3.04	57.76	1.11	58.87	2 55	23 35	12.37
9	J. Houllahan	18 0	3.04	54.72	7.21	61.93	18 50	69 25	27.35
	Total				16.85		43 18	181 15	24.29

Premium percentage of shop=43 hours 18 minutes÷181 hours 15 minutes=23.89 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 19.04 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

SKILLED LABORER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
28	P. J. Noone	19 1	$2.56	$49.60	$12.38	$61.98	38 41	143 35	26.94

Hours worked on premium is 93.85 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1914—Continued.

FIREMEN.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
5	J. Swift	23 0	[1] $75.00	$57.50	$0.11	$57.61	0 21	3 50	9.13
39	R. H. Russell	20 2	[1] 81.00	62.10	.31	62.41	0 55	3 25	26.83
	Total				.42		1 16	7 15	17.98

[1] Per month.

Premium percentage of shop=1 hour 16 minutes÷7 hours 15 minutes=17.47 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 2.10 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

RIGGER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
13	H. Pitts	23 0	[1] $62.00	$47.53	$0.32	$47.85	1 14	7 15	17.01

[1] Per month.

Hours worked on premium is 3.94 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

FURNACE HELPER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
85	E. English	23 0	[1] $70.00	$53.67	$4.43	$58.10	15 16	50 35	30.18

[1] Per month.

Hours worked on premium is 27.49 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MACHINIST APPRENTICES.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
163	E. F. Smith	17 4½	$1.92	$33.66	$0.40	$34.06	1 40	85 20	1.95
170	W. L. Holmes	18 7½	1.92	35.16	7.44	42.60	31 0	92 35	33.48
172	A. J. Boyd	17 7½	2.56	45.92	.54	46.46	1 41	68 45	2.45
	Total				8.38		34 21	246 40	12.63

Premium percentage of shop=246 hours 40 minutes÷34 hours 21 minutes=13.93 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 57.60 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

SCREW MAKER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
159	P. J. Mahony	19 0	$2.56	$48.64	$12.32	$60.96	38 30	135 25	28.43

Hours worked on premium is 89.09 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MACHINE OPERATOR.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
349	M. F. Norton	13 0	$2.80	$36.40	$3.13	$39.53	8 57	86 45	10.32

Hours worked on premium is 83.41 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

MASON'S HELPER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
79	J. McLaughlin	19 0	$2.24	$42.56	$1.25	$43.81	4 28	11 5	40.30

Hours worked on premium is 7.29 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned from Nov. 1 to Nov. 23, 1913—Continued.

CARPENTERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
51	H. M. Haynes	19 0	$3.04	$57.76	$8.30	$66.06	21 51	51 20	42.57
52	J. Connelly	19 0	3.28	62.32	6.17	68.49	15 3	82 50	18.17
55	J. H. Farrell	19 0	3.04	57.76	12.27	70.03	32 17	84 45	38.09
59	E. A. Carlsson	12 0	3.04	57.76	3.01	60.77	7 55	15 25	51.35
62	C. E. Badger	19 0	2.80	53.20	10.89	64.09	31 7	81 15	38.30
63	T. F. Brady	19 0	3.04	57.76	6.12	63.88	16 6	52 45	30.52
67	J. G. Torngren	18 3	2.80	51.45	1.63	53.08	4 39	14 5	33.02
68	C. Josephson	18 7½	3.04	54.91	1.77	56.68	4 39	14 5	33.02
71	W. J. Eccles	18 7½	3.04	57.57	6.11	63.68	16 5	52 15	30.78
	Total				56.27		149 42	448 45	35.09

Premium percentage of shop=149 hours 42 minutes÷448 hours 45 minutes=33.36 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 16.83 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

PAINTERS.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
74	H. A. Gildersleeve	19 0	$2.88	$54.72	$1.79	$56.51	4 58	30 15	16.42
77	B. M. Gaffney	18 0	2.72	48.96	1.68	50.64	4 57	30 15	16.36
	Total				3.47		9 55	60 30	16.39

Premium percentage of shop=9 hours 55 minutes÷60 hours 30 minutes=16.39 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 11.29 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

STEAM HAMMER DRIVER.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
42	J. Shea	19 0	$2.24	$42.56	$2.40	$44.96	8 34	52 15	16.40

Hours worked on premium is 34.38 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

GANG BOSSES.

No.	Name.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
		Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
2	A. Crawford	22 6¾	[1] $125.00	$95.19	$11.75	$106.94			
5	O. G. Stohl	23 0	[1] 100.00	76.67	6.99	83.66			
7	J. D. Flynn	18 4	3.76	71.44	3.22	74.66			
8	G. H. Jones	22 6½	[1] 100.00	76.05	16.93	92.98			
10	W. F. Penney	22 1¾	[1] 100.00	74.06	10.13	84.19			
11	H. E. Fisk	19 0	3.76	71.44	7.29	78.73			
12	R. H. Stackhouse	23 0	[1] 100.00	76.67	16.44	93.11			
15	J. F. W. Hedge	18 4	3.76	71.44	16.25	87.69			
	Total				89.00				

[1] Per month.

Total premium, $2,519.69. Total hours worked on premium is 33.24 per cent of the total time worked by all shops.

[Appendix I to Report of the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, 1913.]

THE TAYLOR SYSTEM OF SHOP MANAGEMENT AT THE WATERTOWN ARSENAL.

WATERTOWN ARSENAL, *June 21, 1913.*

Hon. LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the representatives of the different trade unions employed at this arsenal in the various departments, do hereby request and petition you to abolish the stop-watch system, because of the unfair and unreasonable methods, which are described in the following:

This in the machine shop: A third-class machinist, rated at $2.56 per day, for instance, working on a job, the stop-watch premium makes his appearance and makes a time study of operations, etc. He goes back to his desk and juggles figures for a while, and he is given a long time and a short time to finish the job. Sometimes he makes the time reasonable, and other times he is a long way off. This third-class man may make a premium of 80 cents to $1 per day. But it must be borne in mind that he is only capable of running one kind of a machine, whereas a first-class man, rated at $3.52 per day (this arsenal is depending on first-class work), can operate any machine, and this time study or stop watch is not put on the job. You can therefore see the unfairness of this premium system toward a first and third class machinist.

Another case is of a man getting $3.52 per day and running a large machine. Where it requires so much time to finish a large piece he generally has those pieces on premium from 1 to 6 to 18 months, making $26 to $32 per month, whereas a man going around the shop at the same pay working at different jobs does not get a chance at this class of work or machine, which is absolutely unfair.

It also may be seen that a man is working on a lathe, roughing a dozen pieces. He makes a full premium, which is equivalent to $1 per day above his day's pay. This job very often is taken away and given to another man to finish, which requires close and accurate work and is subject to inspection. He makes approximately 15 to 60 cents on the same job. The difference between the time study on the roughing and the finishing of the job, can be seen, is very unreliable.

Several cases in the blacksmith shop that do not work satisfactory according to the stop-watch premium:

A blacksmith had been working on several forgings and soon after he had started, he was going to be the first victim for the timepiece; forging under normal conditions had been completed and the blacksmith's estimated time for this piece of work was 8 hours and 20 minutes. The stop-watch man made a time study of operations; went away and juggled figures for a while, came back and set the total time for the completion of this piece of work six hours, which was impossible for him to do.

Another blacksmith had a much more trying period with the stop-watch premium system. He was about to start on several forgings and the stop-watch man appeared to make a time study of the job to be completed. The blacksmith evidently was not accustomed to this way of doing business. He put a piece of steel into the fire until it was hot and then started to forge the piece with his helper. The stop-watch man told him to put another piece in the fire while working and he positively refused. The foreman and officer in charge of the shop were notified and came to investigate the matter.

The stop-watch man told the blacksmith there was no need of his being there then. The blacksmith then told him he did not know why he was there, but that he, the blacksmith, did know the reason of the stop-watch man being present there. Finally the blacksmith went out, saying, "No stop watch for me; I have always done a day's work for the Government and always will as long as I work in this arsenal."

The system in the foundry has not been carried out as promised. In addition to the speeding up of men, there has been a continual cutting in the time of similar articles. It is not a question in the minds of those in charge of what a job is worth, but is based upon the quickest time that one can make, and in nearly every case where fault has been found by the workman in regard to time he was told that it was the time set and not satisfaction given whatsoever in this department that it is impossible to keep or to get a sufficient number of laborers owing to the abnormal pace which they are expected to go. This department has unanimously petitioned this continuance of a system.

Take a painter's case, for instance; two men taken from the yard laboring gang were placed upon a job painting shot and shell together with all templets and instructions. For doing the work they are rated at $1.84 per day. The stop-watch premium was advised, therefore they received from 60 to 70 cents, added on to their regular day's pay on account of the premium, and one of the regular painters was suspended for lack of work, whereas if this man was given the work through the regular channels there would be no need of suspension. Whereas a great deal more work would be accomplished by so doing and the other painters would not have to stop their regular work to mix paint for the laboring men from the yard.

The conditions of the stop-watch premium in the carpenter shop are equal to those in the machine department. For instance, a man started to work recently repairing old shot and shell boxes. The work did not require a very skillful man and the stop watch was introduced. This man got 60 cents over his day's pay. It must be taken into consideration that there are first-class men in this woodworking department such as cabinetmakers, pattern makers, and wood turners, whereas it may be seen that the third-class rated man gets more money than the first-class mechanic by this unfair method.

Referring to the laborer in the yard, for instance, a time study has been made between shops and buildings, it is expected that the man shall make the same time from day to day irrespective of load or the animal, with no allowance for the conditions of the weather whatsoever. Again, if a carload of pig iron arrives at this arsenal with approximately 40 tons on board, it is to be unloaded by stop-watch premium. For instance, a car with sideboards measuring 4 feet high is expected to be unloaded just as quickly as a car with 18-inch sideboards, which is utterly impossible. On a recent occasion, a man with a horse and team entered the foundry to clean up waste material, such as slag iron and sand which were unfit for use. They usually use an ordinary shovel with a capacity of 21 pounds, which is described in the so-called Taylor book. He was told by the stop-watch man to use a scoop shovel which has a capacity of 40 pounds, and the foreman of the yard arrived on the job and told him it was not fit for any white man to use on that class of work. The team was loaded, however, with the usual shovel and went on its way to the dumping place. The stop-watch man told the foreman in a very sarcastic manner that he should not talk that way before the men to him. Whereas it may be seen that his sole object was to push the man to the dead limit simply because he was a laborer, irrespective of the size of the shovel or the nature of the work.

Referring to the accidents: A great many are caused by this continual driving from day to day. It also may be seen that the majority of men are failing in health. Whereas it is absolutely impossible for a man to work and do justice to himself or the work which is required of him on account of the stop-watch premium system. More than 75 per cent of accidents has taken place this year than the previous year of which a very careful record has been made from time to time in all departments. It may also be seen that the bad work and rejections are greater than ever before by 100 per cent. Below is a list of the names of the representative mechanics of their respective departments. Machine shop, A. J. Coyle; blacksmith shop, Matthew T. Glynn; foundry, Joseph R. Cooney; pattern, James B. Cunningham; carpenter, Eugene P. Gingras; paint, H. A. Gildersleeve; yard laboring, Peter Kidbride.

Respectfully, yours,

MAURICE W. BOWEN,
Chairman Representative Committee,
23 Charles Street, Auburndale, Mass.

—

WATERTOWN ARSENAL, *June 17, 1913.*

Hon. LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, employees of the Government, representing 349 of a total of 373 hands employed in the various departments as indicated hereon, respectfully petition that the Taylor system, now in operation at this arsenal, be immediately discontinued for the reasons as hereinafter set forth.

We object to the use of the stop watch, as it is used as a means of speeding men up to a point beyond their normal capacity. It is humiliating and savors too much of the slave driver.

A comparison of the record of serious accidents occurring in the works since the introduction of the stop-watch premium system will convince the most skeptical that it is dangerous to limb and life, and we claim that a large percentage of these acidents are the direct result of the driving system in vogue at this plant.

We believe that this system, instead of producing what was claimed it would produce—high wages to employees, with a low cost of production—has worked exactly opposite, inasmuch as the investigation into the wages paid (outside of premium) will show that there has been no material increase in wages, while the cost of production has been increased to such an extent that large deficits are being reported on nearly every job of any consequence that is done at this arsenal.

The number of nonproductive employees in proportion to the productive employees who are necessary to carry out the details of the system has been largely responsible in the great increase in overhead expense, which in many cases has resulted in the Government being unable to compete with outside concerns and has resulted in contracts being placed with outside parties to do work which the arsenal is equipped to do and which, under normal conditions, could be done at a cost considerably under that charged by the contractor securing the work. For instance, it has become the practice to let large contracts for manufacturing patterns which the arsenal is equipped to manufacture and could manufacture at a figure considerably below that charged by outside concerns, the quality of work being considered, were it not burdened by an excessive overhead charge which must be carried to pay an abnormal nonproductive force of employees.

We cite the above case to show that there is ground for our belief that the continuance of this system would finally eventuate in closing this arsenal as a manufacturing plant.

A large corps of inspectors are kept busy examining and rejecting material, and the number of pieces rejected since the premium system was inaugurated has increased by a large percentage. The number of parts rejected since the system was installed will run well into the thousands.

The effect of this system here has been to create a feeling of distrust between the employees and the management; it has destroyed every vestige of cooperation between the workmen and the foremen collectively, and has produced a condition of unhappiness throughout the whole works.

For the reasons as stated above, as well as many others which we will not trouble with at this time, we respectfully pray that you, as head of the War Department, take such immediate steps as will effectually remove this system from Watertown Arsenal and restore the workmen to a condition similar to that enjoyed by other artisans and laborers in the public service as well as in most private manufacturing plants.

We also respectfully petition that the records as obtained by means of stop-watch observation be removed from this arsenal or destroyed altogether, as they do not represent the normal time in which given work should be accomplished, but rather they are the product of the "speed-up" system which has resulted in accidents, inferior work, and numerous abuses such as no American citizen should be called upon to endure.

In conclusion, let it be understood that the signatures to this petition were not obtained by coercion or unfair means, and each individual signing this petition does so of his own free will and accord.

Respectfully submitted.

MAURICE W. BOWEN,
Chairman Representative Committee,
23 Charles Street, Auburndale, Mass.

Signed by 51 molders and helpers; 25 pattern makers, carpenters, and painters; 17 blacksmiths and helpers; 53 yard-laboring men; 88 machinists and helpers, assembling department; 88 machinists and helpers.

—

[Memorandum for the Secretary of War.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, September 6, 1913.

Subject: Petitions of Watertown Arsenal employees against certain features of the Taylor system of shop management.

1. These petitions were referred to this office accompanied by certain questions in regard to the Taylor system of scientific shop management. These questions will be answered in their order.

Question 1. "Exact figures of everything going into the matter of cost; that is, all expenses upon which cost prices should be figured."

Depending upon the use which is to be made of the figures there are three general classes of costs of articles procured for the public service by the Ordnance Department. These can be called—

(a) The appropriation cost;
(b) The arsenal cost; and
(c) The War Department cost.

2. The appropriation cost includes all expenditures made out of the appropriations for procuring the article, either by manufacture or purchase, such as those made for labor, material, civilian superintendence, power, heat, light, clerical work, drafting, current repairs, leaves and holidays, disabilities, etc.

3. The arsenal cost is the appropriation cost with what is known as the "arsenal burden" added. The arsenal burden is composed of items which increase the cost of the article at the establishment where it is procured, but are not paid for from the congressional appropriation which is made directly for procuring the article, such as interest on the value of the plant, depreciation, allowance for fire losses, pay of officers and enlisted men, etc.

4. The War Department cost is the arsenal cost with the addition of the "War Department burden." The War Department burden comprises the proportion of the expense of maintaining the War Department proper which is rightfully chargeable to the manufacturing operations of the Ordnance Department. It is composed of the proper proportion of items, such as salaries in the office of the Secretary of War and in the various bureaus of the War Department, contingent expenses of the War Department, rent of buildings for the War Department, expenses of the office of the Chief of Ordnance chargeable to manufacturing operations, pay of retired officers and enlisted men of the Ordnance Department, etc.

5. The appropriation cost is the only one with which these petitions are concerned, since the statements made therein relate to comparative costs of manufacture before and since the introduction at the Watertown Arsenal of the time-study and premium features of the Taylor system. The arsenal cost is generally used for the purpose of comparing Government manufacture, as carried on by the Ordnance Department, with private manufacture. The War Department cost is of importance when there is a question of securing reimbursement of that department for serviceable property disposed of by it in accordance with the methods authorized by law.

Question 2. "The system as now operated."

6. The Taylor system of shop management may be roughly divided into two general parts. The first part relates to the systemization of processes of manufacture, so that these processes shall be carried on in a perfectly orderly manner, with better forethought and provision than has ever before been given them, and with more detailed arrangements concerning their relations to each other. To the natural inquiry as to what there is new in this, since everybody has always been striving for system and order in manufacturing operations, the answer must be made that the amount of attention which is given under Mr. Taylor's method to system, as evidenced by the number of the personnel engaged and the expense involved—that is, by the amount of administrative energy which is devoted to it—is so different from that which has ever anywhere before his time been devoted to systemization as to be absolutely revolutionary.

7. The second part relates to the quantity of output to be obtained from the workman, and the stimulus required to induce him to cheerfully and earnestly and intelligently strive to give the output. This part rests upon the theory that the best and most expeditious way of doing a piece of work is too difficult of ascertainment for the work-

man who has to do it to have any reasonable chance of arriving at it; and that it must be reached through painstaking study by methods prescribed by a highly skilled and expensive specialist, utilizing measurements of the time required by the various elements of a job, and a great deal of knowledge such as the workman does not have and can not be expected to have. There is the further theory that the current rate of wages, as it exists in any manufacturing community, is not that corresponding to the best directed and most earnest efforts of the employees, but is that corresponding to the class of performance in connection with which the rate has grown up, which is very far from being the best reasonably and agreeably attainable. By expensively finding out the best method of doing a given piece of work, and the time in which it can reasonably be done by following this method, and then by making it very well worth the employee's while to approach, within a given interval, this time, or to improve upon it, means are found to improve the individual output and to improve the compensation which is paid for it in a manner profitable and satisfactory to both employer and employee.

8. For a comprehensive understanding of the system and its inauguration at the Watertown Arsenal it will be necessary to read Mr. Taylor's careful works upon Scientific Management, upon Shop Management, and upon the Art of Cutting Metal. A highly condensed exposure of the system and of the three years of its operation at the Watertown Arsenal is, however, contained in my annual reports for the fiscal years 1911 and 1912, from which the pages relating to this subject have been extracted and are attached hereto.

9. The second part of the system relating to time study of a given job and the premium offered for approaching the time thus arrived at is the part which is objected to in the petitions, being called in one of them the "stop-watch system," because a timepiece is used in studying the various component elements of a job, so as to arrive at a conclusion as to the manner in which the total time may be shortened. The process can be described as follows: A workman being employed upon a job for which it is intended to set a rate, the time-study man takes his station near him and, openly and with the full knowledge upon the part of all concerned of what he is about, proceeds to study the job by first dividing it into its different component movements and periods. He then times carefully each one of the movements and periods, usually more than once. From the data thus obtained he works out what he considers the best sequence of movements and periods, making, if possible, certain elements simultaneous which before were successive, and arrives at a complete program for performing the job and at an estimate of the time in which, by attentively following the program, the job should be completed. This time is called the "task time." It must be understood that the management has theretofore had no definite idea as to the time in which the job should be done, or that it was being done unnecessarily slowly. Knowledge has been lacking to permit an idea as to this point to be formed. Also, any unnecessary slowness is likely to have been caused as much by unscientific methods as by lack of diligence on the part of the workman. The whole object is to secure an intelligent idea of the best way to do the work and of the right time for it. Upon these two points all hands have been without reliable information.

10. After the task time has been arrived at—and it must be remembered that no necessity for unpleasant exertion is admitted in fixing the time—some stimulus in the form of increased pay is given to the workman for meeting this time, or for approaching it. The particular scheme of increase is not important, provided always that it gives an adequate reward for good effort. The scheme applied at the Watertown Arsenal is as follows: The workman is informed that his regular pay is not to be affected. He continues to receive that in any event. The task time is then increased by two-thirds, and he is told that for every minute which he saves within this increased time he will be paid, in addition to his regular pay, for half a minute, at his regular rate. From this it follows that if he completes the job in exactly the task time the increase in his pay will amount to 33⅓ per cent. No limit is placed upon the time in which he can do the work or the extra amount which he can thus earn, and it frequently happens that the task time is bettered, and more than 33⅓ per cent extra is earned.

11. The commanding officer of the Watertown Arsenal makes a report each month of the premiums earned by the employees of that establishment. A copy of his report for the month of May, 1913, is inclosed herewith. It shows that the premiums earned in that month ranged from practically nothing to $31.02, which was made by a man whose day rate was $3.52, whose total day-rate pay was $95.04, and whose premium therefore increased his pay by 35.38 per cent. It is the object of the management to have as many men as possible working under the premium system, and effort is made to enable each workman to increase his premiums to the fullest extent. There has been introduced a system of rewarding the foremen by premiums which increase with the proportion of their subordinates who are working upon premium jobs and with the amount of premiums which they earn. So that the foremen are stimulated to assign as many men as possible to jobs on which they can increase their pay in this way, and to help each one of them to the greatest possible increase. On account of the limited number of time-study men, and on account of the nature of the work, it is not possible to give all of the men premium jobs. The report for May shows that, in the foundry during that month, 13 molders out of 13 had such jobs; in the machine shop, 130 machinists out of 166, and 26 machinists' helpers out of 70; among the laborers, 22 out of 45 had such jobs; and in the carpenter shop, 5 carpenters out of 14 worked on premium jobs. The percentage in extra compensation earned by the men on premium jobs, while so working, on an average was, in the foundry, 25.24 per cent; in the machine shop, 24.69 per cent by machinists, and by machinists' helpers, 28.97 per cent; by laborers, 24.06 per cent; by teamsters, 26.35 per cent; by blacksmiths, 39.39 per cent; by blacksmiths' helpers, 39.39 per cent; and by carpenters, 61.6 per cent. In the foundry 66.95 per cent of the entire working time of the whole number of employees of the class who worked on premium jobs at all was spent on that class of jobs. For the machine shop these figures were 45.65 per cent; for the machinists' helpers, 12.83 per cent; for the laborers, 12.71 per cent; for the teamsters, 26.35 per cent; for the blacksmiths and blacksmiths' helpers, 8.81 per cent; and for the carpenters, 5.38 per cent. It will be seen that there is still much room for including more employees in the number earning premiums, and constant efforts are being made in this direction. The average premium in the month of May, of all the men earning premiums, was $8.96, which was earned by 210 men out of about 600. This average would have been greater if these men had worked on premium jobs all the time, which was not possible.

12. The extracts from my annual report show that great economy of manufacture, as well as benefit to the workmen, arises from the employment of both general parts of the Taylor system. It has been estimated, from analysis of a large number of jobs, that the increase of output, due to time study and premium payment, in a given time, is about 200 per cent. The analysis was of 39 different jobs, of which records were on hand of the time required to do them, both on the day-rate and on the premium system. In four of the cases the jobs, under the two systems, had been done by the same men, and the records showed that the time required by these men, under day work, ranged from one and a half to three and a half times the time in which they did the same jobs under the premium system, with an average of 2.72 times.

13. Perhaps something can be said on both sides of the question of stimulation by high rewards. There are in all walks of life men who wear themselves out in their effort at great accomplishment, and there are more such in a new country, where the rewards are great, than in old countries, where the more settled conditions impose narrower limitations upon what may be accomplished by strenuous and intelligent effort. It is not easy to set a point at which stimulation by high reward should cease. The Taylor system does not attempt to settle the question. But with the limitation of hours of labor in the Government service, it does not seem to be likely that workmen will be stimulated to efforts injurious to their health by rewards so great that they can not refrain from overexerting themselves in order to secure them.

14. The question remains to be answered how the process at the Watertown Arsenal differs in kind from the class known as "speeding-up," or "sweatshop," or "slave-driving" processes, so called. I take it that the essential difference lies in the character of the stimulation which is applied to increase the output. In the reprehensible methods the output of a very rapid workman is taken as the standard, and the rate set is such that this output must be reached in order to make ordinary wages. The task and the compensation are so fixed that, unless the employee puts himself under a great strain all the time he is either discharged or fails to earn a living wage. In other words, the highest possible output is demanded for what is, at best, no more than the current rate of wages. The Taylor system, on the contrary, demands the ordinary output only at the current rate of wages, and, as practiced at the Watertown Arsenal, neither effects nor threatens any reduction of the wages in vogue before the introduction of the system. The increased output is accompanied by an increase, and a very substantial increase, in the pay. And no rate is set which requires heart-breaking exertion or exertion of a character which is not agreeable, in order to increase the wages theretofore received. The management spends a great deal of money and a great deal of effort in finding out the best way to do a piece of work. It then offers the workmen an inducement to meet this by giving them the benefit of the time and money spent, in the way of information as to the best way to proceed, in order to enable them to make higher earnings. No discharges have taken place at the Watertown Arsenal because of failure to accomplish work in the time set; and no reduction of pay of any class of the employees has been put into effect since the introduction of the Taylor system. That is, all premiums earned have been over and above the wages which were being received before the system was put into effect. All of the men are informed of the system in practice at the arsenal, and all give their consent to it by being taken on. The time-study and premium features have now been in use for over two years.

15. A great deal has been made of the following statement in one of Mr. Taylor's books:

"When an establishment has reached an advanced stage of organization in many cases a fifth element should be added, namely, the task should be made so difficult that it can only be accomplished by first-class men."

This is claimed to be the "speeding-up" process, pure and simple. The statement has received some explanation by the following:

"It must be distinctly understood that in referring to the possibilities of a first-class man the writer does not mean what he can do when on a spurt or when he is overexerting himself, but what a good man can keep up for a long term of years, without injury to his health, and become happier and thrive under."

The character of the exertion is well covered by the explanation, but perhaps some relief is needed from apprehension in regard to those men who may not be the fastest workmen of their class. Of course, common sense prevents the understanding that all men must be thrown out of employment except the very best. The work must be done, and it must be done by such men as are in existence. It is not out of accord with ordinary practice, either under the Taylor system or otherwise, to have one's work done by the best workmen that one can get. Harshness of stimulation is avoided by the principle that the task must be such as he who has it to do can "become happier and thrive under." But Mr. Taylor himself has furnished an explanation of what he means by a "first-class" man. On pages 1454 et seq., volume 2, of the testimony taken by a committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the use of the Taylor and other systems at Government establishments, he says:

"I have found that an illustration often furnishes the most convincing form of definition. I want therefore to define what I mean by the words 'first class' through an illustration. To do so I am going again to use horses as an illustration, because every one of us knows a good deal about the capacity of horses, while there are very few people who have made a sufficient study of men to have the same kind of knowledge about men that we all have about horses. Now, if you have a stable, say, in the city of Washington, containing 300 or 400 horses you will have in that stable a certain number of horses which are intended especially for hauling coal wagons; you will have a certain number of trotting horses; and a certain number of saddle horses—of pleasure horses, and of ponies in that stable.

"Now, what I mean by a first-class horse to haul a coal wagon is something very simple and plain. We will all agree that a good big dray horse is a 'first-class' horse to haul a coal wagon (a horse, for instance, of the type of a Percheron). If, however, you live in a small town and have a small stable of horses, in many cases you may not have enough dray horses in your stable to haul your coal wagons, and you will have to use grocery-wagon horses and grocery wagons to haul coal in; and yet we all know that a grocery-wagon horse is not a 'first-class' horse for hauling coal, and we all know that a grocery wagon is not a 'first-class' wagon to carry coal in; but times come when we have to use a second-class horse and wagon, although we know that there is something better. It may be necessary even at times to haul coal with a trotting horse, and you may have to put your coal in a buggy under certain circumstances. But we all know that a trotting horse or a grocery horse is not a 'first-class' horse for hauling coal. In the same way, we know that a great big dray horse is not a 'first-class' horse for hauling a grocery wagon, nor is a grocery-wagon horse 'first-class' for hauling a buggy, and so right down the line.

"Now, what I mean by 'first-class' men is set before you by what I mean by 'first-class' horses. I mean that there are big powerful men

suited to heavy work, just as the dray horses are suited to the coal wagon, and I would not use a man who would be 'first class' for this heavy work to do light work for which he would be second class, and which could be just as well done by a boy who is 'first class' for this work, and vice versa.

"What I want to make clear is that each type of man is 'first class' at some kind of work, and if you will hunt far enough you will find some kind of work that is especially suited to him. But if you insist, as some people in the community are insisting (to use the illustration of horses again), that a task—say, a load of coal—shall be made so light that a pony can haul it, then you are doing a fool thing, for you are substituting a 'second-class' animal (or man) to do work which manifestly should be done by a 'first-class' animal (or man). And that is what I mean by the term 'first-class man.'

"Now, there is another kind of 'second-class' horse. We all know him. Among the 'first-class' big dray horses that are hauling coal wagons you will find a few of them that will balk, a few of them that can haul, but won't haul. You will find a few of these dray horses that are so absolutely lazy that they won't haul coal wagons. And in the same way among every class of workmen we have some balky workmen—I do not mean men who are unable to do the work, but men who, physically well able to work, are simply lazy and who through no amount of teaching and instructing and through no amount of kindly treatment, can be brought into the 'first class.' That is the man whom I call 'second class.' They have the physical possibility of being 'first class,' but they obstinately refuse to be so.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to answer your question, having clearly in mind that I have these two types of 'second-class' men in view; the one which is physically able to do the work, but who refuses to do it, and the other who is not physically or mentally fitted to do that particular kind of work, or who has not the mental caliber for this particular job. These are the two types of 'second-class' men.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then how does scientific management propose to take care of the men who are not 'first-class' men in any particular line of work?

"Mr. TAYLOR. I give it up.

"The CHAIRMAN. Scientific management has no place for such a man?

"Mr. TAYLOR. Scientific management has no place for a bird that can sing and won't sing.

"The CHAIRMAN. I am not speaking about birds at all.

"Mr. TAYLOR. No man who can work and won't work has any place under scientific management.

"The CHAIRMAN. It is not a question of a man who can work and won't work; it is a question of a man who is not 'first class' in any particular line, according to your definition.

"Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know of any such line of work. For each man some line can be found in which he is 'first class.' There is work for each type of man, just, for instance, as there is work for the dray horse and work for the trotting horse, and each of these types is first class for his particular kind of work. There is no one kind of work, however, that suits all types of men."

If, under the Taylor system, a man is not earning good premiums, there is an inducement for everybody connected with the management to try to find out the reason. And if the reason is discovered to be that he is working at a class of employment for which he is not well suited, it becomes everybody's interest to find something for him for which he is well suited and at which he can earn good premiums.

Question 3. "The result of discontinuing the system at present in operation and adopting some other system, and what other system would be recommended if the present system is abandoned."

16. As before stated, the system spoken of is the time-study and premium feature of the Taylor system. The result of discontinuing the premium feature would bring all of the employees back to the state of day-work system of payment under which they were working before the introduction of premiums, and, as a matter of course, the output would fall back to that which previously obtained. That is, the wages of the workmen now earning premiums would be reduced by amounts running up to 35.38 per cent, and averaging about 20 per cent; and the output of these workmen would be reduced about 60 per cent—this without shortening the hours of labor or improving conditions of work. The immediate reduction of the wages of those workmen who are engaged in repetition work could be avoided by substituting for the premium system of payment a piecework system, such as has been for many years satisfactorily used at various other arsenals. So far as these jobs are concerned, there would be little to choose between the premium and the piecework system of payment; but there is little repetition work at the Watertown Arsenal, and the repetition jobs now in progress would soon run out. When an attempt is made to set a rate for a new job of repetition work there is always an embarrassing lack of information upon which to base the proper rate. Usually a tentative rate is set, and when this is found unsatisfactory either to the management or the workmen, as is generally the case, it is changed, to the intense dissatisfaction of either one or the other. Cutting of rates, to meet what has been regarded as unjustifiable wages, has been a fruitful source of dissatisfaction with the piecework system, and has resulted finally, oftentimes, in a limitation of output, holding back both production and compensation. When repetition work of some classes has lasted a long time it sometimes has been found possible to secure a satisfactory and reasonable adjustment of the rate; but even under such conditions the work has proceeded a long time without the advantage, to the management and to the workmen, which would result from an intelligent time study by a skilled specialist, with the object of determining the best program. The repetition jobs at the Watertown Arsenal are too short to permit the use of a try-out method of rate setting, and it is therefore probable that when the work had so changed as to prevent the use of the information which has already been gathered the abolition of time studies would prevent the formation of new programs and the setting of rates on new jobs, and the work would revert ultimately to the day-wage conditions.

Question 4. "Specific facts with respect to all other allegations in these papers."

17. The papers consist of two petitions from workmen at the Watertown Arsenal, one dated June 21, 1913, and signed by names claimed to be those of a representative committee, and one dated June 17, 1913, signed by something over 300 employees. The petitions are fastened together, with the petition dated June 21 preceding. Taking the statements in this petition in order, and numbering them in accordance with the red-ink numbers which have been placed on the margin of the petition, they are met as follows:

Complaint No. 1: This complaint is that a low-class machinist is given opportunity of earning from 80 cents to $1 a day by making a good output. There is no claim made that the work is beyond the capacity of the low-grade machinist, and it appears to be held that the work ought to be given to a higher grade machinist, whether with or without opportunity to earn a premium is not clear, but from the statement "this time study or stop watch is not put on the job," it may be inferred that the claim is that a high-grade man should do the work and that he also should be allowed to earn the premium. On the ground that the reply is obvious none will be made to the claim that a higher grade man than is necessary should be put on the work; but a reply is needed to the inference that highly paid machinists are not allowed to earn premiums.

A partial reply is found in complaint No. 2, where it is alleged that one high-grade machinist makes a premium while another does not, and a conclusive reply is found in the inclosed statement of premiums earned during the month of May, 1913, from which it appears that premiums, and very substantial ones, were, during that month, made by 1 machinist of the $3.76-per-day grade, by 8 of the $3.52 grade, by 33 of the $3.28 grade, and by 58 of the $3.04 grade; while they were earned by only 33 of the $2.80 grade, and 7 of the $2.56 grade. It is true, however, that some of the highest paid machinists, to whom the most difficult jobs must be assigned, do not earn premiums on these jobs, for the reason that, not being intended to be repeated, they are not such as time study can be made upon and a rate for them set. Continued effort is made to so distribute the work that all machinists may have a chance at premium jobs, and when this can not be done and a low-grade man is earning more through a larger output than a higher grade man whose output can not be measured it is no more than the case which is common in industrial work of a pieceworker with no claim to skill in more than a special or narrow line, who, by special industry, is earning more than a man of much more general skill not on piecework. In either case no one is hurt, and some are benefited.

Complaint No. 2: This is a complaint that one of the high-grade machinists is making a premium while another does not have the chance. It is answered above by the statement that this can not always be prevented, but that every possible effort is made to distribute the premium jobs so that all may have a chance at them. The extent to which this effort has been successful in the machine shop is evidenced by the fact that for the months of April, May, and June last the amount of work under the premium system was 36 per cent of all the work done in that shop, including both machinists and helpers, and in the month of May the premium work was 45.65 per cent of all the work done by all machinists.

Complaint No. 3: This is a complaint that rates are so set that machinists doing the rough part makes a higher premium than the more highly skilled man doing the finishing part of the same job. No evidence is given in support of this allegation, and its general truth is denied. The rates are so set that it ought to be possible for any workman of any grade to make, without disagreeable effort, 33⅓ per cent more than his day rating, whatever the day rate may be. The day rate is, of course, determined by the class in which the man's skill causes him to be graded. Very conclusive evidence that the allegation is unfounded is contained in the statement made above as to the relative number of men of the different grades who made premiums during the month of May.

Complaint No. 4: This is a complaint that a blacksmith estimated that it would require 8 hours and 20 minutes to do a certain piece of work, while the time-study man placed the time at 6 hours, which is claimed to have been impossible to meet. Taking this complaint just as it stands, it appears that since the task time was 6 hours the time within which premiums would commence to be earned would be two-thirds greater, or 10 hours. A blacksmith doing the work in 8 hours and 20 minutes would be paid for one-half of the 1 hour and 40 minutes which he would come within the premium time; that is, he would be paid at his regular rate for 50 minutes of time, which for an ordinary blacksmith would amount to 34 cents. It is shown, therefore, that on his own estimate the blacksmith would have made about 34 cents a day extra.

In this connection the following example under the premium system is of interest: Time study was made of a job of forging 40 friction bands, after the forging had progressed through several bands. As a result of the study a rate was set requiring the pieces to be forged in 2 hours and 27 minutes each as task time, in order to earn a premium of 33⅓ per cent, or about $1.09 per day. The blacksmith completed the remaining pieces, 33, in an average of 2 hours and 12.4 minutes each, thereby earning premium of $1.39 per day, more than 33⅓ per cent. For the bands which he had forged before the time study was made he had taken 6 hours and 41 minutes each.

Complaint No. 5: This seems to be a complaint that in making time study of a job of forging some crosshead pawls for a disappearing-gun carriage, the time-study man had endeavored to have the work proceed so that a piece would be in the forge being heated while another piece was being forged; to which the smith objected. In the actual event the point was not insisted upon at the time the study was made, but in fixing the task time the ground was taken that this simultaneous work should be done; that is, a piece should be heated while another was being forged. On this assumption the task time was fixed at 1 hour and 50 minutes, corresponding to a 33⅓ per cent premium. The smith thereupon actually did the work in an average time of 1 hour and 49.5 minutes each, thus earning just over the full premium.

Complaint No. 6: This is a general complaint of speeding up in the foundry, it being charged that there has been a continual cutting in the time allowed for molding similar articles. When the premium system of payment was first started in the foundry no time studies of molding operations had been made, and as it was desired to give both the workmen and the Government the benefit of the increased production due to the stimulation of premiums as quickly as possible, existing records of time in doing jobs under the day-work system were utilized as a basis for setting rates. As was expected, and announced beforehand, many of these rates permitted the earning of abnormal premiums, and some of them did not permit earning sufficient premiums. In the cases where the premiums were too low the rates were adjusted so as to allow higher ones to be earned; but where the premiums attainable were too high the rates for these articles were not changed, and were never thereafter changed; but in setting rates later on very similar articles the experience of the previous rates was utilized so as to permit the average workman to earn the designed premium of 33⅓ per cent. An examination of the inclosed statement of premiums earned in the month of May will show that the average premium earned in the foundry was 25.24 per cent, while the satisfactory fact is also shown that over 66 per cent of all the molder's work done was on a premium basis. These figures are conclusive in showing that the molders in the foundry have had a fortunate experience

In regard to the charge that it has been impossible to keep or to get a sufficient number of laborers in the foundry owing to the abnormal pace at which they are expected to go, it is sufficient to state that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, only two molders were separated

from the service for any cause, one having been furloughed and the other having resigned.

Complaint No. 7: This is a complaint that the work of painting shot and shell is given to selected men from the laboring gang, at $1.84 per day, with the opportunity of earnings premiums said to range from 60 to 70 cents, instead of being given to regular painters, with the result that, in one case at least, a regular painter was laid off for lack of work. Here, again, no charge is made that the laboring men were not capable of doing the work. As a matter of fact, they were capable of doing it, and did it very satisfactorily, since it was exceedingly simple work, requiring no special skill. The regular painters were used for the more appropriate work of mixing the paint and making preparation for the lower-grade men. Actually, must of the work required of the laborers was handling the projectiles, which is rough work for which they are better suited than are painters.

Complaint No. 8: This is another complaint that a man of no great skill was set at doing rather rough work, repairing old shot-and-shell boxes in this case, instead of giving it to a high-grade man. The obvious advisability of giving this kind of work to the class of man that it is stated to have been given to needs no insistence; the fair treatment of the man who did the work is evidenced from the statement in the complaint that he made 60 cents over his day's pay. That the low-class man by the methods used was enabled to make as high pay as do cabinetmakers, pattern makers, and wood turners may be a reason why efforts should be continued to get these last classes of skilled woodworkers under the premium system, but it is not a reason for discontinuing the advantage accorded the less skilled woodworker. It has not thus far been found practicable at the Watertown Arsenal to apply time study and premium system of payment to the high-grade woodworkers, but efforts to this end are continuing; that is, the management is trying to extend the benefits of the system to those who are not now enjoying them, and is not contemplating withdrawing them from the ones who now have them.

Complaint No. 9: This is a complaint that the laboring work of carting must be performed without allowance for the day, load, or animal. The carting about the establishment has been put under the premium system and the load is carefully taken into consideration, but no allowance is made for the weather. That the system does not operate unfairly is shown by the fact that in the month of May laborers working on premium jobs earned 24 per cent over and above their pay of $1.84 for the time while they were so working.

Complaint No. 10: This is a complaint that no allowance is made for the height of the sideboards in the time set for unloading a car of pig iron. This refinement has not yet been gone into, as the cars in which pig iron is received have usually sideboards of 3 feet or under. Time studies of unloading ordinary pig iron have not been made at the Watertown Arsenal, but those used in setting rates have been accumulated elsewhere by the time-study expert employed at the arsenal. In 13 instances reported there was only 1 in which a considerable premium—30 per cent in that instance—was earned. The question as to whether any very great efforts to earn premiums were made is raised by the very different lengths of time required to do apparently similar amounts of work. The subject needs more attention at the arsenal and will receive it.

Complaint No. 11: This is a complaint that the stop-watch man endeavored to prescribe the use of shovels of 40 pounds capacity instead of shovels of 21 pounds capacity in cleaning up waste material about the foundry. The point in this case is that the time-study man was trying to obtain some experimental information in regard to the use of a 40-pound shovel, and had no intention of continuing the use of this shovel for ordinary work. It appears that he did not insist upon the use of the larger shovel, and that the work went on with the smaller one. The matter is a very unimportant one; but it may be stated that on more than one occasion men have been noticed to be voluntarily using 40-pound shovels in the work referred to.

Complaint No. 12: This is a complaint that a large increase in the number of accidents is caused by the driving system. Careful record of all accidents is kept at the arsenal. Most of the accidents occur in the machine shop. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, the total number injured in this shop was 34, of which 5, or 14.7 per cent, were working on premium at the time. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, 57 persons were injured in the machine shop, of which 13, or 22.8 per cent, were premium workers. During these two years the number of workmen employed in the machine shop remained about the same, but the amount of premium work increased nearly fourfold. That is, while the amount of premium work increased about 300 per cent, the percentage of accidents to premium workers increased only 8.1. During the nine months from October to June, 1913, 33 machinists were injured, 10 of whom, or approximately 30 per cent, were premium workers. During this same period 44.8 per cent of the work in the machine shop was premium work. It thus appears that the percentage of accidents among the premium workers was less than the percentage of premium work; that is, that the greater proportion of accidents during these nine months occurred among the day workers. These figures are a conclusive refutation of the charge.

It is true that the number of accidents has increased during comparatively recent times. This increase is coincident with the better understanding of the disability act, by reason of which the employees now receive compensation for absence on account of injury, which was formerly denied them.

Complaint No. 13: This is a complaint that the majority of the men are failing in health. This is distinctly not true. There is no evidence of it, and no complaint of it. A number of men questioned on the subject denied it, no man being found who claimed or admitted that his health had been injuriously affected; and no man has personally claimed that he has been overworked. In regard to the possibility of overwork, it is at least extremely improbable. In machine work particularly, where, as stated before, most of the premium jobs are found, the machinist usually stands for a considerable time looking on while the machine is doing the work. Such a job can be divided into machine time and handling time, and the machine time can be subdivided into that in which the feed is by hand and that in which the feed is by power. It is during the time that power feed is operating that the machinists simply stand and watch the work. Ten jobs, taken at random, have been examined, and the following have been found to be the percentage which the power-feed time—that is, the resting time—is of the whole time required for the job: Job No. 1, 5.75 per cent; job No. 2, 68 per cent; job No. 3, 40 per cent; job No. 4, 58 per cent; job No. 5, 35 per cent; job No. 6, 46 per cent; job No. 7, 78 per cent; job No. 8, 71 per cent; job No. 9, 80 per cent; and job No. 10, 54 per cent. Of course, during the power-feed time, the machinist has to fix his attention upon his work; but it is not strained attention and is not of a wearing character. These figures, coupled with the facts of moderate working hours, frequent holidays, and generally good working conditions, show the practical impossibility, in the general case, of overworking a machinist.

Complaint No. 14: This is a complaint that the number of rejections for bad work is greater than ever before by at least 100 per cent. The inspection service has been improved under the Taylor system and the number of inspectors increased. Formerly it was customary to inspect only the finished pieces, and the inspectors examined only such operations as the foremen called upon them to inspect. Under the better organization of the present system inspections are prescribed in the planning room and many more operations are inspected, with the result that the standard of work is being gradually raised, and that it is much easier than formerly to fix the responsibility for spoiled work, which was then shared indefinitely by the workman, the foreman, and the inspector. An examination of the rejection reports does not indicate that there is a greater amount of spoiled work by the premium workers than by the day workers. It is also shown that the amount of spoiled work at the Watertown Arsenal is not greater than that of other establishments engaged in work of similar character, and is not inordinate. The economy of its production also indicates that fact.

18. In the petition of June 17, 1913, I have numbered the complaints, as in the previous petition, and will speak of them in order:

Complaint No. 1: This is a general complaint that the time-study system is used as a means of speeding men up abnormally; that it is humiliating and savors of the slave driver. The fact of speeding up men abnormally has been denied, and there ought to be nothing humiliating to an honest workman in an effort to arrive, by careful study, at a measure of the time required to do a given piece of work, in order to set for it a rate which is just, and at the same time enables the workman to make higher pay than ever before.

Time studies are not required for every job, nor more than once upon the same job; that is, they are comparatively infrequent. During the two years in which the process has been in operation at the Watertown Arsenal 149 men out of about 600 have had time studies made of work which they were performing. Many of these men had only one time study made of their work during the two years, and the maximum number which was made of the work of any one man was 11, and this occurred in the case of 4 men only. The average number was about three, which would mean one in about eight months. As the premium work increased, however, during the latter part of the two years, the average interval during the latter part would be correspondingly shorter.

Complaint No. 2: This complaint charges the premium system with an increase of accidents and has been answered with reference to the first petition.

Complaint No. 3: This complaint is a statement that the system has not produced the high wages promised. The complaint is that there has been no increase of wages except through premiums paid. As the only increase promised by the system is through premiums, the complaint falls to the ground. Rates of wages, as is well known, are determined by the wages paid for work of like character in the vicinity; premiums are paid as percentages on those rates. Nothing else has ever been promised, and in this respect the promise has been amply fulfilled.

The statement that the cost of production has been increased to such an extent that large deficits are being reported is the exact contrary of the fact, and in that it is made without knowledge is reckless.

Complaint No. 4: The substance of this charge is the same as that mentioned above—increased cost of production, and an illustration is given of orders placed with outside parties of patterns which could have been made at the arsenal. When orders for patterns have been placed with outside parties it has been because there were rush orders for them, which otherwise would have required an increase of the pattern-making force, which would have been only temporary. It is considered undesirable to frequently increase and reduce the force in any department, and to be detrimental in the interests of the workmen. It is true that in many of these cases, if not all of them, the estimate for the manufacture of the patterns at the arsenal was greater than the price for which the patterns were purchased. This is not as it should be, and it may perhaps be explained by the fact that it has not yet been found practicable to apply the Taylor system of shop management to the pattern shop. The statement that the overhead charges due to the system are responsible for the expense therefore falls to the ground, and the strong presumption is raised that an improvement in costs would be effected by applying to the pattern shop some of the features of the system which have been found so effective in other parts of the establishment. This charge as to the cost of patterns instead of being an arraignment of the Taylor system really constitutes an arraignment of its absence.

Complaint No. 5: This complaint concerns the number of inspections and the rejections for spoiled work, which have been dealt with above.

Complaint No. 6: This is a statement to the effect that the system is bound to destroy good feeling between the workmen and the management. All the evidence, except that of these petitions, is directly to the contrary. There is a cheerful and cordial cooperation between all parts of the establishment and of the individuals employed in it, which is markedly better than that which was apparent before the introduction of the system. The occasions on which men have to be admonished for various reasons have diminished and the cooperative efforts in pushing work along have increased, as was to have been expected when it was made to the interest of everybody to push it along.

19. So much for the specific allegations contained in the petitions. In all cases they show the complaints of injury to be without foundation, and in many cases they show that the complaint of too much premium system is really a complaint of too little of it, in that the point complained of is that somebody is given a chance at the premiums while another is not. As frequently stated in the course of this paper, efforts are made to increase the amount of premium work, and the success attained is evidenced by the fact that the amount of premium work during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, was about four times that of the preceding fiscal year. In the 17 months ended May 31, 1913, the amount of money paid out in premiums, over and above the regular wages, was $22,257.82.

20. In the face of the demonstrated advantage of the premium system to a considerable percentage of the workmen, accompanied by no compulsion to undue or disagreeable exertion and of its disadvantage to none, the question remains as to why there should come in a numerously signed petition for the abolition of the system. The statement advanced of reasons for granting the petitioners' requests are shown to have no basis in fact, in that no injustice or real hardship exists. If the reasons given for the requests are the real ones it ought therefore to be supposed that the objections would disappear upon the showing that their foundation is in error. I think the question is partially answered by the statement that in many instances the petitions do not represent the real sentiment of the persons whose names are attached to them. Upon the receipt of the petitions they were sent to the

Watertown Arsenal for certain information, and there a number of the employees were examined individually as to their views. Some stated that they liked the system and had refused to sign the petition. Several stated that they did not wish to sign, but had done so under compulsion. Also it was discovered that the facts alleged in the petitions were not asserted by a considerable number of the alleged signers, since many signatures were obtained without showing the matter subscribed, to which the signatures were afterwards copied—the signers knowing only that they were opposing the Taylor system. As soon as it became known about the establishment that employees were being individually interviewed a telegram charging intimidation was sent to the local Member of Congress, and at the same time the answers received commenced to take on a uniform tone of opposition to the system. Nevertheless it must be stated that some of the workmen, including men who were earning good premiums, declared voluntarily their opposition to the system.

21. I think the petitions are due both to the coercion and the teachings of labor organizations. The coercion comes from the opposition which organized labor has always shown to the increase of the productivity of the individual, which it has fought in all the forms in which it has made its appearance, from the time of the introduction of the power loom. The fact that increased individual production redounds ultimately to the advantage of the working classes, as well as to that of everybody else, has been powerless to produce a change of attitude in this respect. In the ordinary case this is perhaps explicable by the fact that, while the ultimate advantage is demonstrated, the immediate effect is disastrous to some of the individuals involved, while an immediate remedy for the disaster has not been provided. In the instance of increased productivity at the Watertown Arsenal, however, there has been no immediate disadvantage to any class, since the substantial increase in the wages paid out has not been accompanied by any diminution of the working force.

22. From interviews with the employees I am of the opinion that the teaching of the unions at the Watertown Arsenal is that, if the men will join in the expulsion of the premium system, the political power of the unions will be sufficient and will be used to secure the same increase of pay as is had under the premium system, without the necessity of working for it. This, of course, could not be accomplished without the abandonment of the rule of the department that the wages paid at an arsenal shall be the same as those of the vicinity for work of like character. Careful examination upon this point is periodically made, and it is a fact that at the present time the wages at the Watertown Arsenal are slightly above those paid in the vicinity. Evidence as to the effect of the comparison is always welcome from the representatives of the workmen, and readjustment is willingly made when occasion for it is shown.

23. The subject of the discontinuance of the system through legislative action has been up in both Houses of Congress, in which resolutions forbidding it have been introduced and have been favorably acted upon by the committees to which they were referred. So far as I know, the committees have not taken evidence upon the subject matter of the resolutions; no one has been summoned from this department, which is the only Government organization which has introduced the system in its entirety. Pursuant to a resolution of the House of Representatives, a committee of that body investigated the Taylor and other systems of shop management and their application to Government work in 1911–12, and the committees reporting upon the propositions above mentioned to abolish the system made use of the report of the investigating committee, notwithstanding the fact that this report recommended that there should be no legislation upon the subject at the time. The report of the investigating committee, however, did not make a statement of what it had found at the Watertown Arsenal as a result of its investigation, but mentioned in condemnation a number of reprehensible practices which it did not find and did not say that it had found at that establishment. It is impossible to find in the report of the committee a statement of the general conditions under the system and of conclusions in regard thereto; these must be sought in reading through the three volumes of evidence taken and printed. I think it would not be difficult for you to reach a conclusion which would be satisfactory to yourself through an examination which you would have the time to make, and I entertain no doubt that, if permitted to handle the matter at the arsenal without legislative directions, I could continue its operations satisfactorily, since the leaders of disturbance could not hold the men in opposition to the manifest advantages of which they have had experience. But danger lies in congressional action, under pressure from outside the arsenal, and for the purpose of satisfying Congress and the country at large as to the advantage or disadvantage, both to the Government and to the employees, of the features complained of as in operation, I think that an investigation should be made by an authoritative body in which the country could have confidence, which should take the time necessary for the purpose, and would render a report embodying its findings as to the facts and conditions and its conclusions thereon, with its recommendations; which could be relied upon for the government of their action by those in authority who are called upon to take action in the premises and who, of course, have not the time to look thoroughly into the matter for themselves. Such a body I believe to be the Industrial Commission appointed by the President pursuant to the act approved August 23, 1912, entitled "An act to create a commission on industrial relations." I do not believe that there is any more worthy subject for the investigation of this commission than the one of modern scientific management in industrial works, of which they have now an illustration in four years' operation at a Government establishment conducted openly, under public laws and regulations, and operated with solicitude for the welfare of its employees and without profit.

24. The numerous documents containing the information from which this memorandum has been compiled are on file in this office and available for examination, but are withheld in order to diminish the size of this already bulky communication.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM CROZIER,
Brigadier General, Chief of Ordnance.

[Extract from the Report of the Chief of Ordnance, 1911.]

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT.

About three years ago the department began to devote attention to the subject of scientific management as applied to its manufacturing operations. Previously to the last fiscal year the subject has been considered more as an experimental detail of shop management, but it has now assumed sufficient importance to justify a reference to it in this report.

It is unnecessary here to attempt any detailed description of the principles of scientific management or the particular application of those principles which constitutes the Taylor system, since both have been the subject of extensive discussion in the public prints and have been very fully described in various treatises. It may be said, however, that the principles are no new discovery, nor are they claimed to be such by the advocates, and that the many details have been the subject of special and laborious attention for many years. One of the basic ideas is the application of educated and scientifically trained intelligence to those operations of manufacture which were formerly considered either as of too small importance to attract such attention or as belonging entirely to the practice of a trade, and were therefore left to the judgment or choice of those immediately and practically connected with the operations—that is, the workmen and foremen. The employees to whom these matters have heretofore been left acquired their skill not from study, but by copying the methods of their predecessors, and are not generally inclined to question the old methods. Besides, the best method of doing certain work is too difficult of ascertainment for the workman to have any chance of success in arriving at it, which has to be done by careful and scientific consideration of a number of variable elements whose successful combination is a matter of high skill and careful observation. An illustration is the process of cutting metal, a particular task involving which is usually given a workman with no other special instructions than that he is to use a particular machine and follow a drawing upon which dimensions and allowed variations therein are specified. The matters which are left to the workman's own determination are the form of cutting tool—which he usually grinds himself—the speed at which he will run the machine, the depth of the cut which he will take in removing the metal which must come off, and the feed which he will set for the travel of the tool along the piece. In determining these matters there should be taken into consideration the character of the metal upon which the work is to be done, the qualities of the steel in the cutting tool, the best length of time for the cutting tool to last without renewal, the strength of the machine, and the capacity of the belting to transmit power to it without slipping. Certain only of these elements can be known to the workman; others are without his ken and have probably been determined without consulting him, as, for instance, the appliances by which the machine is to be given its power and speed, and the specifications for the steel in the cutting tool; and the best combination so as to secure the completion of the task in the shortest possible time can only be insured by the application of recorded results of long experience and close observation of the art of cutting metals. Efficient work requires that the workman must be given the elements of speed, feed, depth of cut, and a cutting tool by some one who knows what the combination ought to be.

When the claims made by the advocates of scientific management first attracted my attention the question of the efficiency of existing shop methods was naturally raised in order to estimate the probable value of a change. It is believed that the shop methods in effect at the different arsenals were fully abreast of the best general practice in private industries of the same nature. While, therefore, the general conditions would compare favorably with commercial practice, in those arsenal shops engaged in the manufacture of small arms, ammunition, etc., where the work consists of turning out large quantities of the same pieces, the necessity for closely coordinating the successive operations and for eliminating delays had been more evident than in general machine-shop and jobbing work, more study had been given the subject, and as a result the methods there were highly developed. It may be said, in fact, that those shops have had scientific management for years and do not, therefore, appear to afford as wide a field for improvement as might be found in the others. I may also say that one of the earliest publications upon scientific management was a work entitled "The Cost of Manufactures and the Administration of Workshops," by Capt. Henry Metcalfe, an officer of the Ordnance Department, published in 1885. Of Capt. Metcalfe's work Mr. Taylor said, in 1903:

"Among the many improvements for which the originators will probably never receive the credit which they deserve may be mentioned—

* * * * * * *

"The card system of shop returns invented and introduced as a complete system by Capt. Henry Metcalfe in the Government shops of the Frankford Arsenal. The writer appreciates the difficulty of this undertaking, as he was at the same time engaged in the slow evolution of a similar system in the Midvale Steel Works, which, however, was the result of a gradual development, instead of a complete, well thought-out invention, as was that of Capt. Metcalfe."

As a result of consideration given the subject the probability that the general machine-shop and job-work practice might be materially improved by the methods of scientific management seemed great enough to warrant a practical trial. With this object I directed, something over two years ago, the trial at the Watertown Arsenal, Mass., of some of the elementary features of what is known as the Taylor system, with the intention of testing out these features thoroughly and determining their value before proceeding further, and I employed Mr. Carl G. Barth, an expert in shop management recommended to me by Mr. Taylor, to assist us in effecting their introduction.

Mr. Barth's principal service has been the systemization of the general processes of manufacture. Under his guidance we have systematized the method of putting work into the shops, so that orders for manufacture now go from the office to the shops with a much more complete arrangement and supply than formerly of drawings, specifications, lists of parts, bills of material, and orders relating to particular parts of the structure to be produced, so that the foremen are relieved from much of the semiclerical and other office work which they used to have to do, and for which they are not well qualified and can not attend to without a neglect of other more appropriate duties.

We have systematized the work of planning the course of component parts of the structures to be manufactured through the shops of the arsenal, so that this course shall be regular and orderly, and the work shall at no time be held through the lack of some component which is not at hand when needed, and that no wasteful effects shall arise through congestion of work at particular machines, or the idleness of other machines or workmen, while waiting for the assignment of operations which should have been planned for them in advance. For this purpose there has been installed a planning room, equipped with personnel and appliances, for the regular production of what might be called the time-tables of the thousands of pieces which must travel through the pattern shop, the foundry, the forge shop, the machine shop, and the erecting shop on their way from the stage of raw material to that of finished product, without collisions or unnecessary delays. We have systematized the issue of material for manufacture from the storehouses to the shops, and have placed the task of estimating the amount of material required among the duties of persons other

than those who are to make use of the material in manufacture, so as to reduce the likelihood of overestimates, to insure the possession of the material at the time when it is needed, prevent the disappearance of material while awaiting use and the duplication of issues, and to insure the return to the storehouse of surplus material, with the result of a useful reduction of the amount of material issued, and supposedly used, for particular fabrications. We have systematized the care of material in store and the accountability for it, so as to insure more frequent and accurate check of the material on hand with the clerical statement of what ought to be on hand. We have also systematized the methods of caring for machines and tools so as to preserve their efficiency; for example, the proper maintenance of the condition and tightness of the extensive system of belting, and the systematic tempering and grinding of cutting tools; and we have made such improvements in the efficiency of certain machines as to greatly increase their output. As an example of the last-mentioned item of improvement, we made such changes in the cutters and speeds of a certain gear-cutting machine as to increase its daily output nearly threefold, and this at a time when it was operating in accordance with general practice and to the satisfaction of the skilled workman who was employed at it.

The practical effect of these methods at the Watertown Arsenal has been a material reduction in the cost of general manufacture at that place. The most important manufactures at the Watertown Arsenal are seacoast gun carriages, which are large structures, with hundreds of parts, requiring many months for their completion. It is therefore difficult to give at this time many examples of the decrease of cost of production due to the improvements which have thus far been made, but the following are illustrative: Five different orders, each for 40 sets of parts for the alteration of 12-inch mortar carrriages have been given in comparatively recent years. The first two orders were executed before the introduction of the improvements very summarily and partially described herein. The average cost per set of these two orders was $1,536.73. The third order was carried through after some little progress had been made in the new methods, and the cost per set under it was $1,120.32. The last two orders had the benefit of most of the improvements which have thus far been introduced, and under these the cost per set was $988.36. Another example is found in the case of 6-inch disappearing-gun carriages. Under an order for three carriages which was executed under the old system the cost of each carriage was $24,618.31. Under the new system the cost of each carriage, under an order for two, was $18,103.13. This comparison is, however, not quite accurate, since the first order had to stand the cost of the patterns, which the last order got the benefit of. This cost would, however, not have been nearly sufficient to overcome the difference in price. In the case of the parts for the mortar carriages, the direct labor cost per set was reduced from $411 for the first order of 40 to $275 for the last order, and that of the indirect labor and other shop expenses was reduced from $358 to $332. In the case of the 6-inch disappearing-gun carriages the cost of the direct labor was reduced from $10,239 to $6,949, and that of the indirect labor and other shop expenses from $10,263 to $8,956. This satisfactory result has been attained without affecting the pay of the employees or requiring special exertion by them. The previous practice at the Watertown Arsenal was the same as that still followed in practicaly all machine shops the management of which has not yet appreciated the wastage that a scientific study of the usual practice is claimed to reveal. The principal elements of this wastage include failure to appreciate and to utilize the full and efficient power of machine tools, lack of planning by which machines are frequently without work, the employment of skilled workmen instead of cheaper help to bring work to machines or to procure and grind their cutting tools, etc.

By the establishment of specified feeds and cuts the work done by the machines is increased, and by regulating the flow of work so that it shall be even and continuous, and employing laborers and messengers to supply the work and tools to the skilled workmen, the latter are able to devote the time and labor which they previously expended in other ways to work proper for their grade. Mr. Barth entered upon his employment on June 14, 1909, since which date he has given in the two years and three and one-half months intervening till September 30, 1911, 156 days of service to the arsenal, at a total cost, including his expenses, of $8,808.30.

In view of the successful results obtained at the Watertown Arsenal, in December last I decided to assemble at that arsenal a board, which included the commanding officers of the principal manufacturing arsenals, for the purpose of studying the shop methods which had there been put in practice and of determining the extent to which these methods were suitable for other arsenals.

The board of officers made a thorough study of the Watertown methods and recommended the adoption of those methods for similar work at other manufacturing arsenals, with such changes in details as local conditions seemed to require. In accordance with this recommendation preliminary steps toward introducing the methods, in so far as they are applicable, have been taken at several other arsenals. Due, it is believed to an erroneous conception of the purposes which it is intended to accomplish by these methods, the employees at one of the other arsenals to which the changes are to be applied have protested against the installation. They have been assured that this department does not contemplate the introduction of any system, or any features of a system, which is oppressive or unjust. As stated above, the features which have been in effect at the Watertown Arsenal for about two years, and which are all which it is intended to introduce at the other arsenals at the present time, do not affect the wages to be paid to employees or the exertions to be made by them.

The employees have been fully informed as to my intentions in this matter. The explanation given them should suffice to allay any apprehension that may have been aroused by a misunderstanding of the matter and induce them to await the result of the practical trial of the methods in question, with confidence that their proper interests are not endangered.

In addition to the study of methods, scientific management usually includes some plan for demonstrating to the workman that he can increase his production without unduly exerting himself, and for stimulating him to do so by offering him increased pay for such increase in output. The advocates of the Taylor system claim with great positiveness that the features of that system which do affect the employees' pay, if applied, will result in further very marked economies to the Government, accompanied by increased pay and conditions generally satisfactory to the employees. These claims they base upon the result of actual experience in shops in which the system has been put in operation The confirmation of the claims as to the advantages of the features first installed, which the practical test at Watertown afforded, lends such force to these further claims that, in the absence of any positive evidence to the contrary, I do not think they can be disregarded by an administrative officer honestly desirous of serving the interests of the Government. Briefly stated, these features contemplate offering additional pay to workmen for work performed in the manner and sequence selected from the results of careful study and completed within the time which that study indicates as sufficient for the purpose.

The saving in time results, aside from any increased efficiency of machines, chiefly from the effect of the instructions given the workmen, by which their effort is more advantageously applied, and will involve no exhausting exertion on their part, nor such as should be disagreeable. If the work is not performed within this given time, the workman receives his regular daily pay; never less than his regular pay. The proposition is simply that if he follows his instructions and by so doing saves time, his pay will increase in proportion to the time saved. For example, a workman has been doing a piece of work in 190 minutes. After painstaking study of the job and of all the means of saving time, the man is carefully instructed as to these means, and is told that for every minute saved, within, say, 120 minutes, he will be paid for half a minute at his regular rate, in addition to his regular daily pay; and that it is thought that he can do the work in 72 minutes, for which time the increase over his regular pay will amount to 33⅓ per cent. The real point in the matter, however, is the determination, by a method of scientific common sense, of the time within which the work can and should be done, and the particular method of compensation as a stimulus for meeting this time is not important.

An application of the method described to the first employee of the Watertown Arsenal was made in May last. The circumstances are worth examining somewhat in detail, as they are illustrative of what might, at least, be accomplished by the general use of the method. The case was that of a machinist cutting gear wheels on a gear-cutting machine. It must be remembered that all the preliminary means of improving the machine had already been resorted to. It had been standardized and speeded up, and, although not a new machine, it was in as good condition as it could be for getting the best output. The man employed at it, a capable workman, well disposed to turning out a good day's work, had already cut a number of the gears, so that his ordinary rate of production was known. A careful time study had been made, and an instruction card issued to him in accordance with the methods of the Taylor system. The following figures are given as illustrating the change of output: The time which the man had occupied in cutting a gear was 329 minutes; as the result of the time study he had been told that he would be paid at his regular rate for a half minute for every minute under 300 minutes within which he would cut a gear, and that the results of the time study showed that he should cut them in 180 minutes each, in which case his premium would be 33⅓ per cent over his day rate, $3.28, which he was assured he was going to get in any event. No limit was placed upon the amount which he could earn by cutting the gears in still less time than 180 minutes each. Under these conditions the man went at the work and cut 10 gears, all that were left to be cut, in 220 minutes each, thus increasing his pay about 18 per cent over his day rate. This appears to have been a result worth attaining, and was reached, not only by stimulating the man and giving him instructions, but also by affording him all the facilities for doing the work which a careful study made had shown might be given him with advantage to the Government. The magnitude of the achievement does not yet appear in its entirety. Of the 329 minutes which had been taken previously in cutting a gear, 152 minutes was the running time of the machine, which the man could not alter, leaving 177 minutes as the handling time, occupied by the man in taking out finished gears, putting in new blanks to be cut, adjusting cutters, etc., so that the 109 minutes finally saved were out of the 177 minutes handling time. The cost of the gears before putting the man on the premium system had been, for his own labor, for the labor of his helper, for the cost of running the machine, and for indirect expenses, $4.75 each. The final cost for these same items was $3.28 each, making a saving of $1.47 per gear, or 44 per cent. For the effect on the man's pay: He cut each gear in 80 minutes less than the 300 minutes which were given him as the time within which he would be paid premium; he was therefore paid, at his rate of 41 cents per hour, for 40 minutes for each gear, and as he cut a gear in 220 minutes he thus made 40 minutes' pay, or 27 cents, every 220 minutes, which is at the rate of 7.45 cents per hour, an increase of about 18 per cent over his regular rate, which, applied to his entire day's pay, would raise it from $3.28 to $3.87.

Following the above-quoted case, and several others in the machine shop of the arsenal, an attempt was made to extend the improvement in methods to the foundry, where there was thought to be still greater opportunity for economies which would result advantageously both to the employees and to the Government. There had been no opportunity for making a time study such as had preceded the placing of some mechanics under the premium system in the machine shop, but the advantages in that shop had been so great that it was concluded that part of them could be had by placing some of the molders under the premium system, while basing the time within which premiums might be earned upon the record of preceding production. It was well known that this time was greater than it should be, but as it was intended at this time to apply it only to certain work which was not to be repeated, it was considered wise to allow the workmen the advantage of this liberal time for the sake of the economies which would also result to the Government. Several molders were given jobs under this plan; but it was not successful in getting any material reduction of the time occupied in doing the jobs, or in producing premiums for the men. A time study was therefore made upon a mold for the pommel of a packsaddle, of which a considerable number were required. Under the day-wage system a molder had been making these molds in about 53 minutes each. The time study showed that they ought to be made in 24 minutes each; and in accordance with the usual rule premiums were to commence to be earned after the time represented by the 24 minutes plus two-thirds of the 24 minutes, or 40 minutes. Both the molder and the foreman, however, thought this time was too short, and the officer in charge of the shop therefore increased it arbitrarily to 50 minutes.

However, although no objection to the time study was made at the time, on the same evening a meeting of the molders was held, and it was decided that they would not submit to the process, and when on the following day, attempt was made to carry it on with reference to another man on another job, the molders all struck, leaving their work. Their places were being filled by other men employed when, after a few days, they returned to work under the same conditions as those on account of which they had left, with the information that the whole matter would be made the subject of an investigation.

After the return of the striking molders to work the man who had been on the pommel job was again put at it and occupied the same time as before, about 53 minutes for each. One of the new men who had been taken on was therefore assigned to this job, when he made the molds at an average of 20 minutes each, the castings from them

not being distinguishable from those made by the former molder. That this time of 20 minutes each was not difficult of accomplishment is shown by the fact that this man upon one occasion did a whole day's work at the rate of 16 minutes each; and on one occasion was observed to make one of the molds in 10 minutes. Also, one of the striking molders after his return made them in 28 minutes each.

When these molds were produced in 53 minutes each their labor cost, including helper and all the direct and overhead charges, was $1.17 each. When they were made in 20 minutes each this cost was reduced to 54 cents. There was thus a saving of 63 cents on each mold, and as, at the 20-minute rate, 24 molds were made per day, the net daily saving to the Government upon this one molder's job was $15.10. The pay of the time-study man, a high-priced specialist, was $15 a day, so that his entire day's pay was saved on this one job. When the molds were made at the rate of 53 minutes each, under day wages, the molder earned $3.28 per day; when they were made in 20 minutes each, under the premium plan, the molder earned $5.74 per day.

During the month of September last 29 men in the foundry and machine shop were working more or less time under the premium system. Their total pay for the time that they were so working, at their regular rate, was $1,108; the premiums which they earned amounted to $279.19. They thus increased their regular daily pay by an average of something over 25 per cent. It is a pertinent inquiry who was hurt by this process. The men were certainly benefited in their compensation. They were not required to overexert themselves, nor directed to speed up, and the best evidence obtainable is to the effect that the rate at which they worked was not such as ought to have been other than pleasant.

Up to October 1 about 120 jobs have been done under the new scheme in the machine shop, and the average premium earned by the machinists engaged upon them was a little over 21 per cent of their wages.

After the return of the molders to work, Lieut. Col. John T. Thompson, from the office of the Chief of Ordnance, was directed to proceed to the Watertown Arsenal and make an investigation of the strike and the events preceding it. From his report it appears that the objection on the part of the dissatisfied workmen is to the process of making a time study, which generally precedes the setting of a premium time upon a new job; and the underlying cause of this objection appears to be an apprehension that advantage will be taken of the knowledge gained by the time study to speed up the workmen with a temporary incentive to work fast and then to use the knowledge thus acquired to require the increased rate of production at the same old pay. Such an apprehension might well be produced by the following circular:

AFFILIATED WITH THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT,
404–407 McGill Building, Washington, D. C., April 26, 1911.

Official circular No. 12.

To the order everywhere, greeting:

It has been the purpose of the grand lodge in the past to raise a warning voice whenever dangers have arisen which would affect our craft, and to point the way to safety. Through the efforts of our organization the machinists' trade has been raised to a higher level, as far as wages and conditions of labor are concerned, than otherwise would have obtained.

Wherever a high-paid class of labor exists by reason of organization and skill combined it has had the effect of stimulating the inventive genius of employers to find ways of eliminating skill and with it the high-priced mechanic and substituting common laborers with corresponding low wages.

The latest danger, and the one we propose to deal with in this letter, is the so-called Taylor system of shop management. Mr. Taylor, the originator of this system, is a former master mechanic of the Midvale Steel Co., Philadelphia, Pa., and is well qualified by disposition and education to undertake to undermine our trade. His system is very insidious in the process of installation and operation, it being his plan to install it slowly, and by a process of selecting workmen, he will have it in full operation in a shop in the time it takes him to select a body of docile, nonresisting workmen.

Mr. Taylor's system, as applied to the machinist trade, in brief, is as follows:

1. Instead of having a general foreman in a shop, he has four specialized shop foremen, each of whom performs a specified part of a foreman's job. They are called the "speed boss," "gang boss," "repair boss," and "inspector boss." These jobs are given out as plums to machinists who are willing to act as pacemakers.

2. Instead of machinists using their judgment in doing their work, Mr. Taylor has a "planning department," which furnishes the machinist with an "instruction card" similar to a drawing, telling him exactly what feeds, speeds, tools, and machines to use; how to hold the work, etc., leaving nothing to the workman's judgment. This eliminates skill and common laborers are used.

3. Instead of relying on the honor of the machinists, together with the watchfulness of the foreman as a means of getting a fair day's work from the men, Mr. Taylor holds a stop watch on the best workman while working fast, and leaves out the time on all such movements as he thinks is unnecessary. The result forms a standard for a day's work. To get a man to work at a terrific pace is his method. He solves it something like this:

(a) Offering a bonus for reaching this maximum.

(b) Standardizing the movements of a workman, thus making an automaton of him.

(c) Fining the workman all the way from 1 cent to $60.

(d) Discharging all who fail to reach the maximum pace after a trial.

(e) Discharging the dissatisfied workman, and keeping those who will do as they are told.

(f) Offering the foreman a bonus to keep the men spurred up to the top speed.

(g) Installing piecework with a differential rate per piece, thus: If the maximum day's work is 10 pieces, and the workman may get, say, 35 cents a piece, or $3.50 per day, if he succeeds in completing the entire task. If, however, he fails to finish 10 pieces, even if he misses this limit by only a fraction of 1 piece, he gets only 25 cents a piece, or less than $2.50 per day. This gives a tremendous incentive to a man to exert himself to the utmost.

4. Instead of collective bargaining, Mr. Taylor insists upon individual agreement, and any insistence on organized-labor methods will result in discharge.

Wherever this system has been tried it has resulted either in labor trouble and failure to install the system, or it has destroyed the labor organization and reduced the men to virtual slavery, and low wages, and has engendered such an air of suspicion among the men that each man regards every other man as a possible traitor and spy.

The present effort on the part of of Mr. Taylor is to have his system installed in the Government arsenals and navy yards. He has been so successful that the War Department has decided to give his system a trial. This would give his methods a tremendous advertisement, and only be a short time until all private manufacturers throughout the country would adopt his system, since with the public the Government has the reputation of being a good employer. This is but another instance in which a good reputation is exploited for a despicable purpose. We do not know what motives the War Department has in the matter, but we do know that this proposed staggering blow at labor must be met by determined resistance.

The installation of the Taylor system throughout the country means one of two things, i. e., either the machinists will succeed in destroying the usefulness of this system through resistance or it will mean the wiping out of our trade and organization, with the accompanying low wages, life-destroying hard work, long hours, and intolerable conditions generally.

It is manifestly impossible in a short letter to explain the Taylor system satisfactorily, but let this letter serve as a warning to you to prepare for the struggle. As a means of preventing the Taylor system of shop management gaining headway, we ask you to carry out the following instructions:

1. Purchase a book explaining the Taylor system.

2. Appoint a committee to read this book and report findings to the lodge.

3. Instruct the secretary or a committee to immediately write to the Secretary of War, the two United States Senators of your State, and the Congressman from your district, protesting against the installation of the Taylor system by the Government, asking the lawmakers to support any measure that may be submitted to Congress which will secure this result.

It would be well to enumerate some of the objections to the system as outlined in this letter.

We trust that you will be impressed with the importance of this matter and will see the impending danger. Act quickly.

Yours, fraternally,

JAS. O'CONNELL,
President International Association of Machinists.

Shop Management, by F. W. Taylor, can be purchased of Munn & Co., 361 Broadway, New York City.

This circular was issued last spring, closely following a vigorous protest of the employees of the Rock Island Arsenal against the introduction at that arsenal of the first-described part of the Taylor system which concerns systemization and general administration only, without directly affecting the employees or their compensation, and which had been shown to be so advantageous at the Watertown Arsenal, the protest being based upon the fear of what might follow.

It seems quite conceivable that men might be influenced by such publications as this, coming from organizations which they support themselves, to such an extent as to cause them to lose sight of the fact that the Government is not in the "sweatshop" business, and that there are plenty of instances in the Ordnance Department itself in which employees are continuously earning, by stimulated efforts under the piecework system, wages very considerably in excess of those paid to persons of the same degree of skill under the day-wage method.

A little inquiry would show that there are many employees in the department working at employment which can be readily learned in time very much less than that required for the apprenticeship of a machinist, for instance, who are regularly earning the wages of a good machinist paid by the day. If the employees of the Ordnance Department were left to the guidance of their own experience in Government employ, and if the leaders of labor organizations would take pains to inquire as to the promise in regard to conditions of employment which is implied in the record of labor in the Government service before taking and diffusing alarm, I believe that experiments such as the one now making at the Watertown Arsenal would be given the fair chance, which they do not have when feelings are stirred up by such circulars as the one just quoted.

As an example of what is shown by this department's record of employment: The gear-cutting machinist, whose experience has been described above, has been a regular employee of the department for a number of years. During the fiscal year ended June 30 last, in which the experience described occurred, he had been given, as usual, leave of absence with pay for 13¾ days annual leave, 13 Saturday half holidays, and 7 full holidays, making 27¼ days in all, for which he received $83.56, without rendering any service. For the service which he did render during the year he received $899.65. The amount which he received for no service, therefore, was a little over 9¼ per cent of that which he received for his labor; and the labor was rendered at the rate of only eight hours a day. His holiday time he was privileged to use for his own pleasure or profit. In addition he had the stability of the civil-service tenure of office; had an opportunity to take his luncheon in a clean, well-warmed, and ventilated and well-kept lunch room, where facilities were supplied for heating coffee, etc.; was able to take a shower bath at the end of his work if he wished to; and enjoyed the assurance that if disabled by his work for over 15 days he would, under the governmental liability act, be paid at his full rate for the time for which his disability should last, up to one year; or that his dependent family would be provided for at such rate in case of his being killed. With this experience I do not believe that, of his own motion, this good man would have become suddenly possessed of the fear that the spirit of his employment by the Government was to be entirely changed and that thenceforth he was to be subjected to an unendurable slave-driving process.

The theory under which the trial is being made at the Watertown Arsenal is that the current rate of wages is not a just compensation for the employees' best production, but that it is compensation for the character of production under which the rate has grown up, which is very far from the best. It is believed that better production can be had by proper care upon the part of the management, but that continued high production is impossible without correspondingly high wages. It is also considered that there are differences between men which should be taken account of in their compensation. There is not lacking evidence that these differences are not always relished by labor organizations, and that there is some tendency upon the part of members of these organizations to consider that they should be industrially as well as politically equal; and it may be that this feeling is stronger on the part of employees in a Government establishment, feeling that all men are properly equal before the law, than in private employment. I have not yet reached a conclusion as to the extension to other arsenals of the part of the Taylor system of shop manage-

ment which directly affects the workmen, and I do not intend to do so in advance of further trial at the Watertown Arsenal; but I am convinced that, either by this system or by some other, it ought to be possible to secure better cooperation of the employees among themselves and between them and the management than has been had in the past. I think it ought to be possible to accomplish this by making it to the interest of as many employees as possible to call attention to any improvement which would increase their productiveness, or to any slackness which diminishes it, and I do not think that the spirit of keenness and forwardness which ought to accompany conditions of this kind would properly be described as one involving spying, or a state in which every man's hand would be against his neighbor, as has been alleged.

As to the effect upon the employment of labor which would be produced if a given amount of work were to be performed by a less number of men than had previously been required for it, it should be borne in mind that at a Government establishment the amount of work is regulated by the capacity of the establishment and the appropriations available. If by means of improved methods this department should be able to diminish the cost of military stores manufactured by it, by reason of the increased efficiency of labor or otherwise, the funds thus saved would not be turned back into the Treasury but would be used to manufacture additional stores, for which there is much need, requiring the employment of additional labor. This result would be comparable to that obtaining in private manufacture when diminished cost and price increase consumption.

In getting this system going for the last two years or more the commanding officer of the Watertown Arsenal, Lieut. Col. Charles B. Wheeler, and his first assistant, Maj. C. C. Williams, have been called upon for efforts much in excess of those corresponding to ordinary working hours, and have exhibited a degree of zeal and intelligence which merits special mention.

[Extract from the Report of the Chief of Ordnance, 1912.]

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT.

In my report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, the subject of the application of more scientific management to the plants of the Ordnance Department was discussed at some length, and a detailed statement of the reasons that determined the trial, the extent to which the system had been introduced, the conditions under which it would be retained or extended, and the results already obtained were given.

During the past year the subject has received even greater public attention than before, so that it is deemed proper to describe the progress made and the conditions that have developed since my last annual report in greater detail than would otherwise be considered necessary.

The occurrence of the brief strike among the molders at the Watertown Arsenal, mentioned in my last annual report, was represented by the outside labor interests which had supported the strike and were encouraging opposition to the introduction of scientific management in the plants of this department as indicating the existence of unsatisfactory conditions, due to the use of the particular system of management under trial, known as the Taylor system. The representations made induced the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate the Taylor and other systems of shop management. While the resolution authorizing the appointment of the committee provided for the investigation of other systems, it specifically named the Taylor system and directed that the applicability of this system to Government works, its effect on the health and pay of the employees, and on wages and labor cost be ascertained. The special committee thus appointed began its labors on October 4, 1911. The members visited the Watertown Arsenal and held hearings there, at Boston, New York, and Washington, covering a period between October 4, 1911, and February 12, 1912. Ample opportunity was afforded to all Government officers and employees, outside labor leaders and workmen, industrial engineers, civilian managers, and generally to anyone interested in the subject, to present their views to the committee. In short, the committee went into the subject thoroughly and had presented to it in great detail all the information needed for an exhaustive study and the formation of an authoritative conclusion. The committee made its report to the House on March 9, 1912, and it was unanimous. Inasmuch as the opponents of the Taylor system had virtually concentrated their attack upon the time-study and premium features under trial at the Watertown Arsenal, claiming that those features operated against the health and well-being of the employees, it is particularly interesting to note what the committee, as the result of its investigation, had to say upon the points especially affected by those features. Their remarks were as follows:

"Neither the Taylor system, the Emerson system, the Gantt system, the Brombacher system, the Stimpson system, nor any of the systems of so-called scientific management have been in existence long enough for your committee to determine with accuracy their effect on the health and pay of employees and their effect on wages and labor cost. The conclusions we have arrived at are all based upon what we consider to be the logical sequence of the conditions existing or proposed. The selection of any system of shop management for the various Government works must be, to a great extent, a matter of administration, and your committee does not deem it advisable nor expedient to make any recommendations for legislation upon the subject at this time."

In other words, the committee, properly zealous to protect the well-being of the employees, failed to find any ground in the representations made by the opponents of the system upon which to base condemnation or serious criticism of the methods in effect or contemplated by this department, or any conditions which called for remedial legislation, although it showed its alert interest in the well-being of the workmen by mentioning and condemning many oppressive practices, which it did not find, and did not say it had found, at the arsenals of this department. This result should be sufficient to stay the campaign against the use of the Taylor system by the Government, which, on the part of its opponents, has been principally one of misrepresentation of the purposes sought and unjustified assertions as to the results which it would produce, at least until bad conditions become a fact instead of a mere prediction. Particularly have these opponents endeavored, by quoting carefully selected and therefore misleading extracts from the writings of its original advocate, to create a popular prejudice against the time-study and premium features of this system, alleging that these features are only devices for "speeding up" the workman and reducing him ultimately to the level of a "machine" or "beast of burden." The persistency with which these statements have been circulated, in the face of the failure of the committee to discover any facts which justify them, excites more than a suspicion that there is some other reason which animates the opposition than a fear that the employees of the department are going to be overworked. The following instance, which occurred at the Watertown Arsenal, well illustrates the fact that the time study is not an instrument of oppression, but that the determination of the proper quantity of work revealed by its use is advantageous to the workman, as well as to the Government, and that the department intends to act justly upon the information thus obtained. After a time study had been made on a piece of work, the workman proceeded to earn a good premium, but upon comparing the cost of the work to the Government before and after the premium system of payment it was discovered that the cost was greater afterwards than before. That is, there was no saving of time and overhead charges to compensate for the increased amount paid to the workman. The reason was that this was an exceptionally fast and skillful man, and that he had been all along giving an output corresponding to a reasonable task time without getting paid for it. In other words, he was underpaid. The time study disclosed this, and he is now being paid in accordance with his merits.

In spite of the well-grounded conclusion reached by the committee that no legislation is needed at present, interests outside of the Government service have, nevertheless, succeeded in having bills introduced into both Houses of Congress which aim to prohibit the taking of accurate time studies of operations and the payment of premiums, or extra pay, to the workmen. The effect of these bills, if enacted into law, would be to deprive the workmen of all material advantages that scientific management offers them. The attitude of the department is that improvement in industrial conditions should benefit both employer and employee. This attitude is clearly evidenced by the record that the department has made in its dealings with its employees and was given positive expression in my testimony before the special committee last January. To prevent any misunderstanding upon this point, it is considered fitting to quote that portion of the hearings which contains the expression referred to:

"Mr. TILSON. There is another question I would like to ask in regard to the system. If after a fair trial of the second part, as we have called it, of this Taylor system at Watertown Arsenal it should be found that it does not work satisfactorily to both the Government and the men, after a fair trial, so it could not be claimed on either side that it had not had a fair trial, it should be discovered that it could not be installed satisfactorily to the workmen themselves and to the management, do you believe that it would be installed at the other arsenals regardless of that fact?

"Gen. CROZIER. No, sir; it would not be my intention to install it at the other arsenals under those circumstances.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Would it mean the elimination of that feature at the Watertown Arsenal?

"Gen. CROZIER. Yes, sir; it would.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. In its entirety?

"Gen. CROZIER. Of this second part of the system?

"Mr. TILSON. Any part which did not work satisfactorily.

"Gen. CROZIER. I would not permanently continue any system that was the cause of continued discontent.

"Mr. TILSON. You regard the workmen at the Watertown Arsenal as fair-minded men—the majority of them—men who as between man and man would wish to be fair. Now, after giving it a fair trial with these men, if it engendered constant strain and you could not make any satisfactory arrangement with this system, would it not discourage it in your eyes?

"Gen. CROZIER. Yes, sir; it would. After I shall have given it a fair trial, then I shall know everything about it of my own knowledge.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course, there are some features that might remain after this second part of the system was presumed to have been abolished, like the time records, for instance. Would workmen be required to still maintain the time as determined by the time-study methods of this system?

"Gen. CROZIER. I think I have covered that when I say that I would not continue anything that produced permanent discontent.

"Mr. TILSON. The system or any part of it?

"Gen. CROZIER. No, sir.

"Mr. TILSON. I just wanted to be sure of what you said, General. I simply wanted it reiterated, that is all.

"Gen. CROZIER. Anything that produced permanent dissatisfaction and discontent would be given up. We desire to have our relations with the workmen harmonious.

"Mr. TILSON. That's the point."

These expressions should not be misinterpreted. They do not mean that any feature deemed beneficial will be given up immediately upon the request of employees, without investigation of the grounds and reasons for such a request. Before the abandonment of a feature is decided upon it must be demonstrated that those objecting to it have worked under it long enough to understand it thoroughly, that their objections are material and based upon their own experience rather than the suggestions of others, and that they represent in number more than the small discontented element that exists in all industrial organizations.

The time study affords the most accurate measure yet devised for determining the just quantity of work that should be performed without overexertion, and the premium system is one of the means by which this just quantity of work can be adequately paid for. The combination of the two secures increased earnings to the competent workman, without a corresponding decrease to the less competent, a positive and material step forward which it would seem should meet with general approval. The proposed bills, however, take away this advantage, and require the workman to continue to labor under the old conditions, the unsatisfactory and inadequate character of which is evidenced by the symptoms of general unrest occurring throughout the industrial world.

The advocates of these bills profess to foresee that the time study and premium features will produce conditions inimical to the workman, and draw a harrowing picture of a future in which the overwrought workman is laboring feverishly to accomplish daily a task beyond his strength in return for a wage no greater, and perhaps less, than he formerly received. The absurdity of the supposition that such a state of affairs in a plant belonging to this Government would be tolerated by the people, or that there is any incentive which would lead sane Government officials to attempt anything of the sort, does not seem to strike these prophets. Neither do they appear to comprehend the fact that the determination of the rate of wages to be paid is a matter wholly independent of any system of management. The Taylor system has no occult power to force workmen to work under unsatisfactory conditions or for an inadequate wage. It does not take away from the workmen any weapon of self-protection which they now possess. Wages are not fixed by a system, but by agreement. Under the Taylor system there is exactly the same opportunity for bargaining, either individually or collectively; exactly the same remedies for oppressive conditions; in

short, exactly the same protection for the workmen that there is under any other system—no more and no less. The same forces that operate now to maintain, raise, or depress the rate of wages will operate as effectively under the Taylor system, and these are the only forces that can affect the question. When the time study has revealed more accurately than mere guesswork how much work can properly be done, there still remains the question as to how much shall be paid for that work. The settlement of that question is not determined by the time study, nor by any other feature of the Taylor system. But the result of the time study has furnished the workman with a vastly better ground upon which to bargain about wages than he had when both parties were merely guessing as to the amount of a fair day's work. In the face of the actual results so far obtained, and the unequivocal statements as to the future intention of this department, the effort to protect the workmen from purely visionary dangers by depriving them of a present and very material benefit appears so strained and illogical as to suggest irresistibly either that the real reason for the effort has not been revealed or that those who profess to be so alert in protecting labor are singularly obtuse. Should they be successful in their effort to eliminate the time study and premium features, the workman who has become accustomed to receiving a substantial increase in his pay envelope under the premium system is going to find it difficult to figure out how he has been benefited when that increase is taken away from him and his hours of work are not reduced. I believe that the practical experience of the benefits of the premium system obtained by those who have worked under it during the past year will lead to a saner and more enlightened view of the subject, and develop clearly the fact that there is not, on the part of those who are personally affected, any real wish for the enactment of legislation so evidently opposed to their interests.

To show how directly and materially the premium system, based upon time study, has benefited the workman, I invite attention to the following data as to the number, trade, and grade of the employees who have worked on premium during the past year, and the average monthly percentage of their regular pay represented by the premiums earned.

Date.	Number of men.	Hours worked on premium jobs.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Premium paid.	Regular pay.	Per cent of premium.
MOLDERS.		*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*			
July, 1911						
August, 1911	18	796 55	113 7	$46.72	$332.60	14
September, 1911	19	1,745 45	450 35	186.46	721.97	25.8
October, 1911	17	1,962 40	439 35	182.35	807.64	22.6
November, 1911	16	1,564 30	389 40	161.58	644.54	25.1
December, 1911	18	2,141 56	478 29	198.74	881.80	22.5
January, 1912	17	2,570 30	692 40	286.88	1,061.11	27
February, 1912	19	2,392 0	562 40	186.11	1,037.26	17.6
March, 1912	18	2,175 50	600 59	246.79	917.67	26.9
April, 1912	12	1,644 0	507 0	207.81	674.21	30.8
May, 1912	11	1,490 45	478 41	197.03	614.56	32.1
June, 1912	11	1,298 16	380 53	156.85	533.89	29.4
				2,054.32	8,227.25	24.97
MACHINISTS.						
July, 1911	4	255 0	59 45	20.16	84.46	23.8
August, 1911	8	[1] 839 0	190 45	67.40	[1] 351.08	19.2
September, 1911	10	1,052 39	255 15	92.73	384.96	24
October, 1911	15	1,261 28	316 8	115.36	420.89	27.4
November, 1911	20	2,612 5	637 11	235.27	941.21	25
December, 1911	30	3,217 45	844 39	314.14	1,166.93	26.9
January, 1912	51	4,766 30	1,329 37	506.64	1,769.78	28.6
February, 1912	52	4,195 30	1,086 20	414.75	1,580.38	26.1
March, 1912	59	5,088 25	1,629 7	613.60	1,898.40	32.3
April, 1912	88	6,350 5	1,980 40	745.08	2,385.41	31.2
May, 1912	94	7,497 55	2,309 11	876.16	2,849.30	30.7
June, 1912	84	7,511 55	2,311 22	882.82	2,868.97	30.7
				4,884.11	16,701.77	29.24

[1] One man's time omitted on account of loss of card; time assumed.

The net result of these figures may be more significantly summarized by the statement that 153 men received during the last fiscal year a total of $6,938.43 more than they would have been paid except for the time-study and premium features. Had conditions been such that all of these men could have been employed continuously on premium jobs, the premiums earned would constitute an actual increase in their annual pay of 28.59 per cent.

These very substantial increases earned under the premium method, without complaint of undue or disagreeable exertion, can hardly be regarded by any unprejudiced person as other than a distinct improvement in the industrial position of the workmen concerned, who must have been enabled thereby to live better and to obtain for themselves and their families advantages not previously enjoyed. It is difficult to believe that these men and those dependent upon them really favor a legislative prohibition of the premium feature, which would deprive them of their new comforts and compel a return to their former scale of living. I do not believe it, but by evidence gathered on the spot, as well as by the above considerations, am convinced that a free expression of opinion by the employees of the Watertown Arsenal, if it were possible to receive it, would be strongly in favor of a continuance of the system.

The figures given above show the benefits which accrue to the workman from the Taylor system as applied at the Watertown Arsenal. It is now appropriate to consider what advantages have been secured for the Government. In my last annual report such typical examples of reduced cost of manufacture were given as were available at that time. It must be remembered that the Government lacks the simple measure of economical efficiency which a private concern possesses in its net earnings, and that a convincing and definite comparison can only be had when the same or very similar articles have been manufactured under both new and old conditions. It should not occasion surprise, therefore, that the concrete instances available are not more numerous. But while these instances are not many, they serve to indicate beyond a reasonable doubt that the methods which have been so successful in the cases cited are producing a proportionate success in the work generally. From a comparison of the job cards of about 60 different jobs, each of which was performed under both the old day-work and the premium system, it appears that the average rate of production under the premium system is about 2½ times that of day-work. Had the same number of men been working on premium work throughout the year as were employed on such work during May and June at the Watertown Arsenal, there would have been a total net saving to the Government of $100,095.80. Inasmuch, however, as the number in the earlier months was much smaller, the amount saved was less, and the saving actually made was $49,102.95, as compared with the amount which had been estimated that the work was going to cost.

SAVINGS FROM IMPROVED SHOP MANAGEMENT AND PREMIUM SYSTEM (EXCEPT AS NOTED) AND DISPOSITION THEREOF.

The reduced cost of production at the various ordnance establishments, due to the improved methods of manufacture and to the premium system, as previously outlined, will continue to be realized from year to year. These savings were made with practically no reduction of wages of employees; on the contrary, there were a large number of increases in day wages at all the arsenals, and the earnings of those on a piece-work or premium basis were increased considerably. These increases, of course, have been deducted from the amount of savings reported below. Due to the existence of these savings for the current fiscal year the estimates for the next fiscal year have been reduced, thus giving the most practical expression to the results obtained. The savings amounted to over $240,000, which was used to increase the amount of work done and material manufactured under the various appropriations from which the savings were made. The estimates for the manufacture of small-arms ammunition during the next fiscal year have been reduced by $150,000 below the current appropriations; but for the reduced sum just as much ammunition will be procured as would be possible under the present appropriations at the prices of a year ago. The estimate for the manufacture of small arms is $100,000 less. The number of small arms made will not be as great as under the current appropriation, but it will not be diminished in proportion to the reduction in the estimate.

These figures need little comment, and, taken in connection with those showing the increased earnings of the workmen, furnish a complete explanation and justification of the advocacy of the Taylor system by this department. The workmen have received higher wages, while the net cost of the work has been reduced, an industrial result which both employers and employees are generally desirous of achieving. So far at least the advantages anticipated for both the Government and the employees have been realized, and none of the objectionable results so confidently predicted by its opponents have developed. The present situation therefore offers every inducement for the continuance of the conservative application of the Taylor system begun by this department, and such extension of the use of those features proved to be beneficial as local conditions shall justify.

SURPLUS STOCK SAVINGS.

Inasmuch as scientific management more systematically directs greater attention to all details of manufacturing work than was previously bestowed its trial by the department led to a closer study, among other objects, of the amount and kind of material that should be kept on hand for manufacturing purposes, with the object of reducing such stock to the lowest limit consistent with efficient and economical operation. The study given this subject resulted in the adoption during the past year of a uniform system for determining the amount of stock to be carried and for providing for its replenishment. The overaccumulation of stock is easily accomplished. Material is prone to be scattered through a manufacturing establishment in unimpressive lots and to rest in out of the way places unobserved. The record of it is buried in the property return, often under a variety of half-known names, not meaning much to the clerks who handle the returns, which for the large arsenals are ponderous volumes discouraging critical examination. A careful determination under a scientific method of the proper quantity of stock to be kept on hand revealed the fact that in the case of many items the quantity had been excessive, and that the stock of those items could be greatly reduced. The process of realizing upon this surplus by using it in current manufacture was at once begun and will be continued until it is all absorbed. It will take several years to accomplish this. During the past year $122,789.61 worth of this surplus has been used. This means that the manufacture of the articles for which the surplus material was used was accomplished by the actual disbursement of $122,789.61 less than would otherwise have been required, so that that amount of money was available for additional work.

The surplus stock savings, amounting to $122,789.61, were utilized in manufacturing 2,189 additional infantry rifles and a large amount of small-arms ammunition; while $17,585.13 were turned into the Treasury, as the purpose to which this sum was applicable can be covered by other appropriations without increase. Some $17,000 of this saving is still on hand.

STOCK FUND NOT YET UTILIZED.

At the Springfield Armory there is a remaining surplus of $130,313.53 over and above that mentioned above. When future orders are received by the armory for the manufacture of arms report in each case will be promptly made to this office showing the value of the surplus material which can be utilized in such manufacture, and the allotment covering such orders will then be correspondingly reduced. This surplus consists largely of those components of the rifle which require the longest time, in the event of war, for their procurement, as, for instance, gun stocks, which should be seasoned for several years prior to use, and steel for the larger parts, as for the barrel and receiver, so that the amount of the saving does not represent a corresponding quantity of material for that number of completed rifles. It will require several years to absorb this surplus, which represents the amount by which the war reserve of material can be reduced by reason of the satisfactory store of finished rifles.

Reports have not yet been received from the other arsenals as to the resulting surpluses that will be available for such use in the stock fund. When such reports shall have been received these surpluses will be similarly utilized.

Recapitulation of savings.

Savings from improved shop management, and premium system	$240,461.93
Savings resulting from the use of surplus stock	122,789.61
Total	363,251.54

Scrap material was utilized, as usual, in the manufacture of all articles whenever possible. The value of the scrap material so utilized during the year amounts to about $212,000. Under the new stock system this scrap is now taken up at its proper value on the stock-fund account. That used in the manufacture of any article is charged against the allotment for its manufacture and credited to the stock-fund account. When the stock fund exceeds an authorized maximum the excess is turned back to this office and made available for allotment for additional manufactures.

CASH REWARDS FOR EMPLOYEES.

During the past year the subject of the desirability and justice of securing authority by which employees who were the authors of suggestions that resulted in valuable improvements or economies in manufacturing processes or plant could be adequately rewarded was taken up and a recommendation submitted to you that an effort be made to obtain the necessary legislative action.

The history of this department contains many instances of employees who have offered suggestions that resulted in material improvements and economies. Under previously existing law there was no suitable way by which the laudable interest of these employees could be properly recognized. This lack of power to reward such suggestions undoubtedly deprived the Government of much advantage that would accrue from the stimulus to the interest in their work that could otherwise be secured, and placed the Government in the unsatisfactory position of appropriating such suggestions and benefiting from them without suitable recognition of the authors. The action recommended met with your approval and the matter was submitted to Congress. The result was the passage of an act, approved July 17, 1912, which authorized the payment of periodic cash rewards for the most valuable suggestions submitted by employees. So far as I know this act is the first successful effort on the part of any executive department of the Government to recognize in a material way those praiseworthy efforts of its employees which are outside of their ordinary work and for which their regular wage can not be considered a fair compensation. In addition it affords another practical instance of the desire of this department to deal fairly with its employees and to promote that community of interest and close cooperation which both equity and efficiency demand. The necessary instructions for putting the act into effect have been issued, in accordance with which the first period within which rewards may be won will be from October 1 to December 1 of this year.

Premiums earned during May, 1913.

BY MOLDERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
4	27 0	$3.04	$82.08	$12.41	$94.49	32 39	82 10	39.73
5	27 0	3.28	88.56	4.55	93.11	11 7	70 45	15.71
6	14 3	3.04	43.70	5.62	49.32	14 47	93 50	15.75
7	27 0	3.52	95.04	23.72	118.76	53 54	181 35	29.68
8	27 0	3.52	95.04	13.91	108.95	31 37	128 35	24.58
9	27 0	3.52	95.04	13.46	108.50	30 35	176 35	17.29
10	23 0	3.52	80.96	16.60	97.56	37 44	137 30	27.44
11	27 0	3.28	88.56	17.23	105.79	42 2	163 20	25.73
12	27 0	3.52	95.04	18.66	113.70	42 24	118 45	35.70
15	27 0	3.68	99.36	20.94	120.30	45 32	195 25	23.30
16	27 0	3.04	82.08	11.39	93.47	29 59	142 40	21.01
17	27 0	3.52	95.04	15.11	110.15	34 20	104 25	32.88
18	27 0	3.68	99.36	20.95	120.31	45 33	195 25	23.30
Total				194.55		452 13	1,791 0	25.54

Premium percentage of shop=452 hours 13 minutes÷1,791 hours=25.24 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 66.95 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

IN MACHINE SHOP.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
31	27 0	$3.04	$82.08	$1.12	$83.20	2 57	27 25	10.76
33	21 0	3.28	68.88	4.03	72.92	9 50	58 40	16.76
35	24 7	3.04	75.62	8.51	84.13	22 23	135 40	16.49
38	27 0	3.28	88.56	20.85	109.41	50 52	166 10	30.61
39	27 0	3.52	95.04	31.02	126.06	70 30	199 10	35.38
41	27 0	3.28	88.56	21.26	109.82	51 52	158 30	32.72
42	27 0	3.28	88.56	21.38	109.94	52 9	164 5	31.78
43	27 0	3.04	82.08	6.41	88.49	16 52	128 20	13.14
44	15 6	3.04	47.88	6.96	54.84	18 19	67 30	27.13
45	27 0	3.28	88.56	19.44	108.00	47 25	136 35	34.71
46	18 0	3.28	59.04	25.47	84.51	62 7	175 45	35.34
47	27 0	3.28	88.56	21.12	109.68	51 31	184 35	27.91
48	26 4	3.04	80.56	5.09	85.65	13 24	179 30	7.46
49	27 0	3.28	88.56	9.85	98.41	24 2	191 45	12.53
50	27 0	3.52	95.04	29.70	124.74	67 30	193 25	34.89
51	27 0	2.80	75.60	14.13	89.73	40 23	141 35	28.52
52	27 0	3.04	82.08	24.14	106.22	63 32	155 35	40.83
54	27 0	3.28	88.56	14.79	103.35	36 5	132 5	27.31
55	27 0	3.04	82.08	5.96	88.04	15 42	196 25	7.99
56	24 0	3.04	72.96	10.57	83.53	27 49	92 5	30.20
57	27 0	3.28	88.56	1.44	90.00	3 30	15 0	23.33
58	26 4	3.04	80.56	4.87	85.43	12 50	36 0	35.64
59	27 0	3.28	88.56	23.14	111.70	56 27	210 25	26.82
60	27 0	3.28	88.56	6.16	94.72	15 2	39 55	37.66
61	27 0	3.04	82.08	10.35	92.43	27 14	108 45	25.04
62	27 0	2.80	75.60	8.33	83.93	23 49	113 55	20.91
63	26 4¾	3.04	80.84	13.84	94.68	36 26	118 15	30.81
64	26 4	3.52	93.28	6.19	99.47	14 4	130 10	10.80
65	27 0	3.28	88.56	8.82	97.38	21 31	154 10	13.95
67	26 5	3.28	87.33	8.01	95.34	19 32	56 30	34.57
68	27 0	2.56	69.12	.86	69.98	2 42	46 55	5.75
69	26 0	3.28	85.28	22.15	107.43	54 1	226 35	23.83
70	27 0	3.04	82.08	25.62	107.70	67 26	193 15	34.88
71	27 0	3.04	82.08	9.63	91.71	25 21	74 0	34.25
72	27 0	3.04	82.08	8.87	90.95	23 21	310 40	7.51
73	27 0	3.28	88.56	30.22	118.78	73 42	166 20	44.30
75	27 0	3.52	95.04	13.68	108.72	31 5	151 15	20.55
76	26 6	3.04	81.32	13.43	94.75	35 21	176 20	20.04
78	25 1½	3.28	82.61	18.40	101.01	44 53	129 45	34.59
79	26 7	2.80	75.25	4.98	80.23	14 14	80 5	17.17
80	26 7½	2.80	75.42	10.13	85.55	28 56	180 20	16.04
81	23 0	3.04	69.92	15.91	85.83	41 52	137 50	30.37
82	27 0	2.80	75.60	23.89	99.49	68 16	191 25	35.66
83	27 0	3.04	82.08	13.43	95.51	35 21	105 40	33.45
84	26 2	3.04	79.80	25.31	105.11	66 36	194 55	34.16
85	27 0	3.28	88.56	28.25	116.81	68 54	187 5	36.82
86	27 0	3.04	82.08	4.61	86.69	12 8	43 5	28.16
87	27 0	3.04	82.08	3.04	85.12	7 59	58 25	13.66
88	27 0	2.80	75.60	18.29	93.89	52 16	173 35	30.11
89	27 0	3.28	88.56	11.35	99.91	27 41	85 25	32.41

Premiums earned during May, 1913—Continued.

IN MACHINE SHOP—continued.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
90	25 0	$3.28	$82.00	$12.51	$94.51	30 30	310 10	9.83
91	27 0	3.28	88.56	18.03	106.59	43 59	113 35	38.72
92	27 0	3.04	82.08	17.38	99.46	45 44	198 35	23.02
93	25 0	3.04	76.00	18.31	94.31	48 11	169 40	28.39
94	25 1	3.28	82.41	24.21	106.62	59 3	196 20	30.07
95	27 0	3.28	88.56	1.03	89.59	2 30	54 50	4.55
99	26 6	3.28	87.74	4.61	92.35	11 14	65 0	17.28
102	27 0	3.52	95.04	23.05	118.09	52 23	179 5	29.25
103	26 3	2.80	73.83	.73	74.58	2 5	145 25	1.43
105	27 0	2.80	75.60	11.96	87.56	34 11	134 20	25.44
107	26 1½	3.04	79.61	3.49	83.10	9 11	29 5	31.57
108	27 0	3.04	82.08	1.26	83.34	3 19	30 50	10.75
110	26 7½	3.04	81.89	6.14	88.03	16 9	55 30	29.09
111	27 0	3.28	88.56	2.37	90.93	5 47	28 30	20.29
112	26 1½	3.04	79.61	9.91	89.52	26 5	94 20	27.65
115	27 0	3.04	82.08	.22	82.30	0 34	31 15	1.81
116	27 0	3.04	82.08	17.37	99.45	45 42	151 55	30.08
117	27 0	3.04	82.08	5.90	87.98	15 32	101 10	15.35
120	26 2½	3.04	79.99	13.59	93.58	35 45	134 25	26.59
121	5 0	2.80	14.00	.....	14.00	.....	7 30	.....
122	27 0	2.56	69.12	7.04	76.16	22 0	149 5	14.75
123	27 0	3.52	95.04	20.49	115.53	46 34	159 30	29.19
124	27 0	3.04	82.08	6.64	88.72	17 28	96 55	18.02
125	26 7½	3.52	94.82	5.50	100.32	12 30	126 50	9.85
126	10 0	3.04	30.40	.....	30.40	.....	9 20	.....
128	27 0	3.28	88.56	6.87	95.43	16 46	78 20	21.40
129	9 0	3.28	29.52	.57	30.09	1 23	15 0	9.22
133	10 0	3.04	30.40	.18	30.98	1 32	6 40	23.00
135	25 4¼	3.04	77.61	13.71	91.32	36 4	105 0	34.34
136	27 0	2.80	75.60	.04	75.64	0 7	25 55	.45
137	23 7½	3.04	72.77	13.84	86.61	36 25	131 10	27.76
138	25 0	3.04	76.00	1.74	77.74	4 34	146 15	3.12
139	27 0	3.52	95.04	13.13	108.17	29 51	158 35	18.82
140	25 2¼	2.80	70.79	2.57	73.36	7 21	71 15	10.31
141	27 0	3.04	82.08	11.11	93.19	29 14	125 0	23.38
143	26 0	3.04	79.04	11.35	90.39	29 52	92 15	32.37
144	26 7	2.80	75.25	9.69	84.94	27 42	105 5	26.36
145	2 0	2.80	5.60	.....	5.60	.....	3 10	.....
146	27 0	3.28	88.56	18.96	107.52	46 14	157 0	29.44
148	26 6	3.04	81.32	18.66	99.98	49 6	169 55	28.88
149	25 6	3.04	78.28	.....	78.28	.....	13 10	.....
151	25 3½	2.80	71.22	13.16	84.38	37 37	141 45	26.53
153	27 0	2.80	75.60	.31	75.91	0 54	59 30	1.51
154	25 6½	3.04	78.47	.86	79.33	2 15	3 45	60.00
155	26 5½	3.04	81.13	1.53	82.66	4 2	18 25	21.90
158	6 0	3.04	18.24	.71	18.95	1 52	21 10	8.81
159	27 0	2.56	69.12	22.21	91.33	69 25	198 15	35.01
162	26 5½	2.56	68.32	8.14	76.46	25 26	98 15	25.88
168	27 0	2.80	75.60	5.64	81.24	16 7	87 20	18.45
169	27 0	2.56	69.12	.....	69.12	.....	30 50	.....
176	27 0	2.80	75.60	4.54	80.14	12 59	95 0	13.66
177	26 5½	2.80	74.72	23.15	97.87	66 8	159 25	41.48
179	27 0	3.28	88.56	9.71	98.27	23 41	147 35	16.04
180	27 0	3.04	82.08	29.58	111.66	77 51	217 30	35.79
182	27 0	3.28	88.56	5.92	94.48	14 27	44 25	32.53
186	26 4	3.04	80.56	19.30	99.86	0 47	166 40	30.47
188	27 0	3.76	101.52	3.51	105.03	7 28	22 35	33.06
191	24 4	2.56	62.72	11.47	74.19	35 50	120 20	29.77
196	27 0	3.28	88.56	19.59	108.15	47 47	235 25	20.29
197	26 4½	2.56	68.00	3.79	71.79	11 51	80 0	14.81
178	27 0	3.04	82.08	.09	82.17	14	2 30	9.33
198	27 0	2.80	75.60	4.48	80.08	12 49	71 55	17.82
199	11 5	3.04	35.34	.49	35.83	1 17	44 15	2.90
200	26 4	3.04	80.56	.68	81.24	1 47	5 55	30.14
201	27 0	3.04	82.08	16.68	98.76	43 53	134 25	32.64
202	27 0	2.80	75.60	4.49	80.09	12 50	60 40	21.15
203	27 0	3.04	82.08	4.88	86.96	12 51	39 35	32.46
210	26 7½	3.28	88.35	22.97	111.32	56 1	182 55	30.62
211	26 1	3.04	79.42	18.71	98.13	49 14	185 0	26.62
212	27 0	3.04	82.08	11.05	93.13	29 5	167 5	17.40
215	26 7½	3.04	81.69	2.13	84.02	5 37	19 35	28.68
216	26 7½	2.80	75.42	7.49	82.91	21 24	85 25	25.05
220	26 7½	3.04	81.89	3.97	85.86	10 27	91 35	11.41
222	27 0	3.04	82.08	2.10	84.18	5 31	18 15	30.22
223	26 6½	2.80	75.07	1.57	76.64	4 29	20 0	22.41
224	25 0	3.04	76.00	5.07	81.07	13 20	48 20	27.58
225	27 0	3.28	88.56	12.24	100.80	29 52	120 40	24.75
226	25 7	3.04	78.66	16.65	95.31	43 49	152 25	28.74
227	27 0	2.80	75.60	3.47	79.07	9 55	34 40	28.60
287	25 ½	3.04	76.19	26.57	102.76	69 55	192 30	36.32
Total	.....	.....	.....	1,398.06	.....	3,601 8	14,583 35	23.14

Premium percentage of shop=3,601 hours 8 minutes÷14,583 hours 35 minutes=24.69 per cent. Time worked on premium is 45.65 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY CRANEMAN.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
283	28 7	[1] $62.00	$59.68	$1.26	$60.94	4 49	14 5	34.20

[1] Per month.

Hours worked on premium is 1.38 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned during May, 1913—Continued.

BY CHIPPER.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
312	27 0	$2.24	$60.48	$0.82	$61.30	2 55	8 0	36.45

Hours worked on premium is 3.7 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY MACHINISTS' HELPERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
42	27 0	$2.80	$75.60	$5.70	$81.30	16 18	58 35	27.82
174	27 0	2.40	64.80	1.07	65.87	3 33	48 55	7.25
228	27 0	2.00	54.00	3.85	57.85	15 25	46 15	33.33
232	27 0	2.00	54.00	7.38	61.38	29 30	177 0	16.66
234	27 0	2.40	64.89	9.54	74.34	31 47	82 30	38.52
235	27 0	2.40	64.80	3.05	67.85	10 9	60 0	16.91
233	27 0	2.24	60.48	6.63	67.11	23 41	68 5	34.78
236	27 0	2.00	54.00	3.24	57.34	12 39	40 0	32.45
240	25 0	2.00	50.00	3.77	53.77	15 4	56 25	26.70
244	27 0	2.00	54.00	3.61	57.61	14 27	44 25	32.53
247	26 4	1.84	48.76	.40	49.16	1 44	5 35	31.04
252	27 0	2.00	54.00	16.49	70.49	65 59	158 5	41.73
258	26 0	1.84	47.84	2.98	50.82	12 59	40 0	32.45
260	27 0	1.84	49.68	.....	49.68	.....	29 35	.....
263	27 0	2.00	54.00	3.70	57.70	14 48	45 30	32.52
272	25 4	2.00	51.00	.34	51.34	1 22	12 45	10.71
275	27 0	2.00	54.00	8.09	62.09	32 21	120 15	26.90
277	26 3	2.00	52.75	3.59	56.34	14 22	40 40	35.32
278	26 4	1.84	48.76	1.71	50.47	7 27	22 35	32.98
292	27 0	2.24	60.48	8.15	68.63	29 8	114 25	25.46
294	25 0	2.00	50.00	4.43	54.43	17 42	55 15	32.03
295	26 0	1.84	47.84	1.70	49.54	7 24	21 20	34.68
298	27 0	2.00	54.00	9.10	63.10	36 24	96 55	37.55
303	25 5	2.00	51.25	9.38	60.63	37 32	154 10	24.34
309	27 0	1.84	49.68	14.81	64.49	63 24	184 0	35.00
314	24 7½	1.84	45.88	.44	46.32	1 56	6 25	30.12
Total	.....	.....	.....	133.15	.....	518 25	1,789 40	28.06

Premium percentage of shop=518 hours 25 minutes÷1,789 hours 40 minutes=28.97 per cent. Time worked on premium is 12.83 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY LABORERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
54	27 0	$2.24	$60.48	$0.49	$60.97	1 45	5 20	32.81
4	27 0	1.84	49.68	8.94	58.62	38 53	132 0	29.45
5	5 0	1.84	9.20	.22	9.42	57	3 40	25.90
7	28 0	2.00	56.00	1.23	57.23	4 55	15 35	31.55
11	28 0	2.00	56.00	.26	56.26	1 2	3 40	28.18
12	17 0	2.00	34.00	.44	34.44	1 46	6 15	28.26
14	25 4	2.00	51.00	11.92	62.92	47 44	140 10	34.05
16	28 0	2.24	62.72	.03	62.75	7	1 25	8.23
17	27 0	1.84	49.68	1.19	50.87	5 11	39 35	13.09
18	27 0	2.00	54.00	2.29	56.29	9 10	43 35	21.03
22	27 0	2.00	54.00	5.34	59.34	21 23	45 40	46.82
24	27 4	2.00	55.00	2.33	57.33	9 20	38 45	24.08
26	26 4	1.84	48.76	2.15	50.91	9 22	45 0	20.81
36	27 0	1.84	49.68	.18	49.86	48	2 0	40.00
37	26 4	1.84	48.76	6.17	54.93	26 50	100 10	26.78
41	25 0	1.84	46.00	1.95	47.95	8 29	41 15	20.56
43	26 0	1.84	47.84	.18	48.02	48	2 0	40.00
44	21 0	1.84	38.64	.48	39.12	2 7	42 5	5.02
48	26 0	1.84	47.84	.71	48.55	3 4	58 45	5.21
52	26 0	1.84	47.84	.05	47.89	14	22 45	1.02
54	27 0	1.84	49.68	.06	49.74	17	13 0	2.17
58	26 7	1.84	49.45	2.05	51.50	8 52	41 5	21.58
Total	.....	.....	.....	48.66	.....	203 4	843 45	23.02

Premium percentage of shop=203 hours 4 minutes÷843 hours 45 minutes=24.06 per cent. Time worked on premium is 12.71 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY RIGGER.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
13	30 0	$62.00	$62.00	$1.28	$63.28	4 54	15 35	31.44

Hours worked on premium is 6.49 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

Premiums earned during May, 1913—Continued.

BY FIREMAN.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per ct.*
39	30 0	[1] $75.00	$75.00	$1.52	$76.52	4 55	15 35	31.55

[1] Per month.

Hours worked on premium is 6.49 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY TEAMSTERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
3	27 0	$2.00	$54.00	$7.94	$61.94	31 45	134 0	23.69
8	26 4	2.24	59.36	7.51	66.87	26 51	83 30	32.15
28	27 0	2.00	54.00	6.47	60.47	25 53	83 20	31.06
29	23 0	2.00	46.00	5.49	51.49	21 57	85 35	25.64
30	22 0	2.00	44.00	2.78	46.78	11 8	73 30	15.14
45	27 0	2.00	54.00	9.50	63.50	37 59	130 20	29.14
Total				39.69		155 33	590 15	26.14

Premium percentage of shop = 155 hours 33 minutes÷590 hours 15 minutes=26.35 per cent. Time worked on premium is 48.38 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY BLACKSMITHS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
3	27 0	$3.52	$95.04	$14.98	$110.02	34 2	82 5	41.46
6	27 0	3.28	88.56	4.38	92.94	10 41	31 25	34.00
Total				19.36		44 43	113 30	37.73

Premium percentage of shop=44 hours 43 minutes÷113 hours 30 minutes=39.39 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 8.81 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY BLACKSMITH HELPERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
25	26 0	$2.00	$52.00	$8.51	$60.51	34 2	82 5	41.46
29	26 0	2.00	52.00	2.67	54.67	10 41	31 25	34.00
Total				11.18		44 43	113 30	37.73

Premium percentage of shop = 44 hours 43 minutes÷113 hours 30 minutes = 39.39 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 8.81 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

BY CARPENTERS.

Number.	Time.	Day rate.	Total pay, day rate.	Premium.	Total amount paid.	Hours of premium time paid for.	Hours worked on premium.	Average premium earned.
	Days. hrs.					*Hrs. min.*	*Hrs. min.*	*Per cent.*
58	27 0	$3.04	$82.08	$7.92	$90.00	20 51	36 15	57.51
63	27 0	3.04	82.08	13.47	95.55	35 27	53 40	66.05
65	27 0	3.28	88.56	.39	88.95	0 57	2 20	40.71
67	27 0	2.80	75.60	12.44	88.04	35 33	53 45	66.13
68	27 0	3.04	82.08	2.39	84.47	6 17	14 50	42.35
Total				36.61		99 5	160 50	54.55

Premium percentage of shop=99 hours 5 minutes÷160 hours 50 minutes=61.60 per cent. Hours worked on premium is 5.38 per cent of the entire working time of all employees of the same class.

[Extract from the Report of the Chief of Ordnance.]

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT.

In my annual reports for the fiscal years 1911 and 1912 I described the Taylor system of scientific management as it had been installed and put in practical operation at the Watertown Arsenal, and as certain features were in process of installation at other arsenals. The system has continued to operate well at the Watertown Arsenal, where a radical advance over the stage which its introduction has reached at the other arsenals is the application of the time study and premium features. These features have been fully described in my annual report for the fiscal year 1912; they relate to the ascertainment of the best method of doing a job of work, to the instruction of the workman in this method, and to the stimulation which is offered him for carefully following it. As there is very little repetition work at the Watertown Arsenal, and as the number of men who are capable of making time studies is limited, it is possible to have only a portion of the force at any given time engaged upon premium jobs. Effort is constantly being made, however, to increase their number, and the success which has been attained is made evident by the fact that whereas in August of 1912 only 114 men, of about 600 employed at that establishment, worked under the premium system, in the month of August, 1913, this number had been increased to 236; and while the amount paid out in premiums to these men in August, 1912, was $1,037.91, the amount so paid out in August, 1913, was $2,258.51. In the month of May, 1913, the percentage of the entire working time of the whole number of employees in the foundry, of the class who worked premium jobs at all, which was spent on such jobs was 66.95,

and in the machine shop this percentage was 45.68. In the month of August, 1913, the percentage in the foundry was very nearly the same, namely, 67.18, but in the machine shop the figures advanced to 53.51 per cent. In the month of August the average premium earned by molders for the time they worked on premium jobs was 27.64 per cent of their day rate, and for the machinists this average was 26.96 per cent. The total amount paid out in premiums during the 17 months from January 1, 1912, to May 31, 1913, was something over $22,000. This was over and above the regular wages, which were the same as those in the vicinity, no reduction having been made.

It is a difficult matter to give in figures the amount of advantage which has accrued to the Government from the use of the system. None of the principal product of the arsenal which was completed during the fiscal year 1913 was identical with what had been completed during the preceding fiscal year, so that comparative costs are difficult. Also, none of the product of the arsenal is also procured from private manufacturers, so that this kind of comparison can not be had. A private establishment has very conclusive evidence as to the increase of economy and efficiency in production in the effect upon the balance of profit which is available for dividends; but this highly satisfactory method of estimating efficiency is not applicable in Government establishments. Analyses of a large number of different jobs, taken at random, made both in the fiscal years 1912 and 1913, show that the production of the individual when working under the premium system, with the rate set after careful study, is between two and a half and three times that under the ordinary daywork system. In four instances the same job was done by the same men under the two systems, and the average time taken under the daywork system was 2.72 times that taken under the premium system. It should be remembered that when time is gained in this way there is a saving not only of the pay of the workmen but also of the frequently much more considerable overhead charges. A computation might be made as to the total saving to the Government upon this basis as compared with what the cost would have been expected to be under the daywork system, but of course it could only be approximate. It might be stated, however, that there has been revoked from allotments made Watertown Arsenal for doing its work during the fiscal year 1913 the sum of $73,401.05. This is the actual saving as compared with the amount which it was estimated in advance that the work would cost. It must be remembered, however, that part of these estimates were made in expectation of the use of the system which resulted in the savings, so that it does not afford a full estimate of the value of the system as compared with an estimate of the cost which might have been made without it. At some of the other arsenals the situation is better in this respect, for the reason that similar articles are both fabricated at the arsenal and procured from private manufacturers.

At the Frankford Arsenal this is the case to a very considerable extent, and as a result it is computed that in the manufacture of Artillery ammunition and small-arms ammunition at that arsenal a saving of over $1,500,000 was made during the year as compared with what the same ammunition would have cost if procured from private establishments at the best prices which were offered. Also, in the manufacture under contract of these same two classes of ammunition, $400,000 more were paid than it would have cost to make it at the arsenal. The Taylor system, as taught by experts in shop management under this system, has not been introduced in the manufacture of Artillery ammunition or small-arms ammunition at the Frankford Arsenal, but that arsenal has for a long time practiced the piecework system of payment, has recently introduced a premium system, and has paid careful attention to the same kind of methods of efficiency as those pertaining to the Taylor system, and has had the benefit of all the assistance which could be given by the Watertown Arsenal in taking advantage of the teachings of Mr. Barth, Taylor system expert, who had been employed at the latter place.

At the Rock Island Arsenal the systemization features of Mr. Taylor's system have been in course of installation for nearly two years, and elsewhere in this report are stated comparisons of costs of the different articles fabricated as compared with former prices. The method used in getting the system going at the Rock Island Arsenal was to send one of its officers to Watertown Arsenal for the purpose of learning as much as he could absorb of the system established at the latter place. It is not claimed that in the time that this officer spent at the Watertown Arsenal he could become sufficiently master of the system as to install it in its entirety at the Rock Island Arsenal, but he has been able to carry away enough to keep the arsenal staff well employed for nearly two years in putting what he learned into effect.

At the Watervliet Arsenal similar effort has been made, but there was some disadvantage to this arsenal from the fact that the visiting officer had to leave the department through the expiration of his detail a few months after he had returned from the Watertown Arsenal. Watervliet also labors under the disadvantage of inability to compare the cost of its product with the price of private manufacturers, since the field and seacoast cannon which it constructs are not now procured from private sources, the work of the department not being sufficient to keep the arsenal going to such an extent as would be desirable.

The Springfield Armory also uses in its very efficient manufacture many of the principles of the Taylor system, although they were not obtained from Mr. Taylor or his experts, but have been applied through many years, and lately at an increasing rate, by the officers of the armory. The principal output of the armory, the caliber .30 rifle, is believed to be made with remarkable economy; but here again the most satisfactory comparison possible, namely, that with the cost of outside production, is not available, since the Government makes all of its own rifles. The manufacture of automatic pistols has, however, just been inaugurated at the armory, and in the course of a year it will be possible to make comparison of its cost with the price which is paid private manufacturers.

Operations at the Watertown Arsenal had been going on with remarkable smoothness since my last annual report, when, in June last, two petitions signed by something over 300 of its workmen were presented, asking the discontinuance of the system. The features objected to were those relating to time study and the premium system of payment. A number of complaints were instanced, but these were of such trivial and unsound nature and were so easily answered that it seems difficult to believe that they furnished the real basis for the number of signatures that were appended to the petitions. The petitions were addressed to the Secretary of War, and I have dealt with them in a memorandum which accompanies this report as Appendix I. I will not attempt to give even the substance of the memorandum, but will state its conclusion that I believe this apparent opposition to be artificially worked up by a few discontented employees, with the assistance of influence outside the arsenal, and I have recommended that the subject be investigated by the Commission on Industrial Relations appointed by the President under the act approved August 23, 1912. The War Department has accepted my recommendation and has taken steps to induce the commission to make the investigation referred to.

When, nearly two years ago, the extension of the systemization features of the Taylor system from the Watertown Arsenal to the Rock Island Arsenal was undertaken it met with strenuous opposition from a number of the employees, which opposition was fostered and to a certain extent led by officials of labor organizations outside the arsenal. Some of these officials went to the vicinity of the arsenal and used their efforts to prevent the installation of the system. Labor representatives in Washington also exerted their influence against it, and political pressure was resorted to. The opposition took the form of a stand against what is known as the "job card," which is a ticket upon which is noted the name of the job upon which a workman is employed, the name of the workman, the designation of the machine to be used, the time of starting on the job, the time of finishing it, and a few other items of information. Its object is to secure accurate record of the time required to do the work and of certain other facts, such as its inspection, etc., in order that its cost may be properly charged to the order to which it belongs, which often includes a large number of just such jobs. The opposition to the card was at the beginning of the Taylor system, whose introduction it was intended to forestall at its inception. It was not yielded to; but careful explanation of the object of the card was made, and of the fact that it had nothing to do with the subject of wages, but was intended to promote accuracy of cost keeping, and its use was insisted upon. No trouble followed, or has followed since, and the employees have learned from experience that neither this nor any other part of the system which has been introduced contains any element to their disadvantage, as was fully explained to them in the beginning.

[Extract from the Report of the Chief of Ordnance, 1914.]

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT.

In my annual reports for the fiscal years 1911, 1912, and 1913 I have very fully set forth the experience which this department has had in the introduction of improved methods of shop operation in the various arsenals, and have described the advantages which have resulted from them, both to the Government and to the employees of the department. While systemization features have been introduced to a considerable extent in all the arsenals, the feature which relates directly to the efforts made by individual workmen and to the rewards given for good results have been applied at the Watertown Arsenal only. This feature involves what is known as "time study" of any given piece of work, the consequent fixing of a time in which it should properly be done, and the setting of a rate for reaching or approximating this time; the idea being that the Government would be benefited by an increase of individual output and the employee would be benefited by an increase in his pay. I have so fully set forth in my former reports the advantages which have resulted, both to the Government and the employees, from the use of this system that there is little left to be added, except to state in a general way that with the extension of the system, which is continually being made, the advantages have continued and increased. At the Watertown Arsenal the time study and premium features have been extended during the last fiscal year to branches of the establishment which had not previously enjoyed them and the amount of premium work in most of the individual branches has been increased. The following figures relate to the month of August, 1914:

Employees.	Number employed on premium work.	Average premium over and above the regular pay, expressed as a percentage of the latter.	Percentage of all the work done which was performed under premium.
Molders	11	29.27	77.51
Machinists	167	28.18	54.39
Machinists' helpers	29	28.08	12.98
Laborers	29	22.03	9.63
Carpenters	8	29.50	18.59
Blacksmiths	5	20.59	13.93
Teamsters	5	26.87	98.59
Blacksmiths' helpers	6	19.29	12.40
Carpenters' helpers	1	31.43	.31
Screw makers	1	34.16	100.00
Chippers	1	42.01	27.79
Furnace helpers	1	23.11	2.09
Steam-hammer drivers	1	27.01	3.41
Skilled workmen	1	23.16	18.19
Masons' helpers	1	28.06	35.51
Molders' helpers	3	65.38	1.74
Painters	2	10.10	11.81
Skilled laborers	2	22.74	19.79

It thus appears that during that month the 11 molders, for instance, worked, upon the whole, 77.51 per cent of their time upon premium work, and that during this time they earned over and above their daily wages a sum which amounted, as a whole, to 29.7 per cent of such wages. As their regular wages vary from $3.04 to $3.68 per day, they thus earned during 77.51 per cent of their time an extra amount per day varying from about $0.90 to $1.10.

As it is considered advantageous to have the men earn these premiums, and as the opportunities for placing men upon premium jobs can be made greater by care and attention upon the part of the foremen, and the output of the workmen and their consequent earnings can be increased by such care and attention, a system is employed of paying premiums to the foremen, which depend upon the number of their men who are given work upon premium jobs and upon the amount which is made by the men. Under this system there was paid to eight foremen, during the month of August, a sum averaging about 10 per cent of their regular wages. Including this last sum, the total amount which was paid out in premiums at the arsenal during the month of August was $2,657.29, and the total amount of time which was spent in work under the premium system was 26.25 per cent of all the working time at the arsenal during that month.

The time study of work and the accompanying premium system of payment are not liked by many of the labor organizations, and these have manifested strong hostility to the system in practice at the Watertown Arsenal and have exerted their power to stop it. Bills have been introduced in Congress to this effect, and have received the favor-

able report of some committees. A great many objections have been urged, some of which relate to the economical and other advantages realized by the Government and some to the effect upon the employees. The failure of advantage to the Government is not given by any committee of Congress as a reason for hostile action against the system.

The advantage has been so completely and frequently demonstrated that it need not be dwelt upon now. The disadvantage to the employees, who are held by labor organizations to be under their protection, has included two principal items: First, an employee, such as a machinist, of high grade is not given opportunities to earn premium under the system as numerous and as profitable as are those which are given to machinists of lower grade, the accompanying allegation being made that an object of the system is to do away with the high-grade machinist and substitute for him an abnormally stimulated man of lower grade, developed to great speed along one line only, and of less general value in industrial work than the higher-grade man whom he is intended to displace. The figures at the Watertown Arsenal obviate any necessity for discussion of the question of the desirability of the substitution of low-grade special workers for high-grade all-around artisans, which is a process striven for in all manufacturing operations. At the arsenal high-grade machinists receive $3.52 per day, low-grade machinists $2.56 per day, and certain machine operators $2.40 and $2.24 per day. During a certain recorded period there was paid to the high-grade machinists for their increased earnings under the premium system a sum averaging $426.14 each, which was equivalent, for each one of them, to 121 days' pay. There was paid to the low-grade machinists, the $2.56 men, a sum averaging $144.74 each, amounting to 56 days' pay; and there were paid to the $2.40 and $2.24 machine operators sums amounting, respectively, to $117.22 and $32.74 each, or 49 and 14 days' pay. The great relative advantage for the high-grade man is thus seen at a glance, and this particular charge in regard to the effect of the system is shown to be at absolute variance with the facts.

The second charge made is that the system involves the undesirable speeding up of men, stimulated by reward and punishment, to their resulting physical, mental, and moral detriment. When this charge was first made, at the beginning of the practice of the system in the Ordnance Department, it was speculative only and based upon estimates of the practice which were adduced from the reading of the writings of the advocates of the system, and it could be met only by arguments to the effect that these writings were misread and that the department had no intention of inflicting any of the evils apprehended on the workmen. The features objected to have now been in practice at the Watertown Arsenal for something over three years, and in examining the charge of disadvantage to the employees we are no longer required to deal with speculations and premises, but can appeal to a rather extensive experience, which only needs investigation for its interpretation. An investigation worthy of the name has been made by one body only, a special committee appointed by the House of Representatives about two years ago, while the practice of the system in this department was still quite new. This committee visited Watertown Arsenal and other establishments and took a great deal of testimony, which was printed in three rather large volumes. As a result of this extensive investigation the committee did not find, and did not say that it found, anything to the disadvantage of the employees in practice anywhere in the Ordnance Department. It stigmatized certain practices as undesirable, but did not state it found these practices in existence at any of the arsenals, and there is no difficulty in joining heartily in its statements in regard to them. It reported that the whole subject was at that time too new for definite conclusions in regard to it to be made, and it recommended that there should be no legislation by Congress upon the subject at that time.

Some time after the submission of this report of the committee Congress, in August, 1912, created the Commission on Industrial Relations, of which the membership was appointed and confirmed about a year later. Following the recommendation of the Chief of Ordnance the subject of the practice of scientific management at the arsenals of the Ordnance Department was taken up by the commission, which now has it under examination. It has taken considerable testimony, but has not yet personally investigated any of the arsenals. In the meantime bills have been introduced in Congress hostile to the system, as above mentioned, prominent among which is one known as "H. R. 17800," introduced by Mr. DEITRICK in the House of Representatives on July 9, 1914, following other bills of substantially the same effect which had been introduced earlier. The Committee on Labor of the House has taken some testimony upon the subject of these bills and has made a report recommending legislation against the time-study and premium system. The testimony taken was not nearly as extensive as that published by the special investigating committee of the House, above mentioned, and the Committee on Labor has not visited any of the arsenals. Certain statements made in the report of the committee are so erroneous that they seem only to be accounted for by the difficulty of appreciating verbal testimony without the acquaintance with actual conditions which could only be had by a visit to the establishment concerned. For instance, it is said in the report of the committee that the system "really operates to reduce the workmen's wages, not to increase them." The figures given above in this report, and hundreds of others of like purport which are to be found in the records of this department, many of which have been published, make this statement utterly impossible of comprehension under any other explanation of it than the one which I have given in regard to the difficulty of appreciating the conditions without a personal local examination.

Since the Commission on Industrial Relations has been especially created by Congress to give attention to such questions as this one, in view of its careful selection by the President and confirmation by the Senate, and of the expense which the country is incurring in maintaining it, it seems strongly to be desired that Congress shall not take action upon a subject to which the commission is devoting an important share of its attention until after it shall have received the report and recommendation of this body which it has created as its agent.

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

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the proposition, I wish to read a very brief letter bearing out the contentions which I made, and I did not think it would be disputed, that at the Frankford Arsenal a meeting was held in which this system was condemned and steps were taken to convey the condemnation of the employees to the Senate. The letter I have is, in effect, that a petition was mailed to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and I understood from the discussion this morning that that had been done. More than 300 men of the Watertown Arsenal petitioned the Secretary of War against this system and that petition is on file. As far as the statement of the Secretary of War is concerned, if he is anxious to wait for the report of the Industrial Commission, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon, or any other Senator in favor of striking out the language, Why it is that no one has paid any attention to the three committee reports on this subject? Is there any more likelihood that they will pay attention to the report of the Industrial Commission than they paid to the report of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate, headed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], or the present Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, when he was a Member of the House, or with Mr. Redfield, cooperating and joining in his conclusion? Is it likely, when the reports and conclusions of those three committees were utterly ignored by Congress, that they are going to pay any attention to what the Industrial Commission may report?

I wish to correct the Senator from Oregon in one other particular. I will say, in order to relieve his mind, that the retention of this language in the bill will not interfere in any way with any system that has been established anywhere in the United States in any Government arsenal except to the extent of preventing them from paying premiums and bonuses. The system to which I called attention earlier in the day is a very complex and comprehensive method of determining the efficiency of men, every element in the man's character is taken into consideration, the way in which he works, the number of days, the time they arrive and the time they leave, so that there is absolutely no difficulty, as I have said a dozen times, in any intelligent superintendent determining whether a man is efficient or not, and in grading him according to his efficiency, and by instituting piecework for this bonus or premium system we can do what everybody here seems to want to do, give the most efficient man the most money.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator has asked me a dozen questions without giving me an opportunity to answer any of them.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not intend to bring the Senator into an argument with my questions.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me answer one question.

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to say as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and as a member of any other committee of the Senate, I am not going to discharge my duties by paying attention to reports of other committees connected with other subject matters.

Mr. HUGHES. That is exactly it, and consequently the Senator need not wait until the report of the Industrial Commission.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me finish. This particular matter may have been investigated by other committees in connection with other matters, but when it comes before the Military Affairs Committee it comes before that committee with reference to the industrial work of the Government of the United States, and we are to consider it in that connection and not connected with anything else.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. 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	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard
Bankhead	Gore	Nelson	Shively
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Smoot
Burleigh	James	Owen	Swanson
Burton	Jones	Page	Thomas
Camden	Kern	Perkins	Thompson
Chilton	La Follette	Pittman	Tillman
Clapp	Lippitt	Pomerene	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Ransdell	Warren
du Pont.	McCumber	Root	White
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Williams

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

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

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a division of the amendment, the division to be at line 21, the word "nor," separating the question of bonuses from the stop-watch provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the vote be taken on the following part of the proposed committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 70, where the committee proposes to strike out the proviso, divide the question so that the first question will be to strike out the following words:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I presume under the rules we would have a right to perfect the amendment before the vote is taken upon it as to whether it shall be stricken out, and I wish to propose an amendment to the first subdivision.

From the arguments I have heard here I do not find that there is any serious objection on the part of anyone to any proper method of arriving at some means of efficiency, not to follow that up by a constant watch upon the activities of workmen, but a mere means in the beginning to ascertain what is the average as to the time in which a workman under ordinary conditions will perform a given amount of work, and from that average to determine what would be the efficiency in the production of any article in our great manufactures.

Mr. President, with that in view I would suggest the following amendment to the first subdivision of the proviso, and I especially ask the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge. Add, after the word "work," in line 21, which is the end of the first subdivision, these words, "except as a temporary means of arriving at an efficient and economic method of production," so that the provision would read:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or with 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 except as a temporary means of arriving at an efficient and economic method of production.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator permit a question at that point?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think there would be some difficulty about the construction in practice of the use of the word "temporary" there. I think it would be claimed very quickly by those who are opposed to this provision that the test was being continued to a point where it had ceased to be temporary. Would the effect the Senator desires to produce be marred at all by striking out the word "temporary"?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it would, Mr. President, because then it might possibly give the excuse to continue the system. My idea of the use of the word "temporary" is so that this expedient, if used at all, can be used only for the purpose of arriving at the time which might properly be employed in arriving at information and not for the purpose of keeping a tab continually upon the movements of the employees.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It seemed to me that without the word "temporary" it could not be permanent, if it was simply as a means to establish a standard that could not be construed to give them a permanent warrant. My inquiry was directed to that point.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that it would not be construed to give them a permanent warrant, but to be doubly certain that it can not be so construed I use the word "temporary."

Mr. President, I think that anyone can understand the purpose of this amendment. There are a great many in the country who understand this time process as being one that is to be continued not for the purpose of any investigation, but for the purpose of compelling every employee to produce a given amount of work in a given time and to control his movements. Others claim that the only purpose is to give us a standard of efficiency to guide the employer in the future. In order that it may not be abused, that it may be used only as a standard of efficiency and information, and not for general use in conducting the business, I offer the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. I move to lay the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota on the table. I do that because of the time we have already consumed on the matter. The Senator from North Dakota understands the situation, I am sure, and will not be offended, but I should like to get a vote on the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment is considered, where are we going to be? There is a motion to strike out, and it is now proposed to amend the part to be stricken out. How can that be done?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it is not stricken out. The rule, as I understand, provides that an amendment or any portion of the bill must be perfected before it can be moved to be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the rule applicable in this case. That is the rule where there is a motion to strike out and insert. There has been no motion to strike out and insert in this instance. The question is on laying the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the first portion of the committee amendment, beginning in line 13, on page 70, and ending with the word "work," in line 21.

Mr. HUGHES. I move to lay on the table the first portion of the committee amendment striking out the House language, and on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LIPPITT. What is the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is to lay the first portion of the committee amendment on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. What will be the effect of that if agreed to, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The effect of laying the amendment on the table is, of course, to restore the House text. The Senator from New Jersey calls for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]; but to-day I received this telegram:

NEW YORK, *February 23, 1915.*

Senator GALLINGER, *Washington, D. C.:*

Whenever you desire to vote in my absence during balance of session please consider yourself released from pair.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN.

Considering myself released, I vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and on that account withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], who is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] was in the Chamber this morning, but he being sick and desiring to leave, I agreed to pair with him on this question. Were he present, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea"; and were I at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. RANSDELL (when the name of Mr. THORNTON was called). The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is absent on account of sickness. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and vote "yea."

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CLAPP. In view of his absence and my having a general pair with him, I feel constrained to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is detained from the Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND], on account of sickness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have learned that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] did not vote. Having a pair with him, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Ashurst	Johnson	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard
Chilton	Kern	Myers	Shively
Culberson	La Follette	Norris	Swanson
Gronna	Lane	Overman	Thompson
Hollis	Lewis	Pittman	Walsh
Hughes	Lodge	Poindexter	White
James	Martin, Va.	Pomerene	

NAYS—33.

Bankhead	Fletcher	Page	Thomas
Brandegee	Gallinger	Perkins	Townsend
Bristow	Gore	Ransdell	Warren
Bryan	Jones	Root	Weeks
Burleigh	Lippitt	Shafroth	Williams
Burton	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Camden	Newlands	Smoot	
Chamberlain	Oliver	Stephenson	
du Pont	Owen	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—36.

Borah	Dillingham	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Catron	Goff	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Hardwick	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Robinson	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Sutherland
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Shields	Thornton
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Simmons	Tillman
Cummins	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Vardaman

So the motion to lay the first portion of the committee amendment on the table was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the first portion of the committee amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I simply want to say that I voted against laying the amendment of the committee on the table because I wanted to vote on the two propositions involved in the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. They have been divided.

Mr. JONES. I understand that, but I want to make a brief statement. I am opposed to the stop-watch proposition, and shall therefore vote against the committee amendment proposing to strike out the provision of the House bill. I am in favor, however, of the bonus or premium system, and therefore desire to vote in favor of the committee amendment striking out that part of the House provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first part of the amendment reported by the committee. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. JAMES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce the same transfer of my pair as before, and vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and on that account withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). For the reason before announced, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and refrain from voting.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the previous roll call. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. Having a pair with him, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. OWEN. Transferring my pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to inquire whether my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bankhead	du Pont	Owen	Smoot
Brandegee	Fletcher	Page	Stephenson
Bristow	Gallinger	Perkins	Sterling
Bryan	Gore	Ransdell	Thomas
Burleigh	Lippitt	Root	Warren
Burton	McCumber	Shafroth	Weeks
Camden	Newlands	Sherman	Works
Chamberlain	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—29.

Ashurst	Johnson	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Chilton	Jones	Myers	Swanson
Clapp	Kern	Norris	Thompson
Culberson	La Follette	Pittman	Walsh
Gronna	Lane	Poindexter	White
Hollis	Lewis	Pomerene	
Hughes	Lodge	Sheppard	
James	Martin, Va.	Shively	

NOT VOTING—36.

Borah	Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Brady	Goff	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Hardwick	Penrose	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Reed	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Robinson	Thornton
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Tillman
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Shields	Townsend
Cummins	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Vardaman
Dillingham	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Williams

So, the first part of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the second proposition of the amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. Beginning with the word "nor," on line 21, page 70, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

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.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In that connection I should like to call attention to the fact that at some of the Government arsenals the stop-watch method of testing the capacity of the employees has already been used, and data upon which it is proposed to govern the production and pay of men have been obtained, so that the striking out of the first part of this amendment, if it had been stricken out, would not in any way have affected the application of this system in those arsenals. They have obtained the necessary data. Now, if the second part of the amendment should be retained in the law when it passes the Congress, even though the first part should be stricken out, the same identical result would be obtained as though the entire amendment were kept in the law, the result being, in my judgment, to attempt to apply the rules of machinery to flesh and blood. I do not think it is necessary to efficiency or economy. I think it is just as obnoxious as the first half, and upon the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the second half of this amendment.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce the same transfer as heretofore, and vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). For the reasons before given I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and for that reason I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Sterling
Brandegee	Gallinger	Page	Thomas
Bristow	Gore	Perkins	Townsend
Bryan	Jones	Ransdell	Warren
Burleigh	Lippitt	Root	Weeks
Burton	Lodge	Shafroth	Works
Camden	McCumber	Sherman	
Chamberlain	Newlands	Smoot	
du Pont	Oliver	Stephenson	

NAYS—27.

Ashurst	James	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Chilton	Johnson	Myers	Simmons
Clapp	Kern	Norris	Swanson
Culberson	La Follette	Pittman	Thompson
Gronna	Lane	Poindexter	Walsh
Hollis	Lewis	Pomerene	White
Hughes	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—36.

Borah	Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Brady	Goff	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Hardwick	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Reed	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Robinson	Sutherland
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Thornton
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Shields	Tillman
Cummins	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Vardaman
Dillingham	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Williams

So the second part of the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Before the bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole, I wish to say that one change in the bill necessitated a slight change in the bill as it was adopted last evening. The President of the Senate will remember the long discussion about the point of order which was sustained against a certain provision in the bill. Now I desire to move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to on page 25, line 19, and move to amend by inserting "$450,000" instead of "$440,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was adopted will be reconsidered. The Senator from Oregon moves to amend by inserting "$450,000" instead of "$440,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 36, line 23, I ask to reconsider the vote whereby the numerals "$7,746,715.44" were inserted, and amend by inserting "$7,905,415.44" in lieu thereof. It is simply a transposition of figures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the total, on line 23, page 36, and insert "$7,905,415.44."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is one other amendment, Mr. President. I move to reconsider the amendment on page 43, line 9, strike out the numerals "$2,067,558.60," and amend by inserting "$2,106,058.60."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to change the total so as to read "$2,106,058.60."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, on page 69, line 8, there is an item which calls for the testing of types of armored motor cars, and appropriates $25,000 for that purpose. I am informed that the manufacturers of cars in this country are shipping them by the hundred over to Europe, and they are giving satisfactory service, and are being tested by actual combat with shot and shell. There is no information needed on the subject. We are manufacturing a type of them good enough to kill and prevent people from being killed in Europe in one of the greatest wars that has ever occurred in the history of the world. Why there should be an appropriation of $25,000 made for testing them for the information of this Government, when they are being so thoroughly tested in actual warfare, is more than I can understand. If the matter is subject to a point of order I will raise the point or order against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The item was agreed to on yesterday.

Mr. LANE. I should like to have the action of the committee reconsidered, with a view to striking it out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon move to reconsider?

Mr. LANE. On the statement made to me that they are being tested, that we are manufacturing them and shipping them in parts and in pieces by the hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire if the Senator from Oregon voted for that amendment?

Mr. LANE. I will say for the information of the Senator from Colorado that I went into attendance on the Committee on Indian Affairs yesterday at 10.30 in the morning, and stayed until 6 o'clock at night without any lunch, and I had no opportunity to vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that obviates the point of order. I make that point of order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I voted for that amendment, but since that time my attention has been called to this very fact. It seems to me a most monstrous proposition. I realize very well who introduced it, and regret to move a reconsideration; but I move to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was agreed to. It was adopted on a viva voce vote.

Mr. LANE. I simply wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the facts as I am told they exist. If it is true, what is the necessity of spending this money? Is it too late now, or why should it be too late, to stop what is, in my opinion, a useless expenditure under the circumstances?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I will state for the benefit of my colleague that, on lines 6 and 7, there was appropriated by the House $50,000 for the purchase and manufacture of armored motor cars. If the Committee of the Whole is not sustained now, the effect of it would be to strike out the $25,000 and reinstate the $50,000. We did not have enough information to advise us that what my colleague says is warranted by the facts as to the quality and character of these armored motor cars. We did not think the Government ought to invest $50,000 for the purchase of motor cars without knowing something about them.

Mr. LANE. I should like to have that struck out, too. I assure my colleague that I am informed that we are manufacturing the best type of armored motor cars in the world, and they are being accepted by the most careful experts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. In making some examination for a speech I made here on national defense I examined into this question of motor trucks and motor cars. We have not an armored motor car in the Army; we have not a motor truck; and I was officially informed at the War Department that they had not been able yet to find a perfect truck; they were still testing them and looking for a perfect truck. Canada has bought a lot of our motor trucks for use in the field, and finds them sufficiently good for use in the field. Russia has bought more. They said, in reply to that, that the trucks we have sold to Canada did not seem wholly satisfactory; and on that ground in this country, with all the automobile manufacturers we have, we are deliberately told to-day that we can not have a motor truck; we must spend $25,000, and wait a year in testing them. The money is of no consequence, but we must waste a year testing to find a suitable motor truck. Why, they have thousands of motor trucks in the armies of Europe, and we have none. Some motor trucks are better than no motor trucks; and the officers of the War Department are sitting here looking around to find the perfect truck, and in the meantime we have none.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I will move, if it is in order, that the expenditure be changed and an appropriation made for the purchase of them.

Mr. LODGE. But $50,000 is nothing for a purpose of this kind.

Mr. LANE. Well, we can purchase one, or make it more. I am willing to increase the amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on reconsidering the vote whereby the amendment was adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that we adopt the motion to reconsider, and then, instead of substituting $50,000 for their purchase, put in enough to purchase some.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; let us leave out this testing business.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let us put in really enough to make a substantial purchase.

Mr. LODGE. Let us not pass a year in testing motor trucks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments were treated separately upon yesterday. The committee amendment striking out $50,000 was agreed to, and then the committee amendment in line 8 was adopted. Now, the question is on agreeing to the amendment in line 8 for the purchase of motor cars.

Mr. LODGE. That is, to substitute the $25,000 for the $50,000 appropriation.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That leaves it all out of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. The provision for a test is out of the bill. Now it is open to amend the original clause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair stated just a moment ago that upon yesterday the Senate treated these as two separate amendments.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; then it can be moved and be put in in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Or a motion can be made to reconsider the first one.

Mr. LODGE. I move to reconsider that, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the first amendment.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Now, it is open to amendment to appropriate a sum for the purchase of armored cars.

Mr. LANE. I should like to make a motion that we appropriate a sum sufficient to purchase armored cars, $100,000 or $75,000, or whatever sum is agreeable to the Senate. I will say $75,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can advise us about what the cost of a car of the character would be and then we can determine what sum we would wish to appropriate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. This whole matter I might make a point of order against, but I think it is just as well to have something of this kind. It has never been estimated for, but Gen. Crozier testified as to how much armored cars would cost, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. How much do those armored cars cost apiece, Gen. Crozier, or have you any idea of that?

Gen. CROZIER. Well, I would have to give a rough guess. One of those chassis, I would suggest, could be obtained for something like $3,000, Maj. Hillman suggests, and he has direct charge of that subject in my office; and have you estimated on the armor, Maj. Hillman?

Maj. HILLMAN. That costs about $1,500 more.

Gen. CROZIER. I suppose we could get one up for $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Have not the armored cars proved of very great advantage in the European war now going on?

Gen. CROZIER. There again we are without definite information. My impression is that they have been used to a considerable extent. I know that one of the belligerent Governments has bought quite a number of them; I know, for instance, that quite a number of them have gone over to Canada from this country.

It was for that reason that, without any estimate whatsoever, we put in the appropriation for one of these machines instead of expending a lot of money on machines that the officer who has the matter in charge did not know anything about.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me ask the Senator have they been fully tested? Is it reliably known that they are a great success and most valuable?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Gen. Crozier says they do not know. He is the ordnance officer. He says they have been used, he understands, but he does not know with what success. Mr. President, I do not know myself. I suppose over in Europe, where they have good roads, as in France and Germany, where the roads are macadamized and have been in use for hundreds of years, they might use one; but I should like to see one jolting from here down to Appomattox or somewhere else near Washington over the roads we have.

Mr. LANE. I will say for the information of my colleague that they are making a type of car with the "caterpillar" mode of traction by which they go over rough roads and even climb over small logs.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest that an appropriation of $100,000 be made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there a motion pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There does not seem to be any pending.

Mr. WALSH. Regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to insert the sum of $100,000. I have not the bill before me, and I do not know just where to insert it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee reports to strike out lines 6 and 7 on page 69 in the following words:

For the purchase and manufacture of armored motor cars, $50,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to read:

For the purchase and manufacture of armored motor cars, $100,000.

Mr. WALSH. From the information given us by the chairman of the committee to the effect that no estimate has been made for this item, I make a point of order that the amendment is out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. The Chair understands now that the appropriation of $50,000 is to remain in the bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Under the suggestion of the Chair, if it is in order, and I assume it is, I move to strike out lines 6 and 7. It appears that we have no information concerning these cars. Of all the things we would need in war we would not need these cars until the war was upon our own soil and it would require no great length of time to get them. If we are going to use money in preparation for war we should use it for those things that it takes a long time to prepare, and especially to meet conditions upon the water. This will just result in somebody getting $50,000 and the United States Government being no better off. I therefore ask the Senate to strike it out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate just voted not to strike it out.

Mr. CLAPP. I understood that we just voted not to increase it to $100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That went out on a point of order.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I move to reconsider the vote by which the item was left in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am altogether in error now if the question has been stated correctly. The Chair said that the amendment was divisible—that it consisted of the amendment by which a portion was stricken out and a portion inserted. We then reconsidered it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not make that statement. The Chair said on yesterday they were treated as separate amendments, and they were both agreed to on yesterday.

Mr. WALSH. I understood that then we reconsidered the second amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And then the first to-day.

Mr. WALSH. I did not hear that statement, and I was watching, expecting to vote on the question at some time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. I move to strike out from the House bill lines 6 and 7 on page 69.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending question now, as to whether the Senate will agree to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce my pair and its transfer as heretofore, and vote "yea."

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before, and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In the absence of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] and vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Ashurst	Gronna	Norris	Thomas
Bankhead	James	Overman	Thompson
Bristow	Johnson	Perkins	Tillman
Burton	Jones	Pomerene	Vardaman
Camden	Lane	Ransdell	Walsh
Chamberlain	Lewis	Shafroth	White
Chilton	McCumber	Sheppard	Works
Clapp	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Fletcher	Myers	Sterling	

NAYS—27.

Brandegee	Kern	Poindexter	Smoot
Bryan	La Follette	Root	Stephenson
Burleigh	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Swanson
Culberson	Lodge	Sherman	Townsend
du Pont	Oliver	Shively	Warren
Fall	Owen	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Gallinger	Page	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Borah	Goff	McLean	Shields
Brady	Gore	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Catron	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Hollis	O'Gorman	Stone
Colt	Hughes	Penrose	Sutherland
Crawford	Kenyon	Pittman	Thornton
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Williams
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Robinson	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, it will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring to the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WITHERSPOON, Mr. TRIBBLE, and Mr. BUTLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 to the bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1916, and disagrees to the residue of the Senate amendments, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SHERLEY, and Mr. GILLETT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3362. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas;

S. 3897. An act to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15557. An act for the relief of Anna Miller; and

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newman and Los Angeles, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the organization of a naval reserve, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the International Association of Machinists, of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called Taylor system of time study, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Burgesses of Wallingford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WORKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of southern California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials of St. Agnes's congregation, of Ashland; of St. Bridget's congregation, of River Falls; of St. Patrick's congregation, of Superior; of St. Joseph's congregation, of Hayward; of St. Ann's Catholic congregation, of Somerset; of St. Joseph's congregation, of Shell Lake; of Stamford congregation, of Rice Lake; of Holy Family congregation, of Ashland; of St. Adelbert's congregation, of Superior; of St. Francis Xavier's congregation, of Superior; of Most Precious Blood congregation, of Glidden; of Holy Rosary congregation, of Mellin; of St. Ann's congregation, of Turtle Lake; of St. Francis De Sale's congregation, of Spooner; of St. Louis's congregation, of Washburn; of St. Mary's congregation, of Solon Spring; of St. Mary Magdalene's congregation, of Iron Belt; of St. Boniface's congregation, of Chetak; of St. Joseph's Catholic congregation, of Superior; of St. Francis Xavier's congregation, of Merrill; of St. Patrick's congregation, of Hudson; of the Sacred Heart congregation, of Stetonville; of the Holy Trinity Catholic congregation, of Haugen; and of St. Joseph's congregation, of Rice Lake, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the conditions existing in Mexico, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18685) to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1023) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7724) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Ingraham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 7725) to provide for the establishment of a national employment bureau in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 7726) granting a pension to Edward J. Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—FRANK WEST.

On motion of Mr. THOMPSON, it was

Ordered, That the papers with the bill for the relief of Frank West (S. 5483, 63d Cong.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report thereon having been made.

JULIA H. PLATT.

Mr. ROOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 553), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Julia H. Platt, widow of Benjamin S. Platt, late enrolling clerk in the office of the Secretary of the United States Senate, a sum equal to one year's salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives agreeing to the amendment of the Senate No. 68 to the bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, disagreeing to the residue of the amendments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH ELIOT AUSTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. PERKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I desire to present the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I ask for an agreement to the report and for a further conference and for the appointment of conferees on the items still in disagreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the conference report.

The Secretary read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 954).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39, 43, 46, 48, 52, 58, 59, 64, 67, 68, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 85, 89, 99, 103, 111, 112, 118, 119, 120, and 121.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38, 40, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53, 55, 57, 60, 61, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 102, 106, 107, 108, 109, 115, 116, 123, 124, 126, 127, and 128, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,576"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and on page 17 of the bill, line 7, strike out the words "force and," and in line 8 strike out the words "fire department," and in line 7, after the word "police," insert the following: "crossing police, park police, and fire department"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For constructing market buildings on the site of the present municipal fish wharf and market, including refrigerating and cold-storage plant, which shall be equipped for the accommodation of such retail business as may obtain at that point and shall serve as the wholesale receiving and distributing point for marine and other products to be retailed elsewhere in the District, within a limit of cost of $185,000 which is hereby fixed, $125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$110,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$118,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$160,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$49,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 33 of the bill, line 6, strike out "$124,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$119,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$27,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "to be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Hereafter all pupils whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District of Columbia shall be admitted and taught free of charge in the schools of said District, and hereafter the members of the board of education shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 4, 5, and 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: " ; but no person so removed shall be reappointed to any position in said fire department"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$131,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,932"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Gallinger Hospital: Toward the construction and equipment of the Gallinger Hospital, including grading of the site, $150,000,

and the limit of cost of the construction of said hospital and accessory buildings, and equipment, is hereby fixed at $1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$96,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment and, on page 73 of the bill, in line 4, strike out the following: "and of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"ANACOSTIA RIVER FLATS.

"For continuing the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats from the Anacostia Bridge NE. to the District line, to be expended for the purposes and under the conditions specified in the item for this improvement contained in the 'District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915,' $100,000, and authority is hereby granted to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to enter into a contract or contracts for and on account of said work in an amount not exceeding $100,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 51, and 105.

JOHN WALTER SMITH,
LUKE LEA,
J. H. GALLINGER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ROBERT N. PAGE,
T. U. SISSON,
C. R. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, from the reading of the report it was impossible to get any idea of what has really been done. It seems to me it ought to be printed, so as to give us an opportunity to compare it with the bill as passed by the Senate. There were a number of items in the bill in regard to which many Senators were very much interested, among whom are Senators who are not present at this time. I do not think we ought to take action upon it without knowing what we are doing.

I ask that the conference report may be printed and lie over for one day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that it is very important that the conference report should be disposed of, in order that the House of Representatives may know what to do. Most of these matters have been before the Senate in the District bill. I know of nothing new that has been put in that has not been in one or the other of the bills, except, I think, as regards the appointment of the members of the board of education of the District of Columbia. It was the opinion of the conference committee that the present method of appointment was unsatisfactory, for the reason that the board seemed to have nobody to whom to report. The judges make the appointments at present, and we felt that there had not been sufficient reports made by the school board to show what is going on in the management of the schools. We felt that there ought to be somebody to whom they would be responsible, and we put in this provision requiring that the appointments should be made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. We felt that it was in the interest of the schools. In my own State it was once the rule for the judges to appoint the members of the board of education, and it was found very unsatisfactory. The judges here do not wish to make the appointments. They have objected to making them.

Mr. THOMAS. I must join the Senator from New York and ask that the report may be printed so that we can consider it prior to acting upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I likewise join the Senators, and appeal to the chairman of the committee to let the matter go over and be printed. It is a proper request. While we would like very much to facilitate its consideration, and it is desirable that it should be disposed of as speedily as possible, I think the request that it go over should be granted.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If Senators desire an opportunity to examine it further, of course I shall make no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that will facilitate the matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; it is very possible.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Senators recognize as well as I do the importance of a speedy disposition of the matter. We have but a few days remaining, and this matter will have to be acted upon by the House. Of course, I offer no objection, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed and lie over.

LAWS RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 7041) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is the motion made by the Senator from Georgia at this time debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is after 2 o'clock, and it is debatable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I, of course, do not know how much time the Senate cares to devote to anything just now except the appropriation bills, but the bill which the Senator from Georgia proposes to bring up will lead to some debate, and, I doubt not, some considerable debate, involving the broad general question that it does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. 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	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Gallinger	Oliver	Smoot
Brandegee	Gronna	Overman	Stephenson
Bristow	Hughes	Owen	Sterling
Bryan	James	Page	Swanson
Burleigh	Johnson	Perkins	Thomas
Burton	Jones	Pittman	Tillman
Camden	Kern	Poindexter	Townsend
Chamberlain	La Follette	Pomerene	Vardaman
Chilton	Lane	Ransdell	Walsh
Clapp	Lodge	Saulsbury	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	Shafroth	Weeks
Culberson	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	White
Dillingham	Myers	Shively	Williams
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 7041?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What length of time does the Senator think would be taken up in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, Mr. President, I could not say as to that. I want to give, just in perhaps three minutes, my reason for saying why I think the bill ought not to be taken up at this time for discussion. I do not think the Senate ought to enter upon a discussion of the bill now, because, so far as I have been able to ascertain, we have not as yet sufficient information to justify the broad action which this bill demands. I do not know what information other Senators may have, but I know that the report of the committee gives no information. I know that I have, through inquiry by the committee, attempted to gain information, which I have not been able to gain; and I do not think anybody can tell how many additional

United States judges we shall have to provide for within the next two or three years. We know how many we would have to provide for, perhaps, at once; but within the next two or three years it is virtually a compulsory-retirement law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that the Judiciary Committee at its last meeting made two or three amendments to the bill. They are amendments which have been agreed upon by the Judiciary Committee of the other House, and the bill has been unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House. The first amendment suggested by the committee is, on page 3, line 4, after the word "President," where this language is to be inserted: "if in his opinion the public good so requires." Again——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not suppose the President would do it in any event if the public good did not require it. It is only a permissive power anyway.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The view was that he should not do it as a matter of course, but that he should only do it where the public good required it. The House committee put in that language.

The committee also, in the second paragraph, where the power of appointment was given, put in the language "if in his opinion the public good so requires."

As I have stated, the bill has been reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee of the House with those two amendments, and one other amendment that simply more clearly states the meaning of the bill as we intend it. Those amendments were submitted to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate last Monday—the Senator from Wyoming was not present—and I was directed by the Judiciary Committee to ask the Senate to amend our amendment with this language.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will ask the Senator from Georgia if there has yet been any reply to the inquiry made by the Judiciary Committee of the Department of Justice as to how many additional judges this bill would provide for within the next five years?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We asked for the names of the judges between 65 and 70 years of age, and they have furnished us such a list.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Did they also furnish a list of judges over 70 years of age?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; we have that.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can the Senator from Georgia state how many judges there are between 65 and 70 years of age? I confess that I am a little bit surprised at the Senator's statement, because I was the one who wanted that information most directly, and it has never been drawn to my attention.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Wyoming was not at the committee meeting when we received it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can the Senator tell how many such judges there are?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My recollection is that there are 8. There are fewer between 65 and 70 years of age than there are over 70.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There are some 12 or 14 judges over 70 years of age?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. I have the names of those.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, Mr. President, I think it is well shown that this is a bill of very great importance. We passed a bill here the other day providing for a particular emergency in the State of the Senator from Georgia, and I think that bill was properly passed, because the emergency existed; but here is a sweeping bill which provides that when a Federal judge arrives at the age of 70 years, the retiring age, having served 10 years, he shall virtually be retired; that is, no matter how well able the present incumbent may be to transact the business, an additional judge shall be appointed, for when you give the President the power of appointing a Federal judge, that Federal judge is always going to be appointed. Here we are padding the Federal courts with additional judges to take the place of men who are well qualified by years of experience and by their physical vigor to carry on the business of their districts; and we are putting in new men. We say a new man shall conduct all the work of the district and that the old man shall continue in the service, to be assigned to such points as certain statutory judges may assign to him.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is time, no matter how many offices we may create—let us go into the departmental service and create offices, but, for heaven's sake, do not let us make the office of the judge at this time the prey for political appointments. That is all it would amount to, Mr. President.

I concede that quite frequently, or at times at least, judges continue to exercise the duties of their judicial office and decline to retire when perhaps they ought to retire. We have met such an emergency in many cases; we met it the other day in Georgia, where we provided an additional judge to assist in the business; but where we say that in every district of the United States, in every circuit of the United States, and in the courts of appeal, where a man shall have arrived at the age of 70 years and have served 10 years, no matter what his physical or mental capacity may be, an additional judge shall then be appointed, it seems to me we are going a long way in the direction of providing offices for the "faithful."

I have not a doubt but that any President would exercise this power as to him seemed wisest and best; but he would exercise his power; he could not possibly avoid it; he could not resist the pressure. We know that, and we might as well acknowledge it. It seems to me that at this late hour, at this late day in this session, the Senate ought not to take up and consider a widespread and very important measure like that.

I will suggest also to the Senator that if the committee did not agree to any more amendments than those which he has stated, there are certain other amendments that should be put into the bill if it is to be taken up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not think the criticism of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] that the purpose of the bill is to pad the judiciary is at all just. This measure went to a subcommittee composed of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and myself. The bill was perfected by the unanimous action of the subcommittee, the Senator from New York taking as active an interest in it as any of the other members of the subcommittee, and really favoring, perhaps, stronger language.

The bill does not say that the President shall appoint; it says that he may appoint. It goes one step further, according to the amendments upon which we have agreed, and which I shall submit from the Judiciary Committee, and which have been adopted by the Judiciary Committee in the House. It only allows the President to make the appointments when in his opinion the public service so requires.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator will allow me, does he say that has been adopted in the House?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Judiciary Committee of the House has reported the bill out from that committee with that amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes; but I understood the Senator to say——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Judiciary Committee of the House has made a unanimous report on the bill, and we have considered it with three amendments.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understood the Senator to say it had been adopted in the House.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Judiciary Committee of the House has reported the bill with three amendments, and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has adopted those amendments, and I shall suggest two other verbal amendments, inserting words which were omitted in our print. The word "court" was omitted in one place and the word "hereinafter" was omitted in another place.

Now, the other House amendment which we recommend is in connection with the proviso, so that the proviso will read:

Provided, That in the case of the death or resignation thereafter of any circuit or district judge so entitled to resign in a circuit or district in which an additional judge has been appointed as herein provided, the vacancy caused thereby shall not be filled, but the number of the judges of such court shall be reduced accordingly.

The words "in a circuit or district in which an additional judge has been appointed as herein provided" constitute the amendment. The provision already meant what it will mean with the amendment, but the amendment makes it clearer.

Mr. President, it is not intended that in every place an appointment shall be made. We first used the word "shall," but we struck out the word "shall" and inserted the word "may," and then we accepted the provision reported by the House committee limiting appointments to those cases where the President believes that the public good requires them.

Now, let me present the situation to the Senate. To-day the law permits any judge of a district court who has reached 70 years of age and who has served 10 years to retire on full pay. There are two classes of judges who will be affected by the bill, one a class who ought to retire, who have become entirely inefficient and have quit work, but who for some reason do not retire. I illustrate that by a judge in the fifth circuit, a judge from Texas, who is 82 years old, who has not been on the bench in years, who remains at home and never has any hope of again being on the bench. This is a case in which the public good requires that a judge should be appointed, so that the circuit court of appeals in that circuit may have its five judges.

That is a case where a judge ought to retire but will not retire, and where it is absolutely essential to the public service that an additional judge be appointed. A special bill has been reported in both Houses to add an additional judge in that circuit to do the work of the circuit on account of the failure of a man 82 years old, who has not been on the bench for several years and can not go on it any more, to resign or retire. As I have said, that is a case of a judge who, although entirely inefficient, will not resign.

There is another class of judges whose situation will be met by this bill. They are judges who have passed the age of 70, who are able to do good work, who are able perhaps to do good work half the time, but who feel their physical inability to stand the full work of their circuits or their districts. I know several instances of judges of this character who will certainly resign this winter, but they would be glad during the balance of their lives, to the extent of their ability, not simply to draw salaries as retired judges but to render service in return.

Now, what benefit will the Government receive by preventing men of that class from retiring when they feel that they can not do the full work of their circuits or districts? It will be this: Instead of their retiring and with the loss of the benefit of several months every year of efficient work from these men, they will remain judges of the circuit court or judges of the district court, and where a district or circuit is crowded or a judge is sick and relief is needed, these district or circuit court judges, according to this bill, past 70 years of age, capable of good work part of the year, can go to a crowded district or circuit and relieve the situation by a few months' valuable work.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an inquiry?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. What would be in the way when such an occasion presented itself of our then dealing with it, so that the judge could remain, an additional judge being appointed for the district or circuit, as the case might be? It seems to me that each case could easily be dealt with as it arose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the matter can be dealt with better in a general bill. I think, as a general proposition, it is wise to do so. We have had a number of instances of the kind referred to this year, and there are, I know, a number of other judges who are past 70 and who do not wish to quit work entirely. I know of one in Pennsylvania. This bill was brought to my attention in part by the suggestion of one of the circuit judges of Pennsylvania, and in part by a circuit court judge 78 years old in the fifth circuit. The judges who have passed 70 do not wish to resign——

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I think we have had three cases this winter of additional judges being appointed. There has been no difficulty at all in making provision as the cases have arisen. The Senator had no difficulty, in the very midst of an acute situation here, in getting a bill through affecting his section. There never is any trouble about that; and when such a contingency arises provision can be made for an extra judge taking the place of the old judge, who can still remain subject to assignment. I think it would be infinitely better to deal with these cases as they come up rather than to enact a wholesale proposition of this kind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We believe the general policy should be that where a judge has passed 70 and the good of the service requires it the opportunity should be given the President, without special legislation, to appoint a judge. We have had the resignation during the present session of a district judge in the southern district of California who would not have resigned if this bill had been in force. He is capable of doing good work each year, but he has passed 70 and could retire. He did not wish to do the entire work of his district, but I am sure he would have been pleased had a general bill of this sort been in force, to have remained on the district court bench and to have been subject to assignment, and he could have done good work each year. Yet, as there was no such law, he was entitled to retire, and he simply retired. There are two classes of these judges. The only bills that we have passed are in cases where the judge has become entirely inefficient and does not do his work. You find that the man who is capable of doing at least half his work will not bring the subject to the attention of Congress and ask for a special bill to appoint somebody in his place. He will simply retire and go at something else.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wish to ask the Senator if he has data from which he could give the number of judges who would be appointed at this time under this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not give the data of those who would be appointed, because there is a limitation in the bill requiring the President in each case to find that the public service requires it. There are, I think, 14 or 16 who have passed 70 years of age.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if he seriously believes and argues to the Senate that the power and authority being given to the President to appoint these judges he would not appoint them? Would not the same argument appeal to the President that appeals to the Senator in asking that the bill be passed? Would not the same argument appeal to the President to make the appointment?

The Senator has a faith that is sublime if he believes that these appointments being in the power and the gift of the President they would not be made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If a judge was 70 and was thoroughly capable of doing all the work of his district, I would say there would be no appointment made, and should be no appointment made. If the judge was past 70 and did not feel able to do the work of his district, but was able to do a number of months' work each year, but not the full work of his district, then I think the President would make an appointment.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Senator believe that this measure is more important than the appropriation bills which we must consider?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not think that; but I think we could take up this bill, and we ought to be able to dispose of it, one way or the other, in a very short time.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator, I desire to say that it will not be settled in a short time. It opens up a field of debate that may last for days. For one, I do not propose to sit here and permit, if I can prevent it, a revision of the laws that will enable the President to retire judges at 70 years of age when he wants to and load up the pay rolls of the United States with 10 or 15 additional judges.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I must reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas that it would load up the pay rolls with additional expense. It would do nothing of the kind. The law permits the judges to retire and receive their pay when they are past 70.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes; but this bill does that very thing, because the man still remains in the service. If this bill were not passed there would be no other judge appointed if he remained in the service; but if this bill is passed you put $6,000 into every district when he is appointed and $7,000 into every circuit.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, one word, if the Senator will permit me. I see that we have before us for consideration, first, the Agricultural bill. The Senator knows what an important bill that is, and knows that it may take a considerable time to pass it through the Senate. We have the diplomatic and consular bill, the fortifications bill, the general deficiency bill, the Military Academy bill, the urgent deficiency bill. Those measures are likely to take a good deal of time. Then there is one measure in particular that I wish to call to the attention of the Senator, and that is the Indian appropriation bill. I shall not be surprised if that bill takes three or four days; and it seems to me that instead of compelling us to sit up nights and exhaust ourselves, as we are bound to do if we try to pass these appropriation bills with due deliberation, we ought to take up these first, and then, if we have the time, take up the measure to which the Senator from Georgia refers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to address myself, not to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, because of course I realize the importance of taking up the appropriation bills, but rather to the merits of the bill as criticized by the Senator from Wyoming.

I repeat that I regard this bill as a most desirable provision in the direction of economy, in the direction of relieving crowded districts, in the direction of relieving circuits in which there are judges who for some reason can not preside. It will furnish a number of judges on the circuit court bench, several not assigned to particular circuits who can still do a number of months of good work. It will furnish a number of district court judges who are not in a position to do full work who can do a considerable amount of admirable work. Take my own circuit, to illustrate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not yield for the present. The Senator can not take me off the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is on the floor by my courtesy.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I am not. I am on the floor by right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the Senator is there by my consent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to conclude my remarks. I regret that the Senator from Alabama interrupted me.

I am glad that I have been able, by privately speaking to the Senator from Alabama, to satisfy him. I do not intend to take much more time with this measure now, but as it has been criticized I wish the reasons for it and the value of it to be fully stated.

The effect will be that circuit court judges past 70, several of them, can relieve the other circuits without charge to the Government. The effect will be that district court judges past 70 can relieve the other districts without any cost to the country. Let me illustrate, and then I am through.

In my own circuit one of the circuit judges we concede is out of commission, so far as service is concerned; and we must add a man in his place, because he is off the bench, 82 years old, and useless. He will never sit on the bench again. There we have the absolute necessity for another judge. Another circuit judge is 78 years old. He will probably soon retire, and a judge will be appointed in his place to fill the vacancy, but if this bill is passed, he will continue to render able service part of the time. I know two district court judges in our circuit past 70 who will probably retire this winter, and who were on the point of retiring on the 1st of December, except that they hoped, by the passage of the bill in this form, they might still give, for the pay received, service a portion of the time to the Government.

So far as my immediate circuit is concerned, there is absolutely no interest in it except to retain the value of the services of these men who can at least do service half of the time for the Government. It is not padding. The vacancies will take place. They will draw their salaries just the same as retired judges, and the effect of the passage of the bill would be, at least in many cases, to give the Government, for the pay received, valuable service a portion of the time. But, Mr. President, I concede that the appropriation bills should be disposed of; and as the Senators on the other side announce that they intend to take quite a length of time in discussing this measure, the Senator from Kansas suggesting two or three days, I desire to withdraw my motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill at the present time.

COMMISSION ON DISTRICT HALF-AND-HALF PRINCIPLE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 19906, the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion for one moment? If there is the least objection to what I am going to request, it will be immediately withdrawn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. The committee of conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill are having trouble concerning the so-called half-and-half principle which we discussed here. There is no probability that we will reach an agreement unless a commission is provided. The Senate committee has reported a bill, introduced by the Senator from South Dakota, providing for a commission; and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered, with the understanding that if there is any debate it will be immediately withdrawn.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I would hardly like to have that matter taken up to-night, when there are some Senators absent who are very much interested in it.

Mr. GALLINGER. That settles it, Mr. President.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I renew my request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for committee amendments, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for committee amendments, and that the committee amendments be first considered. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, under the subhead "Office of the Postmaster General," on page 2, line 6, after the word "each," to strike out "(an increase of two submitted in lieu of two assistant superintendents, Railway Mail Service, at $2,350 each; to be transferred from the office of the Second Assistant)," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries of post-office inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions, at $3,000 each; 30 inspectors, at $2,400 each; 20 inspectors, at $2,250 each; 32 inspectors, at $2,100 each; 20 inspectors, at $2,000 each; 30 inspectors, at $1,900 each; 90 inspectors, at $1,800 each; 60 inspectors, at $1,700 each; 60 inspectors, at $1,600 each; and 65 inspectors, at $1,500 each; in all, $783,700.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I think I shall take just a few minutes of the time of the Senate, and I can just as well take it now as at any other time.

I was glad to see the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] move a moment ago to take up another bill. I do not know anything about that measure except what was given to us here on the floor, but it indicated that our friends hope not only to pass the appropriation bills, but to pass some other legislation that they consider pressing. There are some bills on the calendar that I think ought to be passed, that I think could be passed just as well as not, before the session closes, and I want to make a plea to the Senate for a part of the administration program, for one of the administration bills.

While I recognize the importance of passing the appropriation bills, I feel satisfied that these bills will be passed; but there is a bill on the calendar which should be enacted into law before the session closes, and there is no excuse for this not being done. I refer to what is known as the Shields-Adamson waterpower bill. It relates to the development of water powers on navigable streams. It has passed the House, and the Shields bill has been reported here as a substitute. Practically every section of the country is interested in this measure, and will be benefited to a greater or less extent by its passage. The Shields substitute has the unanimous, or almost unanimous, recommendation, I understand, of the Commerce Committee. It is one of the measures urged by the President. Why is it not called up? Why not get it to conference, so that an agreement may be reached and legislation had?

It is certain that if this measure is to be made a law it should be passed by the Senate without delay so as to get the matter in conference, so that any disagreement between the Senate and the House may be arranged.

Why not give some time to it, instead of wasting the time of the Senate in attempting to pass legislation which every one knows can not be passed? It is one of the plain evidences of the incapacity of the present governmental leadership that it will waste its time and energy in trying to pass what it ought to know and what its experience has shown can not be passed and thereby prevent the consideration of measures of vast importance and which might be passed with but very little trouble or delay.

Water power is one of our country's greatest natural resources. Properly developed it will become a national achievement and a national blessing. Undeveloped, it continues to be a national reproach. We all agree that under present conditions our water powers must be developed by private capital. Capital can not be secured for development purposes under the restrictive laws now in force. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress to enact wise legislation which, while fully protecting the public interest will present a business proposition that will pass muster in the councils of honorable business men. No benefit will accrue from changing our present water-power laws, under which capital can not be obtained and under which water-power development has become practically stagnant, if new legislation shall merely continue this old policy. It is obvious that unless our new laws make it possible to secure capital, we shall have wasted our time and in the end have no water-power development.

A diligent study of the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce and conferences which I have had concerning it with practical people who merit every confidence and who have developed and who are operating water powers, has convinced me that the bill is sound in principle and businesslike in terms; that it fully protects the public interest and consumers and fairly treats both Federal and State rights. Under its terms capital may be obtained and its enactment would result in the development of the great water powers now wasting their energies in our navigable streams throughout the entire extent of the United States.

I believe that the development of our water powers constitutes by far the greatest and most urgent commercial problem

now before Congress and our wise solution of that problem will be regarded as one of the greatest if not the greatest achievement of this Congress, if we can just get the Senate to take action promptly on this legislation and enact it into law. Let me give you two object lessons of what the passage of this bill in its present form would mean to the State of Washington alone.

Congress has granted a permit for the construction of a dam across the Pend Oreille River for water-power development. Several thousand dollars have been expended in getting ready. The project will cost about $10,000,000 and develop about 200,000 horsepower, which will be largely used in the manufacture of fertilizer and the development of other manufacturing establishments. The work would have been actively under way except that the blighting hand of departmental power has prevented. Some public and forest-reserve lands would have been overflowed by the construction of the dam, and this placed it within the power of the Interior and Agricultural Departments to prevent the work. They granted what they thought was a reasonable permit for the use of this public land. The permit, however, was revocable and this deters capital from investing in the enterprise, and the money has not been secured to put it in. I am assured that there is capital that intends to go into the manufacture of fertilizer in this country or in Canada. Liberal inducements have been offered by Canada, but these people prefer to invest in this country. They would take up this work on the Pend Oreille if this Shields-Adamson bill is passed now. If it is not passed they will this summer go to Canada. We will lose the money and the enterprise, and the product will come in from Canada to retard further development in this country. The investment of $10,000,000 in one enterprise, with the resultant benefits, would alone justify special action by Congress on this legislation, but this is not all.

Come with me into the central portion of my State and let me spread before you a mighty collection of idle resources and unutilized opportunities. This idleness and this lack of utilization are the sole result of congressional inaction. Could you come with me there, there would be no need for me to urge in this Chamber your favorable action on this measure. I would show you a compact block of country more than 400,000 acres in extent—a country made up of the richest of volcanic ash, protected from the cold winds of the north by a barrier of mountains, and nourished by almost perpetual sunshine of nearly semitropical degree. Looking across you would see hardly a habitation, and for miles in every direction your view of sagebrush desert would be practically unbroken. In the midst of that region, however, you would see the Columbia, twelfth largest river in the world, second in the United States, carrying a greater annual volume of water than the Mississippi at Cairo, and a far greater low-water flow. You would see this great stream racing down over Priest Rapids, a 90-foot fall in 9 miles. You would see laid across this country the rails of a transcontinental road, and only a short distance to the south the rails of another transcontinental road, but you would not see the trains stopping here to pick up the products which this area could produce nor to bring into this area the merchandise that it could consume.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JONES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRYAN. From what committee does this bill come?

Mr. JONES. From the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRYAN. Was there any opposition to it there?

Mr. JONES. I understand that it was practically a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the Senator know whether there will be any discussion of it here?

Mr. JONES. I do not know, but I hope not.

Mr. BRYAN. Suppose the Senator should try it out and see whether it will pass.

Mr. JONES. I would be delighted to have that course pursued.

Mr. BRYAN. Then why not go on with the appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. If the Senate will pass this bill, I will stop, but I want to present some facts here showing the object of passing this legislation.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator would not insist on doing that if we passed the bill?

Mr. JONES. Certainly not. I am not talking against the passage of the bill. I hope I will not be accused of filibustering when I am urging the passage of an administration measure.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say that I agree entirely with the Senator from Washington in the statement he has made with reference to the great importance of this measure. I think it is one of the measures, outside of the appropriation bills, which ought to be passed at this session. I am a member of the Committee on Commerce that considered this bill and considered it very thoroughly, and, as I recall, there was not in the committee the slightest opposition to the bill in the shape it was finally reported. The entire committee, composed of Democrats and Republicans alike, favored the bill, and I think if we could get an agreement to vote upon it in an hour or something like that it would be very well to do it. The Senator might give us some indication as to whether there would be any discussion of the bill on his side of the Chamber. I know of no purpose on this side of the Chamber to engage in a discussion of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Colorado, who rose first.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to state that I agree with the Senator from Washington relative to this bill, with one exception, an amendment which I think would be accepted by everyone here, and that is to make these water-power plants subject to taxation for State, county, and school purposes. I think with that done I would have no objection whatever to the Shields bill. I am as much in favor of the bill as I am opposed to the other water-power bill that is proposed to lease the water powers of the States and not have them subject to taxation for State, county, and school purposes. However, I want to suggest to the Senator from Washington that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], who reported the bill, is not here now. I think he can get the bill up at any time and in a few minutes pass it with that slight amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely desire to say that I do not share the view of my colleagues about me here who a moment ago expressed the opinion that the bill referred to by the Senator from Washington could be passed after a very brief discussion. In my opinion it will require a day or two and probably more than that amount of time to pass the bill. I know a number of Senators who have expressed the desire and the intention to discuss the bill. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that it is impracticable at this time to consider the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Washington permit me one moment?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I think this bill is one of the most important measures before the Senate, and I sincerely hope Senators will permit it some time or other before adjournment to come up for consideration. I would be glad to help the Senator on this side and on the other side of the Chamber as far as I can to get consideration for this measure. I think it is wanted from Maine to Oregon and Washington and California, as far as I can find out.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from Pennsylvania, however, would not want to have it called up in the absence of the Senator who reported the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. No; I did not know anything about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no purpose to call up the bill now. I wish to ask about how long it will take the Senator from Washington to conclude?

Mr. JONES. I think about 10 minutes. I will go a little fast.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am anxious to proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES. I have a sincere purpose in this matter and I am glad to see the interest manifested in it by different Senators in this Chamber. As the Senator from Pennsylvania said it is a bill in which the people from Maine to California and from Michigan to Florida and the Southland, and all over the country, are interested. There is probably not a State in the Union that would not receive some benefit from the passage of this legislation, and we ought to be able to pass it with very little discussion. I am simply calling attention to some of the conditions in my State that probably will be duplicated to a greater or less extent in many of the other States in the Union showing the very great importance of this measure. I feel satisfied there will not be very much discussion upon the bill on this side of the Chamber, and I certainly hope that Senators on the other side of the Chamber will try to avoid discussion as much as possible in order to place on the statute

books at this session at least one measure of the administration program.

The Columbia is a navigable river and Priest Rapids, 400 miles from the Pacific Ocean, lies in the heart of this naturally favored region and presents a barrier to up-river navigation. The completion within the present year of the Celilo Locks, 200 miles farther down the river, will bring to the foot of these rapids a deep, navigable channel from the Pacific Ocean. With Priest Rapids surmounted by locks and a dam, the navigable channel would penetrate 180 miles farther into the State, or, to within 250 miles of the Canadian border. This surmounting of Priest Rapids would cost the United States Treasury an enormous sum, but under the terms of this bill the Government expense of that accomplishment would be nominal, while the benefits to navigation would be vast.

Let me show you a picture, the best that I can portray but relatively poor and inadequate, of that which would follow the adoption of this measure. An enterprise would be started that would result in an ultimate initial expenditure of $40,000,000.

I am assured to-day by a very reliable gentleman from Maine that if this measure will pass financial arrangements have been practically completed by which this work could be undertaken, but if this legislation does not pass those very people will go into Canada and establish a similar enterprise there, for which very liberal inducements have been offered to them. It seems to me under such conditions as that Congress really neglects its duty by a failure to act.

A dam across the foot of Priest Rapids 90 feet high would be constructed. This would lift the water so that it would flow by gravity over 200,000 acres of this rich land and the utilization of a part of the water power developed would lift more water to an additional 135,000 acres of richer land. The Columbia River carries water enough at the low season to irrigate practically every acre along its course susceptible of cultivation, but, as though nature had by intent selected this region for the bestowal of especial bounties, the flood flow of the Columbia comes during the irrigation season. This flood flow consists largely of the late melted snows of the Canadian Rockies. So at the time of the greatest demand for irrigation there is in this mighty stream ample water for navigation and for the development of water power. I now emphasize water power, for Priest Rapids developed for navigation and for irrigation purposes must, by very consequence, become the Niagara of the West.

The commercial water power at Priest Rapids amounts to about 400,000 horsepower. Reflect upon the meaning of this opportunity when developed in the midst of this agricultural region. We of the State of Washington have by our public-utility laws amply provided for the proper control and use of this power resource, and we now want to bring to Priest Rapids the great new manufacturing industries which have, by the use of electric power, changed the course of industry and so enlivened those parts of the civilized world in which water-power resources exist. This enlivenment has taken place, however, only where governments have encouraged water-power development instead of discouraging it, as we have done in the United States. We want to bring to Priest Rapids the great nitrogen factories which will give to the West a source of cheap agricultural fertilizer and to the whole country a self-sustaining basis as to nitrogen in our national defense. Senators, in the midst of a war almost world-wide, we can not avoid the uneasy reflection, however peaceful our intent and purpose may be, that if we were stricken with the misfortune that now besets Europe we would be dependent upon foreign nations for the principal element in warfare—nitrogen. Without it all of our other possessions and accomplishments would be useless.

We of Washington want to bring to Priest Rapids the electric furnace for the smelting of ores which are making over the metal industries of the world, but in which industrial improvements we are lagging far behind our world competitors. We want to electrify our railroads and therefore cheapen the cost of their operation and obviate what is now our greatest and most needless waste of our exhaustible coal resources.

We want to make available for irrigation the tremendous waters now running unused to the sea and make productive the thousands of acres of fertile land now idle and unpopulated. This land will produce in abundance every product of the Temperate Zone—every 40 acres will support a home in comfort and plenty, and ultimately there will be a happy home on every 10 acres—and where now is waste and silence will be thousands of people, prosperous towns, villages, and cities with railways, electric lights, and all the modern accompaniments of civilization.

In this region now lying in desert silence villages and towns will spring up which will furnish homes for employees, which will develop schools and churches, and all will be set in the midst of and be supported by this agricultural development. It is not an exaggeration to predict that within five years after the passage of this bill at least $100,000,000 would be invested in this region. Down the Columbia to the sea and along the railroad line will go the agricultural and manufactured products. All this we of the State of Washington wish to bring into this now unproductive section; but it should be realized and emphasized that if it be accomplished, the opportunities and facilities there must be placed in competition with the opportunities and facilities offered by other industrial countries. It will be necessary for Congress to determine whether this country shall have a fair chance in industrial competition, or whether it must sustain a handicap of unfair and unbusinesslike governmental restrictions.

If the Federal or State Governments are not to develop our water powers, then it is imperatively necessary that laws under which capital will be invested should be enacted. Congress, on behalf of the people, can afford to be generous toward capital in this matter, and they can not afford not to be generous. I plead against the narrow, restrictive, unbusinesslike policy which would prevent these developments. There is no sense in our enacting laws which will not be taken advantage of, but which will be relegated to the dust shelves where other restrictive measures now repose. This bill as now framed will induce and permit development; it preserves to the States the rights given them under the Constitution, and the people will fully protect the consumers under local laws and regulations. We are anxious to extend our foreign trade by the expenditure of millions. Why not enact legislation that will encourage the use of our own resources and develop our own industries without the cost of a single dollar to the people and the Government?

Mr. President, I certainly hope that in the next few days Senators will give this matter careful consideration and try some way to get it sent to the House and put it in conference and bring it out here and pass legislation which will really be constructive legislation and bring tremendous development to the country.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I will not take 30 seconds in what I want to say. It is simply this, that the bill the Senator referred to is Order of Business No. 740, House bill 16053. I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator from Washington has said, and I wish to assure him and other Senators who favor it that I will cooperate with them to get early action upon this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be agreed to, without objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 5, line 8, after the word "postmasters," to strike out "$30,750,000" and insert "$31,255,720," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to postmasters, $31,255,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 9, to insert:

Provided, That hereafter the respective compensation of postmasters of the first, second, and third classes shall be annual salaries, graded in even hundreds of dollars, and payable in quarterly payments, to be ascertained and fixed by the Postmaster General from their respective quarterly returns to the Auditor for the Post Office Department, or copies or duplicates thereof to the First Assistant Postmaster General, for the calendar year immediately preceding the adjustment.

For compensation to assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices, 5, at not exceeding $4,000 each; 45, at not exceeding $3,000 each; 10, at not exceeding $2,500 each; 5, at not exceeding $2,000 each; 20, at not exceeding $1,900 each; 50, at not exceeding $1,800 each; 95, at not exceeding $1,700 each; 150, at not exceeding $1,600 each; 180, at not exceeding $1,500 each; 180, at not exceeding $1,400 each; 400, at not exceeding $1,300 each; 575, at not exceeding $1,200 each; 525, at not exceeding $1,100 each; 300, at not exceeding $1,000 each; 130, at not exceeding $900 each; 100, at not exceeding $800 each; in all, $3,350,000. And the appointment and assignment of assistant postmasters hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 11, to strike out:

Superintendents of finance, superintendents of mails, and superintendents of delivery, 6 at not exceeding $3,800 each.

Superintendents of finance and superintendents of mails, 6 at not exceeding $3,400 each.

Superintendents of finance and superintendents of mails, 16 at not exceeding $3,200 each.

Superintendents of finance, auditors, and superintendents of mails, 20 at not exceeding $3,000 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, 30 at not exceeding $2,800 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of stations, 55 at not exceeding $2,600 each.

Superintendents of stations, 10 at not exceeding $2,500 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of stations, 60 at not exceeding $2,400 each.

Superintendents of stations, 15 at not exceeding $2,300 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, and superintendents of stations, 60 at not exceeding $2,200 each.

Superintendents of stations, 40 at not exceeding $2,100 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 140 at not exceeding $2,000 each.

Superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 70 at not exceeding $1,900 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 150 at not exceeding $1,800 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 240 at not exceeding $1,700 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 400 at not exceeding $1,600 each.

Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 700 at not exceeding $1,500 each.

Superintendents of finance, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 1,575 at not exceeding $1,400 each.

Superintendents of finance, superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 2,700 at not exceeding $1,300 each.

Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 18,500 at not exceeding $1,200 each.

Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 8,800 at not exceeding $1,100 each.

Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 6,535, at not exceeding $1,000 each.

Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 2,650, at not exceeding $900 each.

Clerks in charge and clerks, 2,339, at not exceeding $800 each.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 10, at not exceeding $3,200 each.

Auditors and superintendents of mails, 10, at not exceeding $3,000 each.

Assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 20, at not exceeding $2,700 each.

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 30, at not exceeding $2,600 each.

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, and superintendents of stations, 30, at not exceeding $2,500 each.

Assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, bookkeepers, cashiers, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 40, at not exceeding $2,400 each.

Assistant superintendents of mails, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, finance clerks, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, and superintendents of stations, 50, at not exceeding $2,200 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, bookkeepers, cashiers, examiners, of stations, finance clerks, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, superintendents of inquiry, and superintendents of stations, 130, at not exceeding $2,000 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 165, at not exceeding $1,800 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendent of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 155, at not exceeding $1,700 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 250, at not exceeding $1,600 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 900, at not exceeding $1,500 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, special clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 1,560, at not exceeding $1,400 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, casahiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, special clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 2,800, at not exceeding $1,300 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, chief stamp clerks, clerks, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 18,500, at not exceeding $1,200 each.

Assistant superintendents of stations, clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 7,000, at not exceeding $1,100 each.

Assistant superintendents of stations, clerks, clerks in charge of stations, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, and superintendents of second-class matter, 6,400, at not exceeding $1,000 each.

Clerks, clerks in charge of stations, and stenographers, 2,500, at not exceeding $900 each.

Clerks and clerks in charge of stations, 1,872, at not exceeding $800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 10, after the words "without pay," to strike out "And to provide for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade; in all, $48,860,000" and insert "$46,100,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1915, clerks at first-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade and clerks at second-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade. All promotions of clerks shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade, and no promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding two years," so as to read:

Substitutes for clerks and employees absent without pay, $46,100,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1915, clerks at first-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade and clerks at second-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade. All promotions of clerks shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade, and no promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding two years; and hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I move to strike out and insert so as to restore the old law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all from and including line 6, on page 14, down to and including the word "years," on line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

And to provide for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade; in all, $48,860,000.

Mr. BRYAN. It seems to me the better way would be to disagree to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand this matter.

Mr. BRYAN. It would simply amount to a disagreement to the committee amendment, or, in other words, restore the House provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote whereby the amendment to strike out the House text was agreed to is reconsidered, and the amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to a matter as to which I do not know whether or not I am correct, but I have a memorandum that the amount on page 14, line 10, of "$48,860,000" should be "$47,200,000."

Mr. BRYAN. I understand the department estimated for $48,860,000.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer that as an amendment. If I am not mistaken, I think, if the chairman will examine it, he will see that that figure is proper. I am satisfied to call the matter to the attention of the chairman, however, and let it go over. He can then look into it later in the evening or to-morrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, $47,200,000 is the correct amount.

Mr. PENROSE. Then that is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 10, in the total appropriation it is proposed to strike out "$48,860,000," and to insert "$47,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to say that in respect to biennial promotions I have prepared and submitted to the committee an amendment which preserves the old law, as suggested by the committee itself, I having received many petitions from many employees of the Post Office Department, requesting that the former custom of annual promotions be retained, and that the suggestion of biennial promotions be opposed. I take the liberty at this time to ask, so that I may not occupy any time, to tender a resolution of the city council of Chicago and ask to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The old law with reference to that matter has been restored.

Mr. LEWIS. I understand that, and I am only asking that this paper which I present may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be inserted in the RECORD. The Chair hears none.

The paper referred to is as follows:

Whereas the postmaster of the city of Chicago, in pursuance of directions from the Postmaster General regarding expenditures at the Chicago post office, has undertaken and proposes to reduce the wages of approximately 350 letter carriers from positions which they now occupy, so that a number of carriers will become collectors and certain of the collectors will become substitute letter carriers, and their wages will be cut from $1,200 per annum to $1,000 per annum, and the $1,200 grade will be reserved only as a reward for specially meritorious service, which under the schedules adopted can only be performed by young men; and

Whereas the method in which this is being done makes it incumbent upon men who have been in the service for many years to waive their present grade under the civil service and to consent to work under conditions which will make it necessary to be promoted through the medium of efficiency markings in the future, thereby cutting themselves off from the possibility of again acquiring their present rank by reason of the fact that they are no longer able to maintain averages as high as younger men in the service; and

Whereas the gross receipts of the Chicago post office for the year 1914 were about $26,000,000, while the total expenditures, including all salaries, wagon contracts, and other incidentals, amounted to about $9,000,000, leaving a surplus of approximately $17,000,000, which the Chicago post office turned in to the treasury of the Post Office Department at Washington for the year 1914; and

Whereas the letter carriers of the city of Chicago have already been overburdened by reason of changes which have reduced the number of deliveries in most parts of the city, so that the service which the people in these districts have a right to demand is impaired, the prompt delivery of mail is no longer possible, and the strength of the carriers is overtaxed by being compelled to include more mail in one delivery than is proper and reasonable or conducive to good service; and

Whereas the reduction of salaries above mentioned and the onerous conditions imposed on men long in the service will take away the incentive for rendering the excellent service these men have always given and tend to lower the morale and efficiency of the force to the detriment of the people of Chicago: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Chicago should protest, and hereby does protest, against the reduction of the salaries of the 350 postal employees who are included within the order reducing the wages of letter carriers from $1,200 to $1,000 per year, believing that such reduction and the manner in which it is being put into effect will tend to lower the standard of efficiency in the force of employees of the Chicago post office, and will tend to deprive the people of Chicago of the high-class service which they are paying for and have a right to demand;

Be it further resolved, That it is the sense of this council that it is unjust and contrary to public policy to place men who have rendered efficient service for many years, some of whom have grown old while working for the Government, into a position where they will be unable to again meet the requirements for efficiency that will replace them where they will be entitled to their former salary, and that the city authorities feel bound to take notice of the results which must arise from such a course, in order that the right of the people of Chicago to the best possible postal service may be asserted;

Be it further resolved, That if it is necessary to reduce the wages of employees in order to meet the conditions arising from the falling off of postal receipts this should be done in places where the receipts fall below the expenditures, or at any rate in places where there is not so large a surplus in the earnings of the department as in the city of Chicago; and

Be it further resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the city clerk to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, the postmaster of Chicago, the two Senators from Illinois, and the Members of the House of Representatives whose districts are wholly or partly within the city of Chicago, to the end that prompt action may be taken against carrying out the proposed unjust policy.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Francis D. Connery, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the annexed and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution relative to postal employees adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago on the 15th day of February, A. D. 1915, original of which resolution is on file in my office, and that I am the lawful custodian of the same.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of said city of Chicago this 17th day of February, A. D. 1915.

FRANCIS D. CONNERY, *City Clerk.*

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. I wish to join the Senator from Illinois in expressing my gratification that the committee has eliminated the feature of biennial promotions. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a communication, for the enlightenment of future Congresses, reciting the inconveniences and evils of the biennial promotion proposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The communication referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1915.*

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Post Office appropriation bill, reported to the Senate February 8, contains three amendments which permanently change existing law by substituting biennial promotions for annual promotions for post-office clerks, city letter carriers, and railway mail clerks.

The first of these amendments, which affects clerks in first and second class post offices, occurs on page 14, lines 10 to 20, and its purpose is to permanently amend the classification act of 1907 so as to compel two years of service in each grade before promotion to the next higher grade instead of one year, as is now provided.

Under existing law clerks in first-class post offices can be promoted $100 per annum until the maximum grade of $1,200 is reached, and clerks in second-class offices can be promoted $100 per annum until the maximum grade of $1,100 is reached. The existing law provides that no promotion can be made except upon satisfactory evidence to the department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the clerk during the preceding year.

Before receiving regular appointment these clerks must serve as substitutes for an average period of two years or more, during which time they are held on call and receive no fixed compensation. Therefore under existing law it requires a period of from six to seven years' service for a clerk to reach the maximum grade of $1,200 per annum in first-class offices.

Under the pending amendment, on page 14 of the bill, it would require 12 years or more to reach the same maximum grade.

The paticular employees who will be affected by these pending amendments are the lowest-paid servants in the Postal Service, and consequently they are the least able to bear the burden of what practically amounts to a serious reduction in their compensation.

These post-office clerks are for the most part employed at night.

In addition to their regular hours of duty in the post office, the great majority of them are compelled to devote hours of study outside of the post office in order that they may learn the difficult and constantly changing "schemes" of mail distribution. They must regularly submit themselves to examinations to insure the maintenance of a high degree of efficiency.

We submit that if the pending amendments herein referred to should be adopted, the efficiency of the service will suffer, because the position of post-office clerk will no longer be sufficiently attractive to induce the right kind of young men to enter the service.

Your attention is respectfully directed to the fact that the three amendments herein referred to constitute practically the only new legislaion recommended by the Senate Post Office Committee.

The United National Association of Post Office Clerks, representing more than 26,000 clerks employed in the first and second class post offices of the country, earnestly petition you to oppose the pending amendments.

Respectfully, yours, FRANK T. ROGERS, *President.*

Mr. LEWIS. Might I ask the chairman of the committee, does this change apply to all parts of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. The chairman of the committee having stated that it applies to all parts of the bill renders it unnecessary that I occupy the floor of the Senate any further.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, both the Senator from Illinois and I had lengthy speeches which we intended to deliver on this subject, and I regret that by reason of the action of the committee we are personally deprived of the privilege of addressing the Senate on this subject.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I decline to be entirely ignored on this subject, and I join in the expressions which have been made by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I will state that I had introduced an amendment, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to correct this matter. I, too, want to join the noble band, consisting of my colleague [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] on this proposition.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 14, line 23, after the word "appropriated," to strike out:

Provided, That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation to employees other than those in the clerical grades in post offices of the

first class shall be annual salaries graded in even hundreds of dollars based upon the postal receipts for the preceding calendar year of the post office at which they are employed, as follows.

At each post office where the receipts are $40,000 but less than $60,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,300; superintendent of mails, $1,300.

At each post office where the receipts are $60,000 but less than $100,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,400; superintendent of mails, $1,400.

At each post office where the receipts are $100,000 but less than $150,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,500; superintendent of mails, $1,500.

At each post office where the receipts are $150,000 but less than $200,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,600; superintendent of mails, $1,600.

At each post office where the receipts are $200,000 but less than $300,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,700; superintendent of mails, $1,700.

At each post office where the receipts are $300,000 but less than $400,000: Superintendent of finance, $1,800; cashiers, $1,500; superintendent of mails, $1,800; assistant superintendent of mails, $1,500.

At each post office where the receipts are $400,000 but less than $600,000: Superintendent of finance, $2,000; cashiers, $1,600; superintendent of mails, $2,000; assistant superintendent of mails, $1,600; stenographers, $900 to $1,200.

At each post office where the receipts are $600,000 but less than $800,000: Superintendent of finance, $2,200; cashiers, $1,700; superintendent of mails, $2,200; assistant superintendent of mails, $1,600 and $1,700; stenographers, $900 to $1,200.

At each post office where the receipts are $800,000 but less than $1,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $2,400; cashiers, $1,800; superintendent of mails, $2,400; assistant superintendent of mails, $1,700 and $1,800; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $1,400.

At each post office where the receipts are $1,000,000 but less than $1,500,000: Superintendent of finance, $2,600; cashiers, $2,000; superintendent of mails, $2,600; assistant superintendent of mails, $1,800 and $2,000; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookeeper, $1,500.

At each post office where the receipts are $1,500,000 but less than $2,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $2,800; cashiers, $2,200; superintendent of mails, $2,800; assistant superintendent of mails, $2,000 and $2,200; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $1,600.

At each post office where the receipts are $2,000,000 but less than $3,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $3,000; cashiers, $2,400; superintendent of mails, $3,000; assistant superintendent of mails, $2,000, $2,200, and $2,400; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $1,800.

At each post office where the receipts are $3,000,000 but less than $5,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $3,200; cashiers, $2,600; superintendent of mails, $3,200; assistant superintendent of mails, $2,200, $2,400, and $2,600; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $2,000.

At each post office where the receipts are $5,000,000 but less than $10,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $3,400; cashiers, $2,800; superintendent of mails, $3,400; assistant superintendent of mails, $2,400, $2,600, and $2,800; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $2,200.

At each post office where the receipts are $10,000,000 but less than $20,000,000: Superintendent of finance, $3,600; cashiers, $2,800; superintendent of mails, $3,600; assistant superintendents of mails, $2,400, $2,600, and $2,800; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $2,400.

At each post office where the receipts are $20,000,000 or over: Superintendent of finance, $3,800; cashiers, $2,800; superintendent of mails, $3,800; assistant superintendent of mails, $2,400, $2,600, and $2,800; superintendent of delivery, $3,800; assistant superintendents of delivery, $2,400, $2,600, and $2,800; stenographers, $900 to $1,200; bookkeeper, $2,400; auditor, $3,000: *And provided further*, That there may also be employed at first-class post offices special clerks, foremen, and stenographers, at a salary of $1,300 or more per annum: *And provided further*, That on and after July 1, 1915, the salary of station superintendents shall be based on the postal receipts and number of employees at their respective stations on the following basis:

When the receipts of a carrier station do not exceed $5,000 per annum, the station shall have a credit of three points, and for each additional $5,000 a credit of one point.

When the receipts of a noncarrier station do not exceed $5,000 per annum, the station shall have a credit of three points, and for each additional $30,000 a credit of one point.

When the employees (clerks and carriers, city and rural) at a carrier station are three or less, the station shall have a credit of one point and for each multiple of three employees a credit of one point.

Stations having credit of less than five points shall be in charge of a clerk at a salary not to exceed $1,200.

At stations having a total credit of 5 points or more the salary of the superintendent shall be as follows: Five and six points, superintendent, $1,300; 7 to 9 points, superintendent, $1,400; 10 to 13 points, superintendent, $1,500; 14 to 18 points, superintendent, $1,600; 19 to 23 points, superintendent, $1,700; 24 to 32 points, superintendent, $1,800; 33 to 44 points, superintendent, $1,900; 45 to 64 points, superintendent, $2,000; 65 to 100 points, superintendent, $2,100; 101 to 135 points, superintendent, $2,200; 136 to 200 points, superintendent, $2,300; 201 to 275 points, superintendent, $2,400; 276 to 350 points, superintendent, $2,500; 351 points and over superintendent, $2,600: *Provided*, That by reason of the reclassification plan herein provided no employee shall receive less compensation than before the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 23, before the word "years," to strike out "two" and insert "four," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, $1,200,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Postmaster General may enter into contracts for the conduct of such stations for a term not exceeding four years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 3, after the words "post offices," to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,900,000," so as to make the clause read:

For temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at first and second class post offices and temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, $1,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 15, after the word "further," to strike out "That in the disbursement of this appropriation no employee shall be paid at a rate higher than $600 per annum," and insert "That the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of this appropriation, expend not exceeding $400,000 for the employment, at a maximum salary of $600 per annum, of assistant postmasters at post offices of the third class where the salary of the postmaster is $1,800 or $1,900 per annum," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no allowance in excess of $300 shall be made where the salary of the postmaster is $1,000, $1,100, or $1,200; nor in excess of $400 where the salary of the postmaster is $1,300, $1,400, or $1,500; nor in excess of $500 where the salary of the postmaster is $1,600 or $1,700; nor in excess of $800 where the salary of the postmaster is $1,800 or $1,900: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of this appropriation, expend not exceeding $400,000 for the employment, at a maximum salary of $600 per annum, of assistant postmasters at post offices of the third class where the salary of the postmaster is $1,800 or $1,900 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 11, after the words "without pay," to strike out "and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade"; and in line 16, after the words "City Delivery Service," to strike out "$38,760,000" and insert "$37,060,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1915, carriers at first-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade and carriers at second-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade. All promotions of carriers shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade and no promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding two years," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of letter carriers at offices already established, including substitutes for letter carriers absent without pay, City Delivery Service, $37,060,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1915, carriers at first-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade and carriers at second-class post offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade. All promotions of carriers shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade and no promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding two years.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. That is connected with the amendment which has been heretofore agreed to, and in view of that fact this amendment should be disagreed to. We should restore the House language and leave out the amendment proposed by the committee appearing in italics.

Mr. PENROSE. What part of the bill is the Senator from Florida proposing to amend?

Mr. BRYAN. On page 21.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senate has been making such unseemly haste all day that I have had difficulty in keeping up with the proceedings.

Mr. BRYAN. There were three classes of employees involved in biennial or annual promotions. The Senate has restored the House provision in so far as the postal clerks are concerned. The letter carriers are likewise situated, as are the postal clerks. On page 21 the letter carriers are dealt with, and disagreement with the amendment would restore the House provision as to letter carriers, which allows annual promotions instead of making them biennial.

Mr. PENROSE. Then the provision for the biennial promotion of letter carriers is stricken out of the bill?

Mr. BRYAN. That increases the amount $1,700,000.

Mr. PENROSE. I again express my gratification that the committee has taken that action. I had some remarks to make on the measure, but, of course, it is not necessary to address the Senate on it, and I shall restrain myself and ask the Reporter to insert in the RECORD the communication which I send to the desk, from the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. BRYAN. It is costing about a million and a half dollars every time the Senator from Pennsylvania restrains himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be inserted in the RECORD. The Chair hears none.

The communication referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1915.

Hon. BOIES PENROSE, *City.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I submit herewith for your consideration a statement showing the effect that the amendment proposed in the Post Office

appropriation bill, on page 21, lines 17 to 24, and page 22, lines 1 and 2, will have on the classification act, which provides the manner and method for promotions of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service. Under the law as it now stands a letter carrier works on an average of eight years before he can possibly reach the maximum grade in a first-class post office or the $1,100 grade in a second-class office, and during that period of time his average daily compensation is $2.05.

A letter carrier is only paid for the actual time that he is employed, so that in case of sickness or other causes a letter carrier is off duty, his average earnings fall below the above amount. A postal employee can not be promoted to any of the intermediate grades unless he renders satisfactory service for one year in each of the lower grades, so that his promotion depends entirely on his rendering efficient service. I trust that you will read the statement submitted herewith, and that you can see the depressing effect that the proposed amendment will have on the letter carriers of the country if it is enacted into law.

I hope that the justice of retaining the classification act in its present form will meet with your approval and that you can see your way clear to record your opposition to the amendment proposed, and that you will not think it presumptuous of me for drawing your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, yours, ED. J. CANTWELL, *Secretary.*

EFFECT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT ON LETTER CARRIERS' CLASSIFICATION LAW.

The Post Office appropriation bill as reported to the Senate February 8, 1915, contains three amendments which, if enacted into law, will amend the classification acts of post-office clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and railway mail clerks, and provide that promotions in these services shall be made biennially instead of annually as at present. For the information of the Senate a statement is herewith submited of the operation of the law in its present form and also the effect that the proposed amendment would have if it is adopted.

In the City Delivery Service, when a man receives an appointment he is assigned for duty as a substitute. These substitutes serve on an average of three years before they receive an appointment to the regular force, and during this substitute period earn on an average of $25 per month. When appointed to a regular position the employee receives a salary of $800 per annum the first year, and if his services are satisfactory to the department and he is recommended for promotion by his postmaster he can receive annual promotions of $100 each year until he reaches the $1,100 grade in second-class offices and the $1,200 grade in first-class offices. Under the most favorable circumstances he must work eight years under the present law before he can reach the maximum grade of salary, and during that period of time he averages $61.46 per month, or $2.05 per day.

Under the proposed amendment a city letter carrier would work on an average of three years as a substitute at $25 per month, and if then appointed to the regular force he would have to serve two years in the $800 grade and two years in each of the intervening grades, or a total of 13 years before he could reach the $1,200 grade. His average earning capacity during the first 8 years under the proposed amendment would be $55.21 per month, or $1.84 per day. A comparison of 8 years of service under the present law and that of the amendment proposed in this bill is herewith submitted.

PRESENT LAW.

Average period served as a substitute is three years, with an average salary of $25 per month, or $300 per year.

3 years as substitute, at $300	$900.00
1 year as regular, at $800	800.00
1 year as regular, at $900	900.00
1 year as regular, at $1,000	1,000.00
1 year as regular, at $1,100	1,100.00
1 year as regular, at $1,200	1,200.00
Total 8 years' salary	5,900.00
Average yearly salary	737.50
Average monthly salary	61.46
Average daily salary	2.05

PROPOSED LAW.

3 years as substitute, at $300	$900.00
2 years as regular, at $800	1,600.00
2 years as regular, at $900	1,800.00
1 year as regular, as $1,000	1,000.00
Total 8 years' salary	5,300.00
Average yearly salary	662.50
Average monthly salary	55.21
Average daily salary	1.84

The present law provides that "no promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year. The Post Office Department may reduce a clerk or carrier from a higher to a lower grade whenever his efficiency falls below a fair standard or whenever necessary for purposes of discipline." According to the law as it now stands, an employee must earn his promotion by rendering service entirely satisfactory to the postmaster and the Post Office Department officials, and unless he does so he is denied promotion. Under the most favorable conditions and with a record of efficient service, an employee works on an average of eight years before he can possibly reach the $1,200 grade. If the amendment proposed by the Senate committee is adopted it will take an employee 13 years before he can reach the $1,200 grade.

The amendment referred to above is on page 21, lines 17 to 24, and page 22, lines 1 and 2. Post Office appropriation bill.

It is contended that under the laws that now exist that the promotions of employees are none too rapid considering the duties they perform, and it surely would not be an incentive to competent and efficient employees to continue in the service if they have to look forward to 13 years of service before they could reach the highest grade of $1,200 per annum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the amendment is disagreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 22, line 5, after the word "established," to strike out "$3,500,000," and insert "$3,000,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For pay of substitutes for letter carriers absent with pay, and of auxiliary and temporary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 24, line 2, after the words "mail bags," to strike out "$650,000," and insert "$625,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For pay of freight or expressage on postal cards, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, and empty mail bags, $625,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$30,429,825" and insert "$29,664,000"; so as to make the clause read:

Railway Mail Service: For 15 division superintendents, at $3,250 each; 2 assistant superintendents, at $2,350 each; 15 assistant division superintendents, at $2,250 each; 121 chief clerks, at not exceeding $2,100 each; 466 clerks, grade 10, at not exceeding $1,800 each; 1,658 clerks, grade 9, at not exceeding $1,700 each; 601 clerks, grade 8, at not exceeding $1,600 each; 6,985 clerks, grade 7, at not exceeding $1,500 each; 2,041 clerks, grade 6, at not exceeding $1,400 each; 1,839 clerks, grade five, at not exceeding $1,300 each; 2,441 clerks, grade 4, at not exceeding $1,200 each; 2,672 clerks, grade 3, at not exceeding $1,100 each; 2,429 clerks, grade 2, at not exceeding $1,000 each; 2,213 clerks, grade one, at not to exceed $900 each; in all $29,664,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "exceeded," to insert:

Provided further, That from and after July 1, 1915, regular promotions of railway postal clerks now provided for by law shall be made, and promotions above these grades within the maximum grades of the classification may be made in the discretion of the Postmaster General for meritorious service, only at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade.

Mr. BRYAN. Following the same action that has heretofore been taken, the proposed amendment from line 13 to line 25 should be disagreed to.

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

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, may I say, in line with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has said, that I am sorry that the Senate will be deprived of some very eloquent remarks from West Virginia on that subject, owing to the action which the Senator from Florida has just taken. I, too, desire to congratulate him.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment on page 25, line 4, striking out "$30,429,825" and inserting "$29,664,000" was agreed to, and that the amendment be disagreed to. The rejection of the amendments in regard to promotions costs money, and we will have to put back the amounts originally provided.

Mr. PENROSE. As I understand, the rejection of the proviso beginning on line 13, page 25, eliminates the biennial promotion proposition so far as the railway postal clerks are concerned?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. In that connection, without making the speech which I intended to make on this question, I desire to insert in the RECORD a communication from the official representatives of this class of employees, explaining the reasons why the amendment proposed should not prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 11, 1915.*

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate, City.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sending with this a statement that will explain, on behalf of the men in the Railway Mail Service, the effect of the amendment contained in the Post Office bill as reported by the Senate committee. The amendment affecting this branch of the service reads as follows:

"*Provided further*, That from and after July 1, 1915, regular promotions of railway postal clerks now provided for by law shall be made, and promotions above these grades within the maximum grades of the classification may be made, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, for meritorious service only at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of two years' service in the next lower grade."

The effect of this amendment is to change the system of annual promotions established by the law of August 24, 1912, to a biennial system. The effect of this amendment will fall most heavily upon the men in the lower grades of this service and but lightly upon the men in the higher grades.

I would be pleased to have you give the inclosed statement such consideration as you may think the subject merits.

Very respectfully, GEO. H. FAIR.

A STATEMENT.

The Post Office bill as reported by the Senate committee contains three similar amendments. These affect the post-office clerks at certain offices, the carriers at free-delivery offices, and the Railway Mail Service. The amendment affecting the post-office clerks is found on page 14 of the bill, lines 10 to 20; that affecting the carriers is found on pages 21 to 22,

beginning with line 17 on page 21; and that affecting the Railway Mail Service is found on page 25, lines 13 to 20.

The law providing for annual promotions in the Railway Mail Service was passed August 24, 1912—less than three years ago. By it the clerks in this service were placed upon the same promotion basis as the letter carriers and the post-office clerks. While it provided for successive promotions up to a certain limit, it was essentially a service-promition measure. Under the provisions of this law a clerk in a class A line might be promoted successively to the $1,100 grade, a clerk in a class B line to the $1,200 grade, and a clerk in a class C line to the $1,300 grade. In each case the clerk must earn his promotion by rendering a year's "satisfactory service" in the next lower grade. Promotions above these grades are "meritorious promotions," to be made in the discretion of the Postmaster General upon satisfactory evidence of "the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year."

In the Railway Mail Service a prospective clerk enters the service as a substitute, without regular employment or any guaranteed compensation. He is given employment whenever his services are needed, because of the absence, from any cause, of the regular clerks. He may have steady employment for a season or he may work but a few days in a month. His period of service as a substitute under normal conditions has been, approximately, two years, but under existing conditions it will be a longer time. He is regularly appointed when he has reached the head of the substitute list. During his whole life as a substitute he is required to study his schemes of distribution unless he be assigned to a terminal railway post office.

When he is regularly appointed, it is as a clerk of grade 1, at a salary of $900. Under the present law he serves for one year in this grade, and, if his services have been satisfactory, he is promoted to $1,000. After a year's satisfactory service in this grade he is promoted to $1,100. This is his "successive promotion limit" on a class A line. If he be assigned to a class B line or a class C line, he may be promoted to $1,200; and if he be assigned to a class C line, he may be promoted to $1,300. Each of these promotions depends upon "satisfactory service," which includes study requirements, road work, and general qualifications.

Under the law of August 24, 1912, it requires approximately seven years to reach the limit of the successive promotions and nine years to reach the highest grade in the service below that of a clerk in charge. Under the proposed amendment it will require 10 years of service before a clerk reaches the highest grade of the successive promotions, the $1,300 grade, and 14 years before he can reach the highest grade in the service below that of a clerk in charge—that is, the $1,500 grade in a class C line. During all of this time he is exposed to the hazard incident to this branch of the service and is maintaining his examination requirements at the high standard fixed by the Post Office Department.

This proposed change does not affect to a very great extent the higher grade men of the service, but the burden of it falls upon the men of the lower grades.

Taking into consideration the hazard of his employment, the exhaustive physical effort required to work at high tension upon rapidly moving trains, and the exact knowledge required of him in the discharge of his duty, it would appear that his compensation was not out of proportion to the services rendered.

Respectfully submitted.

GEO. H. FAIR,
President Railway Mail Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On page 25, line 4, does the amount, "$30,429,825," remain in the bill?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I have moved to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to striking out that amount and inserting "$29,654,000" and that the amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask if the effect of the committee amendment being disagreed to revives the old law providing for annual promotions if deserved?

Mr. BRYAN. It makes promotions compulsory if the employees remain in the service.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 29, after line 12, to strike out:

The appropriation for two delegates to the International Postal Union at Madrid, to be appointed by the Postmaster General from the Post Office Department, made by the act of August 24, 1912, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, is hereby continued and shall be available for such convention when it shall be held.

And insert:

The appropriation for two delegates to the International Postal Union at Madrid, to be appointed by the Postmaster General from the Postal Service, made by the act of August 24, 1912, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, is hereby continued and shall be available for such convention when it shall be held.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 30, line 7, after the words "Rural Delivery Service," to strike out "$54,700,000," and insert "$52,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of letter carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, $52,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $20,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for compensation of clerks in charge of substations.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SWANSON. That amendment goes over.

Mr. SMOOT. It goes over.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not want any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. SWANSON. It is the amendment on page 30, line 7, under the heading "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General."

Mr. WEEKS. There are several Senators who want to discuss that matter.

Mr. SMOOT. That goes over with section 21 on page 56.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. BRYAN. What is the amendment which goes over?

Mr. SWANSON. It is in regard to the Rural Delivery Service on page 30.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no objection to that amendment being passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 30, line 21, after the words "third class," to strike out "$200,000," and insert "$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

For experimental village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, for myself only, I desire to move to strike out lines 20, 21, and 22, on page 30. I wish to state in a word that the provision incorporated in those lines will embark us upon an expenditure that in a few years will mount into the millions of dollars for village delivery service. This item is added on the theory that it is experimental; but before the House committee it was stated that the object they have in view and what this money will be spent for will be to make an experimental delivery service in each congressional district. When you establish such a service in one village in each congressional district, then every other town and every other village of the same size will be demanding it; and they will have justice behind the demand. They will demand it upon the ground of equality of treatment.

Now, I understand that the Senate is going to allow the provision to remain in the bill, but I want to register my protest against it here and now, and I make the prediction that if it does remain in the bill, in 10 years the service will cost the Government $20,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Why does he think the Senate will necessarily leave the provision in the bill?

Mr. BRYAN. They left it in last year. The experiment was initiated two years ago with an appropriation of $50,000. The Post Office Department was opposed to it then, and is opposed to it now. They want to save this $150,000. They tried to save by asking the men in the service to waive for this year the annual promotions, but it became so evident that Congress would not agree to that proposition that the committee met again and reconsidered their action, because of which the appropriation has been increased by the amendments agreed to in the last few minutes between two and a half and three million dollars.

When the first appropriation for this experimental service was made, the department, to show its disapproval of it, did not spend the money; they have never spent the amount of money that has been appropriated; and even this year they came before Congress and said, "We do not want this money"; and yet the House gave $200,000. The department said, however, "If you give it to us, the understanding is that we will put a delivery service in one village in each congressional district"; and it is not difficult to figure that in a very few years every other village in every congressional district will be insisting upon the same privilege, and the people who now can not be kept away from the village post office, who go there day by day to see the trains pass and to get their mail, will stay at home or will not go to the post office, or, if they do go, they will not get their mail there, but will have it delivered to them.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the rural carriers could deliver this mail without any additional expense at all, but that is not the plan. The plan is to build up a system that in a few years is going to cost 50 per cent of the amount the Rural Delivery Service costs to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will agree to strike out lines 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope so, too, and I hope at least the matter will go to conference.

Mr. SMOOT. If those lines are stricken out, it will go to conference. I agree with the Senator from Florida in relation to this item. I do not believe that we ought to embark on this undertaking.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this is simply an appropriation to continue the present existing service. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars was spent for this purpose last year, and the amount has been reduced in this bill to that figure. There are certain small towns which do not have the advantages of the larger towns; they do not have the advantage of rural delivery. The department has endeavored to make experiments in those places to see to what extent they could improve the mail facilities, which are really worse in some of the small villages than they are in the country districts.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. Was it agreed by unanimous consent that the committee amendments should be first considered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, I desire to withdraw my amendment, because I had forgotten that for the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at the present time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask that that provision in the bill go over until to-morrow, as some other Senators desire to speak on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been agreed to, and there is nothing to go over. It will be subject to amendment to-morrow.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, under the subhead "Postal savings system," on page 31, line 17, after the words "straps," to insert "baskets," and in the same line, after the word "repair," to strike out "baskets," so as to make the clause read:

For supplies for the City Delivery Service, including satchels, straps, baskets, and their repair, time cards, time-recorder supplies, maps, transfer designs, and stencils, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 5, after "$100,000" to insert "*Provided*, That $6,000 of the sum hereby appropriated may be expended immediately after the passage of this act for the purchase of dies for letter boxes," so as to make the clause read:

For equipment for City Delivery Service, including letter boxes, letter-box fasteners, package boxes, posts, furniture, trucks, and time-card frames, $100,000: *Provided*, That $6,000 of the sum hereby appropriated may be expended immediately after the passage of this act for the purchase of dies for letter boxes.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the amendment of the committee on page 33 just read by the Secretary is rather a radical departure from the policy of the Post Office Department. As I understand, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General proposes to go down to the navy yard or some other place and make certain dies for letter boxes, which have heretofore and are now being actually made and contracted for by private individuals and corporations. I raise the point of order that this is in the nature of new legislation and should not be retained in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any law that authorizes the making of the dies for letter boxes?

Mr. PENROSE. No, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the point of order is overruled.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not understand the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated that unless there is some general law upon the subject the point of order is overruled.

Mr. PENROSE. The law at the present time authorizes the contracting for these dies with private individuals. I should like to have this matter go over until to-morrow, so that the Chair may look into it, and I want to be heard on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asked the Senator from Pennsylvania whether there was any law on the subject, and he said there was not.

Mr. PENROSE. My mind is not clear as to what the existing law is, and if the chairman of the committee will consent to having this passed over I should be glad to have that done.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I think all the law is contained in this appropriation:

For equipment for City Delivery Service, including letter boxes, letter-box fasteners, package boxes, posts, furniture, trucks, and time-card frames, $100,000.

There is no law on the subject except that, as I understand it.

Mr. PENROSE. That is all.

Mr. SWANSON. This is to authorize these dies to be purchased as much as to rent them or lease them, and the purchases to be made where it can be done to the advantage of the Government. I do not see how it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion?

Mr. PENROSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It appears that for equipment for City Delivery Service, etc., including certain things, $100,000 is appropriated. Then there is couched in the language and under the guise of a proviso a provision that a part of this sum that is authorized to be spent for certain specific purposes herein enumerated is to be diverted and spent for another purpose that does not appear by law to be authorized. It seems to me that under the guise of a limitation upon an appropriation for a specific purpose it is an authorization for a different purpose. I was confused by the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut has no doubt, has he, that the Congress of the United States has a right to expend this money for post-office purposes as it pleases?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, I think the money must be spent as directed by Congress, and if Congress directs that $100,000 shall be spent for letter boxes, letter-box fasteners, package boxes, posts, furniture, trucks, and time-card frames, I do not think the Senate can add an amendment to a general appropriation bill legislating, under the guise of a limitation, that part of this money shall be spent for something else. When the Chair asked the question whether there was any law authorizing this proviso, and was informed that there was no law, I expected that the Chair was going to sustain the point of order because there was no law authorizing it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. Why could not the Senate, if it wanted to, amend this and provide that not more than $6,000 should be used for letter boxes, or any other amount, for that purpose?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly they could put a limitation in the nature of a proviso upon the amount to be spent for each purpose for which they had authorized the expenditure; but that is not what they attempt to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The House authorizes this $100,000 to be spent for certain enumerated objects. The Senate says: "*Provided*, That a part of it shall be spent for something else," which, as it seems to me, is legislation on an appropriation bill. Of course that is only my opinion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is some law of the United States that fixes how dies for letter boxes are to be bought, the Chair will be compelled to overrule the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 33, line 23, after the word "operation," to strike out "$325,000" and insert "$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

For rental and purchase of canceling machines and baling presses, including cost of power in rented buildings, motors, repairs to motors, and miscellaneous expenses of installation and operation, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next committee amendment proposes to strike out all after line 9, on page 35, down to and including line 24, on page 57, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the act approved August 24, 1912, being "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," is hereby amended as follows: At the end of section 5 of said act, after the word "service," insert the following: "*Provided*, That compensatory time for Sunday service during the month of December in any year may be allowed during the month of January next succeeding."

SEC. 3. That hereafter the Postmaster General may establish, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, one or more branch offices, nonaccounting offices, or stations of any post office for the transaction of such postal business as may be required for the convenience of the public.

SEC. 4. That on and after July 1, 1915, when the total compensation of any postmaster at a post office of the fourth class for four consecutive quarters shall amount to $1,000, exclusive of commissions on money orders issued, and the receipts of such post office for the same period shall aggregate as much as $1,900, the Auditor for the Post Office Department shall so report to the Postmaster General, who shall, in pursuance of such report, assign such post office to its proper class, to become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding quarterly period, and fix the salary of the postmaster accordingly.

SEC. 5. That so much of section 1 of the "Act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, which provides that the Post Office Department shall not extend or enlarge its present policy of sending second-class matter by freight trains, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. That the Postmaster General, in cases of emergency, between October 1 and April 1 of any year, may hereafter return to the mails empty mail bags theretofore withdrawn therefrom as required by law, and for such times may pay for their railroad transportation out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes at not exceeding the rate per pound per mile as shown by the last adjustment for mail service on the route over which they may be carried, and pay for necessary cartage out of the appropriation for freight or expressage.

SEC. 7. That when, during a weighing period, on account of floods or other causes, interruptions in service occur on railroad routes and weights of mail are decreased below the normal, or where there is an omission to take weights, the Postmaster General, for the purpose of readjusting compensation on such railroad routes as are affected thereby, is hereafter authorized, in his discretion, to add to the weights of mails ascertained on such routes during that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been normal the estimated weights for that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been not normal, or where there has been an omission to take weights, based upon the average of weights taken during that part of the weighing period during which conditions are shown to have been normal, the actual weights and the estimated weights to form the basis for the average weight per day upon which to readjust the compensation according to law on such railroad routes for the transportation of the mails, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, requiring that the average weight shall be ascertained by the actual weighing of the mails for such a number of successive working days, not less than 90, as the Postmaster General may direct: *Provided further*, That readjustments from July 1, 1913, may be made under this provision on routes in the first section affected by the floods in the Ohio Valley and tributary territories, commencing about March 25, 1913.

SEC. 8. That so much of section 4 of "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, as provides that no adjustment shall be made unless the diverted mails equal at least 10 per cent of the average daily weight on any of the routes affected is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. That hereafter the Postmaster General may transfer, under such regulations as he may prescribe, clerks or carriers from post offices of the first and second classes to the Railway Mail Service at salaries not exceeding the salary which the clerks or carriers are receiving in the post offices at the time of such transfer, with the consent of the clerk or carrier.

SEC. 10. That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid to railroad companies from and after the 30th day of June, 1915, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, for the transportation and handling of the mails and furnishing facilities and services in connection therewith upon the conditions and at the rates hereinafter provided.

The Postmaster General may state railroad mail routes and authorize mail service thereon of the following four classes, namely: Full railway post-office car service, apartment railway post-office car service, storage car service, and closed pouch service.

Full railway post office car mail service shall be service by cars 40 feet or more in length, constructed, fitted up, and maintained for the distribution of mails on trains. The authorizations of full railway post office cars shall be for standard size cars 60 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided.

Apartment railway post office car mail service shall be service by apartments less than 40 feet in length in cars constructed, fitted up, and maintained for the distribution of mails on trains. Two standard sizes of apartment railway post office cars may be authorized and paid for, namely, apartments 15 feet and 30 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided.

Storage-car mail service shall be service by cars used for the storage and carriage of mails in transit other than by full and apartment railway post-office cars. The authorizations for storage cars shall be for cars 60 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That less than 60 feet of storage space may be authorized in baggage cars.

Service by full and apartment railway post-office cars and storage cars shall include the carriage therein of all mail matter, equipment, and supplies for the mail service and the employees of the Postal Service or Post Office Department as shall be directed by the Postmaster General to be so carried.

Closed pouch mail service shall be the transportation and handling by railroad employees of mails on trains on which full or apartment railway post-office cars are not authorized, except as hereinbefore provided.

The rates of payment for the services authorized in accordance with this act shall be as follows, namely:

For full railway post office car mail service at not exceeding 21 cents for each mile of service by a 60-foot car.

In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding $2 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 60-foot car.

For apartment railway post-office car mail service at not exceeding 10½ cents for each mile of service by a 30-foot apartment car and 5½ cents for each mile of service by a 15-foot apartment car.

In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding $1 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 30-foot apartment car, and 50 cents as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 15-foot apartment car.

For storage-car mail service at not exceeding 20 cents for each mile of service by a 60-foot car.

In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding $2 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 60-foot car.

Where authorizations are made for cars of the standard lengths of 60, 30, and 15 feet, as provided by this act, and the railroad company is unable to furnish such cars of the length authorized, but furnishes cars of lesser length than those authorized, but which are determined by the department to be sufficient for the service, the Postmaster General may accept the same and pay only for the actual space furnished and used, the compensation to be not exceeding pro rata of that provided by this act for the standard length so authorized: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may accept cars and apartments of greater length than those of the standard requested, but no compensation shall be allowed for such excess lengths.

For closed-pouch service, on routes upon which closed-pouch service only is performed, at not exceeding the rates of compensation provided by existing law for average daily weights of mail carried over the whole route; on routes upon which apartment railway post-office car and closed-pouch services are performed, at not exceeding $20 per mile per annum for each 2,000 pounds average daily weight of mails carried, and at pro rata of such rate of compensation for each 100 pounds of average daily weight greater or less than 2,000 pounds; and on routes upon which full railway post-office car and closed-pouch services or full railway post-office car, apartment car, and closed-pouch services are performed, at not exceeding $19 per mile per annum for each 2,000 pounds average daily weight of mails carried, and at pro rata of such rate of compensation for each 100 pounds of average daily weight greater or less than 2,000 pounds, the average daily weights to be ascertained in every case by the actual weighing of the mails.

The Postmaster General may require railroad companies carrying the mails to deliver them into and take them from the terminal and intermediate post offices and transfer them between railroad stations on their routes without additional compensation, under such regulations as he may deem proper, in cases where he does not provide for such service otherwise: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may relieve any of the roads of such service.

Railroad companies whose railroads were constructed in whole or in part by a land grant made by Congress, on the condition that the mails should be transported over their roads at such price as Congress should by law direct, shall receive only 80 per cent of the compensation otherwise authorized by this act.

The initial and terminal rates provided for herein shall cover expenses of loading and unloading mails, switching, lighting, heating, cleaning mail cars, and all other expenses incidental to station service and required by the Postmaster General in connection with the mails that are not included in the car-mile rate. The allowance for full railway post-office cars, apartment railway post-office cars, and storage cars may be varied in accordance with the approximate difference in their respective cost of construction and maintenance.

For the purpose of ascertaining the average weight of closed-pouch mails per day upon which to adjust compensation, the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to have such mails carried on the several routes weighed by the employees of the Post Office Department for such a number of successive days, not less than 35, at such times after the passage of this act as he may direct, and not less frequently than once in every year thereafter, the result to be stated and certified in such form and manner as he may direct. In computing the average weight of mails per day carried on a railroad route, the whole number of days included in the weighing period shall be used as a divisor. The expense of taking the weights of mails and the compensation to tabulators and clerks employed in connection with the weighings, for assistance in completing computations, and of rentals, if necessary, in Washington, D. C., shall be paid out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

In computing the car-miles of the full railway post-office cars and apartment railway post-office cars, the maximum space authorized in either direction of a round-trip car run shall be regarded as the space to be computed in both directions, unless otherwise mutually agreed upon.

In computing the car-miles of storage cars, the maximum space authorized in either direction of a round-trip car run shall be regarded as the space to be computed in both directions, unless the car be used by the company in the return movement, or otherwise mutually agreed upon.

New service and additional service may be authorized at not exceeding the rates herein provided, and service may be reduced or discontinued, with pro rata reductions in pay, as the needs of the Postal Service may require: *Provided*, That no additional pay shall be allowed for additional closed-pouch service on established routes until the next regular readjustment of pay therefor on such routes, and no additional pay shall be allowed for additional car service unless specifically authorized by the Postmaster General.

All cars or parts of cars used for the Railway Mail Service shall be of such construction, style, length, and character, and furnished in such manner as shall be required by the Postmaster General, and shall be constructed, fitted up, maintained, heated, lighted, and cleaned by and at the expense of the railroad companies. No pay shall be allowed for service by any railway post-office car which is not sound in material and construction and which is not equipped with sanitary drinking-water containers and toilet facilities, nor unless such car is regularly and thoroughly cleaned. No pay shall be allowed for service by any wooden full railway post-office car unless constructed substantially in accordance with the most approved plans and specifications of the Post Office Department for such type of cars, nor for service by any wooden full railway post-office car run in any train between adjoining steel cars, or between the engine and a steel car adjoining. After the 1st of July, 1917, the Postmaster General shall not approve or allow to be used, or pay for service by, any full railway post-office car not constructed of steel or steel underframe or equally indestructible material, and not less than 25 per cent of the full railway post-office cars of a railway company not conforming to these provisions on August 24, 1912, shall be replaced with cars constructed of steel annually after June, 1913; and all full railway post-office cars accepted for this service and contracted for by the railroad companies hereafter shall be constructed of steel. Until July 1, 1917, in cases of emergency and in cases where the necessities of the service require it, the Postmaster General may provide for service by full railway post-office cars of other than steel or steel underframe construction, and fix therefor such rate of compensation within the maximum herein provided as shall give consideration to the inferior character of construction, and the railroad companies shall furnish service by such cars at such rates so fixed.

Service over property owned or controlled by another company or a terminal company shall be considered service of the railroad company using such property and not that of the other or terminal company: *Provided*, That service over a land-grant road shall be paid for as herein provided.

Railroad companies carrying the mails shall furnish all necessary facilities for caring for and handling them while in their custody. They shall furnish all cars or parts of cars used in the transportation and distribution of the mails, except as is herein otherwise provided, and place them in stations before the departure of trains at such times and when required to do so. They shall provide station space and rooms for handling, distribution, and transfer of mails in transit, and for offices and rooms for the employees of the Postal Service engaged in such transportation, when required by the Postmaster General.

Every railroad company carrying the mails shall carry on any train it operates and without extra charge therefor the persons in charge of the mails, and when on duty and traveling to and from duty, and all duly accredited agents and officers of the Post Office Department and the Postal Service, while traveling on official business, upon the exhibition of their credentials.

If any railroad company carrying the mails shall fail or refuse to provide cars or apartments in cars for distribution purposes when required by the Postmaster General, or shall fail or refuse to construct, fit up, maintain, heat, light, and clean such cars and provide such appliances for use in case of accident as may be required by the Postmaster General, it shall be fined such reasonable sum as may, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be deemed proper.

The Postmaster General shall in all cases decide upon what trains and in what manner the mails shall be conveyed. Every railroad company carrying the mails shall carry on any train it operates and with due speed all mailable matter, equipment, and supplies directed to be carried thereon. If any such railroad company shall fail or refuse to transport the mails, equipment, and supplies when required by the Postmaster General on any train or trains it operates, such company shall be fined such reasonable amount as may, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be deemed proper.

The Postmaster General may make deductions from the pay of railroad companies carrying the mails under the provisions of this act for reduction in service or in frequency of service where, in his judgment, the importance of the facilities withdrawn or reduced requires it, and impose fines upon them for delinquencies. He may deduct the price of the value of the service in cases where it is not performed, and not exceeding three times its value if the failure be occasioned by the fault of the railroad company.

The provisions of this section shall apply to service operated by railroad companies partly by railroad and partly by steamboats.

The provisions of this section respecting the rates of compensation shall not apply to mails conveyed under special arrangement in freight trains, for which rates not exceeding the usual and just freight rates may be paid, in accordance with the classifications and tariffs approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Railroad companies carrying the mails shall submit, under oath, when, and in such form as may be required by the Postmaster General, evidence as to the performance of service.

The Postmaster General is authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and to rent quarters in Washington, D. C., if necessary, for the clerical force engaged thereon, and to pay for the same out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes, and hereafter detailed estimates shall be submitted for such services in the annual Book of Estimates.

The Postmaster General shall, from time to time, request information from the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the revenue received by railroad companies from express companies for services rendered in the transportation of express matter, and may, in his discretion, arrange for the transportation of mail matter other than of the first class at rates not exceeding those so ascertained and reported to him, and it shall be the duty of the railroad companies to carry such mail matter at such rates fixed by the Postmaster General.

The Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for the determination of a postal carload or less-than-carload rate for transportation of mail matter of the fourth class and periodicals, and may provide for and authorize such transportation, when practicable, at such rates, and it shall be the duty of the railroad companies to provide and perform such service at such rates and on the conditions prescribed by the Postmaster General.

The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, distinguish between the several classes of mail matter and provide for less frequent dispatches of mail matter of the third and fourth classes and periodicals, when lower rates for transportation or other economies may be secured thereby without material detriment to the service.

The Postmaster General is authorized to return to the mails, when practicable for the utilization of car space paid for and not needed for the mails, postal cards, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, empty mail bags, furniture, equipment, and other supplies for the Postal Service.

The Postmaster General, in cases of emergency between October 1 and April 1 of any year, may hereafter return to the mails empty mail bags and other equipment theretofore withdrawn therefrom as required by law, and where such return requires additional authorization of car space under the provisions of this section to pay for the transportation thereof as provided for herein out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

The Postmaster General may have the weights of mail taken on railroad mail routes and computations of the average loads of the several classes of cars and other computations for statistical and administrative purposes made at such times as he may elect, and pay the expense thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

It shall be unlawful for any railroad company to refuse to perform mail service at the rates of compensation provided by law when and for the period required by the Postmaster General so to do, and for every such offense it shall be fined not exceeding $5,000.

That the appropriations for inland transportation by railroad routes and for railway post-office car service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, are hereby made available for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 11. That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's order No. 7349, of July 25, 1913, respecting rates upon and limit of weight of parcel-post packages in the local, first, and second zones, and effective from August 15, 1913, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after August 15, 1913, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent thereof per annum.

SEC. 12. That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's orders Nos. 7720 and 7721, of December 18, 1913, respecting rates upon and limit of weight of parcel-post packages, and admitting books to the parcel-post classification, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after January 1, 1914, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding 1 per cent thereof per annum.

SEC. 13. That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails quantities of not less than 500 identical pieces of third-class matter and of second-class matter mailed at the special rates of 1 cent and 2 cents a copy and of 250 identical pieces of fourth-class matter without postage stamps affixed: *Provided*, That postage shall be fully prepaid thereon at the rate required by law for a single piece of such matter.

SEC. 14. That such part of section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a system of postal savings depositories as reads "but no one shall be permitted to deposit more than $100 in any one calendar month" is hereby amended to read as follows: "But the balance to the credit of any person upon which interest is payable, shall not exceed $1,000, exclusive of accumulated interest"; and said act is further amended so as to repeal the proviso in section 7 thereof and insert in lieu of such proviso the following: "*Provided*, That the board of trustees may, in their discretion, and under such regulations as such board may promulgate, accept additional deposits not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000 for each depositor but upon which no interest shall be paid."

SEC. 15. That if any person shall hereafter perform any service for any contractor or subcontractor in carrying the mail, he shall, upon filing in the department his contract for such service and satisfactory evidence of its performance, thereafter have a lien on any money due such contractor or subcontractor for such service to the amount of same; and if such contractor or subcontractor shall fail to pay the party or parties who have performed service as aforesaid the amount due for such service within two months after the expiration of the month in which such service shall have been performed the Postmaster General may cause the amount due to be paid said party or parties and charged to the contractor: *Provided*, That such payment shall not in any case exceed the rate of pay per annum of the contractor or subcontractor.

SEC. 16. That whenever an accepted bidder shall fail to enter into contract, or a contractor on any mail route shall fail or refuse to perform the service on said route according to his contract, or when a new route shall be established or new service required, or when, from any other cause, there shall not be a contractor legally bound or required to perform such service, the Postmaster General may make a temporary contract for carrying the mail on such route, without advertisement, for such period as may be necessary, not in any case exceeding one year, until the service shall have commenced under a contract made according to law: *Provided*, That the cost of temporary service rendered necessary by reason of the failure of any accepted bidder to enter into contract or a contractor to perform service shall be charged to such bidder or contractor.

SEC. 17. That section 3949 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All contracts for carrying the mail should be in the name of the United States, and shall be awarded to the lowest bidder tendering sufficient guaranties for faithful performance in accordance with the terms of the advertisement: *Provided, however*, That such contracts require due celerity, certainty, and security in the performance of the service; but the Postmaster General shall not be bound to consider the bid of any person who has willfully or negligently failed to perform a former contract."

SEC. 18. That the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, sec. 198, 35 Stat., p. 1126), be amended to read as follows:

"Whoever shall willfully or maliciously injure, tear down, or destroy any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or shall break open the same, or shall willfully or maliciously injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited therein, or shall willfully take or steal such mail from or out of such letter box or other receptacle, or shall willfully aid or assist in any of the aforementioned offenses, shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years."

SEC. 19. That section 3938 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All letters of domestic origin which can not be delivered by postmasters shall be sent to the Post Office Department, and such as contain inclosures of value, other than correspondence, shall be recorded. If the sender or addressee can not be identified, such letters shall be held for a period of one year awaiting reclamation. If within one year they have not been claimed, they shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General may direct.

"All other undeliverable letters shall be disposed of without record and not held for reclamation."

SEC. 20. That whenever in the judgment of the Postmaster General the bids received for any star route are exorbitant or unreasonable, or whenever he has reason to believe that a combination of bidders has been entered into to fix the rate for star-route service, the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized, out of the appropriation for inland transportation by star routes, to employ and use such means or methods to provide the desired service as he may deem expedient, without reference to existing law or laws respecting the employment of personal service or the procurement of conveyances, materials, or supplies.

SEC. 21. That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be $1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, $1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, $1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, $960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, $840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, $720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, $672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, $624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, $576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, $528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, $480. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Postmaster General the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding $1,800 per annum.

SEC. 22. That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay an additional compensation to rural carriers, out of the appropriation for village delivery service, a sum not to exceed $150 per annum in any individual case for delivering mail at second and third class post offices not now by law entitled to free delivery service.

SEC. 23. That the act approved January 21, 1914 (Pub., 49), authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty, be so amended as to include Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks.

SEC. 24. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is a whole series of sections there on different matters.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that section 21, on page 56, relating to the rural letter carriers, be passed over.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands, then, that except as to section 21, beginning on line 14, of page 56, and ending at line 15, on page 57, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there some other objections?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, section 19 has no relation to these matters of routes or railroads, and it is an amendment for which there has been a great deal of demand—an amendment to the law for the purpose of getting a record of letters of value. At present a man undertakes to pay a bill and the people have moved, and he has no record. This does not add to the expense in any way, but provides for a record and for holding it for a period of a year. I do not see what objection there can be to that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the objection to it is that the bill was framed upon the idea that this is strictly an appropriation bill, and all new legislation was eliminated. That is the theory upon which we have been proceeding, and this is certainly new legislation.

Mr. LODGE. No point of order would lie against it, because it is a House provision.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. LODGE. You can not make a point of order on a House provision.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have not made a point of order. We simply left it out of the bill upon the theory that all new legislation should be eliminated. This matter has all got to go into conference.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that; but I do not see what objection there could be to that provision. It involves no expense.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there are a number of propositions here that are very valuable, but upon which there would be considerable discussion; and the committee decided, inasmuch as this was an appropriation bill, that it would limit the bill to items of appropriation. If we took up the general legislation covered by these sections after page 35, we would be here for days considering this appropriation bill. It would take a week or more; and there seemed to be but one fair way to do it, and that was to limit it to appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. Is it the understanding of the committee that the House is going to assent at once?

Mr. BRYAN. Of course we do not know what the House will do; but I will say to the Senator that there were some members of the committee who were in favor of certain provisions and some in favor of others. On the other hand, there were some equally opposed to the provisions of the Moon bill, so called. There is a provision there for revision of the method of railway mail pay. It is all involved in this. There is a difference between the bill as incorporated into this appropriation bill and the bill recommended by the joint commission of Congress. A consideration of that question would take days, and perhaps weeks.

Mr. LODGE. That amounts to leaving it all in the hands of the conference committee to legislate.

Mr. BRYAN. It does not take away from the Senate the power to pass upon it finally.

Mr. LODGE. Then, also, I should like to ask what has become of the provision about the biennial promotions?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator evidently has been out of the Chamber. The Senate has disagreed to the amendment and restored the House provision, so that the old law as to promotions will remain in force.

Mr. LODGE. I came in just as they got to this point. Section 19 is a mere matter of convenience to a great mass of people, and I should think it could be left in in conference without any serious trouble.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. I understand that on page 21, the Senate committee amendment, relating to letter carriers, was disagreed to. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], who was compelled to leave the Chamber on important business, is interested in lines 10 to 16, on page 21, relating to letter carriers. I ask that that may go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that; the committee amendment has been rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber that I was unable to hear what the Senator said.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I say that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] requested me to ask, on his behalf, that the provisions of the bill, on page 21, relating to letter carriers—that is, the House bill—go over until to-morrow. He desired to be heard briefly on that matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He evidently meant rural carriers. That is section 21.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, no.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have agreed to pass that over until to-morrow at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and others who said they could not be here.

Mr. POINDEXTER. You have already agreed to do that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; we have already agreed to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any exception, then, besides section 21? The question is on agreeing to the other amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Two or three days ago information came to me authoritatively that the President and Members of the Cabinet were being very much annoyed and worried by the reception of letters threatening the destruction of life and property, and all that sort of thing. The matter was called to the attention of the Attorney General. He looked up the matter and said there was no statute by which parties could be punished for mailing letters of that character. He prepared an amendment, which I understand of course is new legislation and subject to a point of order under the rule we have been following; but I hope a point of order will not be raised against this amendment, in order that parties who are guilty of offenses of this sort may be punished when they are apprehended and tried. I should like to have the Secretary read the amendment prepared by the Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the bill by adding a new section after line 9, on page 35, as follows:

SEC. 2. Any person who shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited in the mails any letter, circular, card, or other missive containing any threat to take the life of or to inflict grievous bodily harm upon the President of the United States or any officer entitled by law to succeed to the Presidency, upon conviction thereof shall be fined not to exceed $1,000 or shall be imprisoned for not more than three years; and any person who shall otherwise make any such threat, or, with intent to kill or to inflict grievous bodily harm, shall make or attempt to make any assault upon the President or any officer of the United States entitled by law to succeed to the Presidency, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or because of his official character, or because of any of his official acts or omissions, shall likewise upon conviction be fined not to exceed $1,000 or be imprisoned not more than three years.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course I would not think of making a point of order against legislation of this character. I simply rose to express my amazement that the matter was not already covered by law. Of course I accept the opinion of the Attorney General that it is not.

I do not see why the amendment should apply only to offenses of that character aimed at these gentlemen while they are engaged in their official capacity. I should think that anybody who mailed a letter threatening the life of anybody ought to be guilty of a crime, whether he did it because the official had committed some public act of which he did not approve or not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I understand that the present statute covers cases where assaults are made upon the President or those who are entitled to succession, but there is no statute, so the Attorney General says, that punishes a man for mailing a letter of this character. They have one gentleman under arrest now who admits that he wrote the letter. I saw a copy of the letter, and it is a bad letter, I may say; and there is no way of punishing him under the statute.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is this prohibition against the man who simply mails the letter or the writer of the letter?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is against the man who knowingly mails the letter as well as the writer.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should be glad to have the Secretary repeat just the first few words of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Any person who shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited in the mails any letter, circular, card, or other missive—

And so forth.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. If the chairman will permit me, this matter came up a few years ago, when I was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, by reason of a similar outbreak, I believe, from some so-called anarchists in Paterson, N. J. I agree with the Attorney General and the chairman of

the committee that the law is defective in this connection; but I know that at that time the committee, while anxious to do something, were unable to agree on the character of the amendment. This amendment does not impress me, from the hasty consideration I have been able to give to it from hearing it read, as being complete, and I ask the Senate to let it go over until to-morrow, so that I may examine some of the amendments that were offered in the committee at that time and examine this one a little more carefully.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this amendment was prepared, so I am advised, by the Attorney General or some one in his office under his direction and supervision.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not suppose the source is infallible, although it is high.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with that.

Mr. PENROSE. It can be offered just as well to-morrow. There will not be many letters coming in between now and the enactment of this law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It might be well to state that the Chair turned over a letter in which it was proposed to blow up the Senate with nitroglycerin. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. The Chair might be liable, under this amendment, for transferring the letter across the desk.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know who drew the amendment, but as I glance at it the amendment does not provide that the man who mailed the letter must know the contents of the letter, but if he knowingly mails it he is guilty of a crime. I suppose anybody who drops a letter in the mail knows that he drops it in.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This amendment is up to the Senate, Mr. President. They can make any disposition of it they please. I do not think it ought to go over until to-morrow.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not see why this letter should not cover Senators and others. I sometimes take an unpopular course in the field of political activity, and I receive a great many abusive letters, and I should like a little protection from such missives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not President, and he is not in line of succession. This is only intended for those who expect to succeed the President.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, in these days no one can tell who will be President. I am for myself until I see a better man. [Laughter.] But, leaving that suggestion aside, I really think Senators are entitled to protection. I know the Senator would sympathize with me if he could see some of the letters I have received.

I suggest that this matter go over until to-morrow. It is evidently incomplete and hastily prepared.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think when the Senator seriously thinks about this he will not insist upon its going over.

Mr. PENROSE. Let it be printed and let us consider it.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I desire to protest against this or any other part of the bill going over until to-morrow. This evening session was provided that the pending appropriation bill might be passed. Senators on both sides of the Chamber understood that situation. It is now proposed to permit all those parts of the bill about which there is any controversy to go over and consume another day. I shall object to it as far as I may.

Mr. PENROSE. It already has been agreed that the rural-carrier proposition goes over until to-morrow, and it is evident that we can not complete the bill to-night.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will take a casual look around the Senate Chamber and decide that we can force a vote on this proposition to-night, I should like to have him tell me how he can do it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Wait a minute. The matter referred to has gone over until to-morrow. It went over because we were notified that certain gentlemen desire to be heard on certain provisions of the bill, and that they could not possibly remain here. It is perfectly evident if we undertake to press it that the question of a quorum will be raised.

Mr. FLETCHER. In my judgment, Senators ought to understand that we must stay here and do business or quit. That is all there is to it. These gentlemen were notified to be here, and if they are not here they can be gotten here. We ought not to waste time in taking up bills and let every question that any one has any point about go over until to-morrow. If we pursue that course, we will never get through with the appropriation bills.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This bill has been completed so far as the Senate committee is concerned except one item in it. I do not see how the Senator can say that the time is being frittered away.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not talking about what has been acted upon, but I am referring to items going over until to-morrow.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the Senator, in all kindliness, if I may be allowed to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has that opportunity now.

Mr. LANE. Right now?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Right now. I will withdraw the amendment that I offered.

Mr. SMOOT (to Mr. BANKHEAD). Do not withdraw it. Let it be adopted.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be adopted and that any Senator who wishes may reserve the right to move to amend it when the bill reaches the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator from Alabama will not withdraw the amendment. I do not want to be in the position of objecting to it. Let him offer it and let it be adopted, and I will reserve the right to move to amend it, if I see fit, when the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all right. Let the question be put on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr BRYAN. On page 23, line 11, before the word "purchase," I move to insert the word "exchange" and a comma, so as to read "for the purchase, exchange, and maintenance of wagons or automobiles."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the passage of the bill, and that is why I made the remark which I did. I have two amendments which were submitted to me some time ago and I promised to introduce them. Here is one of them, which I will ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, after line 17, insert:

The sum of $200,000 due the estates of deceased colored soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and which was in the hands of the commissioner of the Freedman's Bureau and which have been repaid into the Treasury of the United States, be, and is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to build a national home for aged and infirm colored people and for working girls, and to establish industrial farms for the maintenance of the same, the building or buildings to be erected in the District of Columbia upon land owned or to be owned by the association known as the Home for Aged and Infirm Colored People, duly incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia for the purpose specified in this act; and the said industrial farm to be established in the State of Virginia upon good agricultural land owned or to be owned by the same: *Provided*, That no money shall be paid to the said association until the Postmaster General of the United States has investigated and reported to the Secretary of the Treasury that such association is legally incorporated for the relief of colored people. The plans and specifications and contracts must be submitted to and approved by the Postmaster General, and the money only taken from the Treasury by such vouchers as may be drawn by the association, approved by the Secretary, as the work progresses; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay the money hereby appropriated to the said association upon the fulfillment of the terms herein specified, and the said association must give good and sufficient bonds to the Postmaster General for the faithful expenditures of the money herein appropriated.

The commissioner of the Freedman's Saving & Trust Co. and his successors in office are authorized and directed to pay, or cause to be paid, under such regulations as said commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, to all depositors in the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co. whose accounts have been properly verified and balanced under existing laws, or to their heirs or legal representatives, a sum of money equal to the verified balance due said depositors from said company at the time of its failure, less the amount of dividends which may have been paid from the assets of said company; and for this purpose the sum of $1,291,744.50 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, said amount to be placed to the credit of the said commissioner by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of this act specified; and the clerical expense for the settlement of these claims shall be paid out of the money herein appropriated; and none of said accounts which have been sold, transferred or assigned by said depositors, their heirs or legal representatives, shall be allowed or paid under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That any money not called for within two years after the passage of this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

It shall be unlawful for any person to directly or indirectly accept or receive from any such depositor, or from any heir or legal representative of any such depositor, or from any beneficiary of this act, any compensation for any service rendered or claimed to be or to have been rendered in the collection or payment of said deposit. Any person who shall violate this section shall be punished by a fine of double the amount as accepted or received and not more than $1,000 in addition thereto, or by imprisonment of not more than one year, or both.

Mr. BRYAN. I raise a point of order against the amendment. It is so evidently a private claim——

Mr. LANE. Let me make an explanation.

Mr. BRYAN. Just a minute. Let me state the point of order.

Mr. LANE. I wish to make an explanation.

Mr. BRYAN. No; I wish to make my point of order first. Evidently it is a private claim and violates paragraph 4 of Rule XVI, and it would not be courteous to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LANE. I wish to say in explanation——

Mr. BRYAN. I raise the point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. LANE. Does the Senator do that to shut me out?

Mr. BRYAN. It is not in order. It violates paragraph 4 of Rule XVI.

Mr. LANE. Then, Mr. President, I rise to a matter of personal privilege. I introduced this amendment in good faith and with the assurance that the distinguished Senators who are now raising the point of order against it were in favor of having it passed in connection with this bill. I have not looked into it. I have been very busy on committee work and other work and I have not studied it. I do not wish to delay the passage of the bill, and if it is subject to a point of order I will withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LANE. Then I withdraw it.

Now, with the kind permission of the gentlemen I will give them something which will furnish them food for thought. I wish to offer another amendment to the bill. At the end of the bill or anywhere where it will go in and fit nicely, I move to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That all limitations upon the amount that may be deposited in postal savings banks be removed, and that the rate of interest paid by the Federal Government upon such deposits be increased to 3 per cent per annum, and the money that may hereafter be deposited in postal savings banks shall be used as a basis for the formation of a rural credit system in this country.

I offer that as an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. I would like to inquire if this amendment is subject to a point of order? It calls for no appropriation of money from the Government. The people of this country are demanding just such legislation incidentally as we go slipping by with other kinds. We did pass a bill last year in which we created a credit system, an emergency currency system, in which the farming people and the small home owners and the little man secured no benefit whatever. He had to go and borrow his money from the usual sources, and at the same time his property backed the currency which the Government authorized to be reloaned to him at a higher rate. I should like to have this amendment adopted, so that he might receive some benefit.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think that there will be a point of order raised on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. I should like to have a roll call on the amendment. ["No!" "No!"]

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I make the point of order that this is general legislation on an appropriation bill and obnoxious to the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the point of order is made, the Chair will be compelled to sustain it. There is a law in reference to postal deposits.

Mr. LANE. The amendment goes out on a point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment here, which I should like to have read, and ask the chairman of the committee whether he will accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, after line 8, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That letter carriers assigned to collection service who were promoted to the higher grades, in accordance with the classification act approved March 2, 1907, and whose salaries have been reduced during the past year, through no delinquency or charges of misconduct on their part, shall be restored to their former grades.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Was unanimous consent given that a certain paragraph of the bill should go over until to-morrow?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not as the Chair understands it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood it so. I thought without objection the matter went over until the next day, and there was no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. It is section 21, on page 56.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I want to understand the parliamentary situation, that is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The statement was made that section 21 was to go over until to-morrow, and the total, on page 30. As to that being a unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair does not know how it would be construed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I assume, of course, that where it goes over without any objection it is done by unanimous consent. There was no vote about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. None whatever.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is so much confusion we can not hear on this side what the Senator from Connecticut is saying.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply asked the Chair whether the paragraph to which the Senator from Alabama alluded a few minutes ago as having gone over until to-morrow had gone over.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In reference to the pay of rural carriers?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; I asked whether it had gone over by unanimous consent or not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It did, as I understand it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, if that is so, we can not pass the bill to-night.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are through with the bill, so far as we are concerned, until a vote can be had on the item which was unanimously passed over until to-morrow.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I say, I do not see how we can do any more with the bill to-night.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to be inserted as an additional section at the end of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add to the bill as an additional section the following:

IMPROVING ROADS FOR RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE.

SEC. 3. That there is hereby appropriated the sum of $500,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Postmaster General, in improving the condition of roads to be selected by the Postmaster General over which rural delivery is or may hereafter be established, such improvement to be for the purpose of increasing the territory which could be served by each carrier as a result of such improvement, the increasing of the number of delivery days in each year, and to establish a relative saving to the Government in the operation of the Rural Delivery Service and to the local inhabitants in the transportation of their products by reason of such improvement: *And provided*, That such improvements shall be made under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that for the carrying out of this act the necessary expenses for the rental of buildings and clerical and other assistance in the city of Washington and elsewhere shall be deducted from the amount herein appropriated. That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to report to the Congress within one year after the ratification of this act the result of their operations under the same, the number of miles of road improved, the cost of the same, and such other information as they may have acquired in connection with the operation of this act, together with such recommendations as shall seem wise for providing a general plan of maintenance of postal roads in cooperation with the States and counties, and for providing the necessary funds for the further carrying out of such plans of national aid, if it shall be deemed feasible to provide the same, or any part thereof, otherwise than by appropriation from the Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if that was estimated for?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it was not estimated for. Mr. President, I desire to say simply this with reference to the amendment: In the Post Office appropriation bill in the year 1912 a provision similar to this was inserted in conference. That provision appropriated the same amount proposed here, $500,000, for experimental work on postal routes for the purpose of getting the information provided for in this amendment. Under the direction of the Division of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture and the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General those roads are being constructed in various States throughout the country. I am advised by them that they have secured very satisfactory results, but they really need additional funds in order to complete the work and obtain the information that was desired and asked for in the act of 1912.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Where were these experiments made? I have never heard of them in my State.

Mr. SIMMONS. In quite a number of States.

Mr. WARREN. Where was the money expended?

Mr. SIMMONS. Probably a larger sum is being expended in the State of Ohio than in any other State in the Union.

Mr. WARREN. I would be glad to have specifications about the expenditure.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think a part of it, about $30,000, is being expended in my own State. Some of it has been expended in Kentucky. It has been pretty generally expended, I think, and

roads are being constructed in quite a number of States under the provisions of the act of 1912.

Mr. WARREN. I would be very glad to know specifically the States. I have no doubt the Senator is right as to the States he mentioned, but I should like to have the others.

Mr. SIMMONS. I know that money has been expended for this purpose in quite a number of States.

Mr. SWANSON. The money was to be divided among all the States, every State having the privilege of taking it, and because of those that refused it was given to other States. I understand that the Government proposed to give $10,000 to each State that furnished an equal amount. The States that would not comply with the law produced a surplus which was afterwards divided among the States that would comply with the law. I understand it was done in that way.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The Chair would like to know who has the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have the floor, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three Senators have taken it without asking for it. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that I addressed the Chair and was not undertaking to speak before I was given the privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to have some semblance or order, and wanted to begin at some point and to have an understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the State of Utah wanted the amount that was allotted to each State and I know she did not get it. Some question arose and they said it was all divided out and we could not get any.

But, Mr. President, that is not the reason for which I rose. I thought the Senator from North Carolina was through. I want to say that as soon as he is through I shall make a point of order against the proposed amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have here a list of States that participated in the distribution of this fund. It is as follows:

Alabama, $10,000; Maryland, $14,400; Tennessee, $20,800; Maine, $65,000; North Carolina, $34,000; South Carolina, $9,600; Virginia, $39,500; Iowa, $40,000; Oregon, $10,000; Kentucky, $13,100; Mississippi, $50,000; Ohio, $120,000; Texas, $75,580.

Mr. SIMMONS. I trust the Senator from Utah will not insist upon his point of order. Of course, I will admit that the amendment is subject to a point of order, but it is very good legislation. The results that have been obtained up to this time, I am told by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General and by the Director of Public Roads, have been good, but they have not enough money to carry it on in a way which would get the necessary information they desire to obtain. At their instance, very largely, I have offered this amendment for an additional appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to make the point of order against the item. There is a good-roads bill now on the calendar of the Senate, and I think what money is appropriated for good roads in the future by the Government ought to be appropriated and expended in a systematic way, and that a plan ought to be adopted and followed up. For that reason I make the point of order that this item is not estimated for, and also that it is not moved by direction of a standing or select committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator takes his seat——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that I do not regard this as exactly in the line of good-roads legislation. It is not offered as a good-roads proposition, because, if it were, the amount is too inconsequential. It is offered for the purpose of obtaining information with reference to the effect upon the cost of carrying the rural mails and the parcel post through the country where the roads are good and where the roads are bad, in order that the department may report back to Congress the results of their investigation and furnish us data upon which to base a comprehensive good-roads plan.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina if it is not a fact that a large part of the money heretofore appropriated was expended in building fanciful roads in different places, where probably there is very little rural delivery? Is it not a fact that $120,000 was spent in the State of Ohio, and that nearly all of it went to build a vitrified brick highway between two cities there in one particular locality? Was not quite an amount of money appropriated to Maryland and used to construct the macadam road between here and Chevy Chase Lake, where probably a rural carrier may go or he may not? I doubt whether or not that road is used by rural carriers. Is there any information of which the Senator from North Carolina ever heard that has been acquired with the half-million dollars that has been appropriated?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator, in response to his last inquiry, that I know a report upon that subject already has been made. With reference to how the money has been expended in Ohio and in Maryland, I am not able to give the Senator any information; but I am able to say to the Senator that in my own State I think three different roads have been selected for the expenditure of this money. The Government is contributing one-third, and the counties or townships through which the road passes contribute the other two-thirds. I myself personally consulted with the Postmaster General and the Director of Good Roads in connection with the selection of the roads upon which this money was to be expended; and I know, as a matter of fact, that they were exceedingly particular in securing routes where the question of rural delivery probably would be raised and where information with respect to that matter would be developed.

I do not know with reference to Ohio. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is present and probably can answer; but my impression is, judging from the solicitude of the Post Office Department with reference to selecting routes that would afford the information that was desired and asked for in this act, that in other States they have exercised the same good judgment and the same caution as has been exercised in North Carolina.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question before he takes his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is it the Senator is now discussing? The Chair understood that a point of order had been raised by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. The Chair has been ready for some time to rule upon the point of order.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah is going to insist upon his point of order, of course I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to insist on it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall submit to the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After hearing full discussion of the point of order, the Chair sustains it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama understands that this is as far as we can go with the pending bill to-night.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, Mr. President; and if there is no other business I move that the Senate take a recess——

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I have the floor, Mr. President, and I wish to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20189, known as the river and harbor bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would it not be better for the Senator to permit me to ask that the pending bill be laid aside temporarily?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; I am willing to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Post Office appropriation bill will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I shall object to laying aside the Post Office appropriation bill, Mr. President.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is there objection to laying the bill aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; there is objection to the request.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20189.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20189, known as the river and harbor bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. What is the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is the river and harbor bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Florida that I understood that as soon as the Post Office appropriation bill

was passed, with the exception of the one item referring to rural carriers, the Senate would take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I say yes; that is what I understood.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know from whom the Senator understood it; it was not from me.

Mr. KERN. The understanding is exactly to the contrary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	James	Penrose	Thomas
Brandegee	Kern	Pittman	Thompson
Bristow	Lane	Pomerene	Vardaman
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Walsh
Burton	Lewis	Shafroth	Weeks
Camden	Lodge	Sheppard	White
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Oliver	Smoot	
Hughes	Page	Swanson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators and the Senator from Connecticut moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a question of order, which is that the motion to adjourn takes precedence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was going to put the question. The Senator from Connecticut moves that the Senate adjourn. The question is on that motion. Those in favor of the motion will say "aye"——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Chair has not put the negative as yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that. All in favor of the motion will say "aye." Contrary, "no." The "noes" have it.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. PENROSE. Division!

Mr. FLETCHER. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that, but a division has been called for. Those in favor of the motion to adjourn will rise and stand until counted. [A pause.] Those opposed will rise. [A pause.] The motion is clearly lost.

The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Indiana that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does not the rule provide that when the lack of a quorum is disclosed the list of absentees shall be called?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not, except on motion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thought we had amended the rules so as to provide for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. ROBINSON entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. MYERS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Tuesday, February 23, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 24, 1915, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 23, 1915.*

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

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

We realize, O God our heavenly Father, that Thou art a righteous God, and that Thou desirest righteousness of us. Help us to accentuate it, we beseech Thee, in thought, word, and deed this day, that we may prove ourselves worthy recipients of Thy boundless love. In the spirit of the Lord Christ. Amen.

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

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question in reference to Senate amendment 47, on page 57 of the print that we have, appropriating $25,000 to continue the work of collecting, and so forth, Revolutionary War records. My recollection is—and I am quite sure it is correct—that when we passed the act providing for the collection of these records we put a limit of cost upon the expenditure. This of course extends the limit of cost. I do not know whether it does any good to put a limit of cost on propositions or not; apparently it seems to have no effect anywhere. Was this item brought to the attention of the House committee in the consideration of the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Without attempting to commit the managers on the part of the House——

Mr. MANN. I am asking if it was brought to the attention of the House committee?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. Last year we took testimony which showed that it would cost a million dollars, and this year they brought it down to $500,000; but they never have yet made an estimate that any reasonable, intelligent man would be justified in recommending.

Mr. MANN. The original limit of cost was $25,000, and that was appropriated. I notice in the report on this work that the money seems to be used principally in paying the salary of one officer who draws another salary from the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is the general superintendent.

Mr. MANN. I refer to a retired officer drawing pay as a retired officer; and the principal items of expense out of the money heretofore appropriated seems to be the payment to that retired officer of $200 a month for his services. I do not know what his services may be, but I suppose he is giving good service, although I can not see that they have accomplished very much up to date out of the $25,000 appropriated under a limit of cost of $25,000. Do the departments pay no attention at all to the laws that we pass fixing a limit of cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They thought it was an impertinence for Congress to make any such suggestion. [Laughter.] That is no joke; it is a fact.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask one other question. I see that the Senate has inserted an item to pay Mrs. Lurton, the wife of former Justice Lurton, one year's salary. I wonder whether it will become the policy of Congress to pay to the widows of all deceased justices and judges of the courts of the United States a year's salary upon the decease of the judge.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope not. That has been done only on two occasions, one in the case of Justice Harlan and the other in the case of Justice Brewer. This matter was suggested to the House committee in the last session of Congress Justice Lurton had been on the Supreme Bench only a comparatively few years, although he had been occupying official positions for a great many years. I was one of those who did not believe that Congress was justified in granting a gratuity of a year's salary, although there were some able, earnest, and devoted public servants from the same State as Justice Lurton who earnestly urged the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have the widows of all the justices receive a year's salary, or 10 years' salary, if it could be done without paying it out of the Treasury and having the people first pay it into the Treasury. I think if this item should be agreed to, without any question it means that whenever any justice of the United States Supreme Court dies we pay a year's

salary to the widow on an amendment offered in the Senate; and that will mean that everybody else in the Government service who draws a good salary will get the same gratuity; it will not apply to those who draw a small salary, because they would have no influence.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I want to express the hope that the conferees will not undertake to decide this matter now until after the matter is fully gone into and discussed in conference. The gentleman from New York has already stated that there are two good precedents for this sort of a case. He also states that Justice Lurton has held official position for a great many years. That is true, but I want to call attention to the fact that he was judge on the circuit court bench for quite a number of years prior to his appointment to the Supreme Court bench. The gentleman knows that the salary of that court is not large. It is not a fact that the justice accumulated anything during those years, and I think the matter has a good deal of merit in it. I hope the gentleman will reserve his opinion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I am not stating any opinion.

Mr. MANN. And I am not asking the gentleman to express any opinion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am simply stating a previous condition of mind that might or might not disqualify me as an impartial juror.

Mr. MANN. I suppose if Mr. Justice Lurton had been from the State of Illinois and I had been besieged by everyone in the State to favor such an item as this that I very likely would be in favor of it, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is in favor of it now.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to be exactly right to single out the widow of a man who has been getting a very large compensation during his lifetime and pay her a year's salary, particularly at a time when the country is witnessing the spectacle of having all of the men who are engaged in the Postal Service of the country being called upon to sign waivers agreeing to a reduction of their salaries from $1,200 to $1,000 a year, and in the event of their refusal to sign such a waiver to sign another waiver which will put them out of the service, because of the shortage of funds. It seems to me that with this condition of things existing throughout the country, and it runs from one end of the country to the other, this is not a very good time to——

Mr. GORDON. To make donations.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; put it in that way. If a man drawing a salary of $12,000 a year, or whatever the compensation may be, is unable to save any part of that salary during his lifetime, it may be well to realize that the men who are drawing not to exceed $1,200 a year, having large families to support, may not be able to save very much out of their compensation, and I call particular attention to this because the Government, after these men have served anywhere from 15 to 25 years loyally and faithfully, now finds it necessary not only to refuse to pay compensation to their widows, but to reduce their compensation for the same work to be performed during their lifetime.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Senate amendment No. 46 proposes to reduce the appropriation for the valuation of railroads from $3,000,000 to $1,900,000, and I would not be willing that the House conferees should agree to that Senate amendment without an opportunity of having the matter discussed or voted upon in the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should not either, although I might say to the gentleman that I doubt very much whether the amendment was made seriously, because, while this bill was more carefully scrutinized and debated in the Senate than any sundry civil appropriation bill in my experience in Congress, no one mentioned this particular item, which aroused some suspicion in my mind as to whether it was really intended to press it.

Mr. MANN. I know it is not proper to make a reference to the proceedings in the Senate, but I read the Senate proceedings on this bill, and I think that the Senator in charge of the bill deserves the commendation of the country for the way in which he handled it in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to have a separate vote on one of the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. When does the gentleman desire it?

Mr. SISSON. I want it now.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the gentleman refers to the appropriation for the Howard University?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not move now to concur in that amendment? I would be very pleased to move to concur in that amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if we can have a vote upon this question without taking time to debate it, in order to test the feeling in the House, I shall move to concur in the amendment. If there is any desire to debate it, however, I do not wish to do that now, for I do not wish to stand in the way of the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to debate it and explain my reasons for voting to disagree to the Senate amendment, but owing to the peculiar situation of the House I am willing to take the vote without debate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 68. Page 119, after line 7, insert:

"HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

"For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than $1,500 shall be used for normal instruction, $65,000;

"For tools, materials, fuel, wages of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, $12,000;

"For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, $1,500;

"For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, to be immediately available, $10,000;

"Medical department: For part cost of needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, $7,000;

"For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the new science hall, including cases and shelving, $2,000;

"For fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, including necessary labor to care for and operate the same, $3,500;

"In all, $101,000."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments excepting Senate amendment No. 68, and send it to conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants first to dispose of this particular amendment before he asks for a conference.

The SPEAKER. This action can be taken only by unanimous consent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the House by unanimous consent disagrees to all of the other Senate amendments excepting 68, then I shall move to concur in Senate amendment 68.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair stated. The gentleman furthermore asks unanimous consent that this Senate amendment 68 be voted on separately. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment 68.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, the motion to concur, of course, takes precedence over a motion to disagree?

The SPEAKER. It does. The question is on concurring in Senate amendment 68.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on concurring in Senate amendment No. 68.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 86, answered "present" 1, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 85.]

YEAS—199.

Abercrombie	Broussard	Cramton	Fess
Alexander	Brown, N. Y.	Cullop	Fitzgerald
Allen	Browne, Wis.	Deitrick	FitzHenry
Anderson	Browning	Dershem	Fordney
Anthony	Bulkley	Dickinson	Foster
Ashbrook	Burke, S. Dak.	Dillon	Fowler
Austin	Burke, Wis.	Donohoe	Frear
Avis	Butler	Doolittle	Gardner
Bailey	Calder	Drukker	Gerry
Baker	Campbell	Dupré	Gill
Barton	Casey	Esch	Gillett
Bell, Cal.	Chandler, N. Y.	Estopinal	Gilmore
Booher	Church	Evans	Goldfogle
Bowdle	Clancy	Falconer	Good
Britten	Connelly, Kans.	Farr	Gouiden
Brodbeck	Cooper	Fergusson	Gray

Green, Iowa	Lafferty	O'Hair	Small
Greene, Mass.	La Follette	Padgett	Smith, Idaho
Greene, Vt.	Langley	Page, N. C.	Smith, Minn.
Hamill	Lee, Pa.	Palmer	Smith, N. Y.
Hamilton, Mich.	Lenroot	Parker, N. J.	Stafford
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lesher	Parker, N. Y.	Steenerson
Hamlin	Levy	Patten, N. Y.	Stephens, Cal.
Hart	Lieb	Patton, Pa.	Stephens, Nebr.
Hawley	Lindbergh	Peters	Stevens, Minn.
Hay	Lloyd	Phelan	Stevens, N. H.
Hayes	Lobeck	Platt	Stone
Helgesen	Logue	Plumley	Stout
Helvering	Lonergan	Porter	Sutherland
Hinds	McKenzie	Powers	Switzer
Holland	McLaughlin	Rainey	Taggart
Howell	MacDonald	Raker	Talcott, N. Y.
Hoxworth	Madden	Rauch	Tavenner
Humphrey, Wash.	Maguire, Nebr.	Reed	Taylor, Colo.
Johnson, Utah	Manahan	Reilly, Wis.	Temple
Johnson, Wash.	Mann	Rogers	Ten Eyck
Kahn	Mapes	Rubey	Thacher
Keating	Mitchell	Rucker	Thomson, Ill.
Kelley, Mich.	Mondell	Russell	Underhill
Kelly, Pa.	Montague	Saunders	Underwood
Kennedy, Iowa	Moore	Scott	Volstead
Kennedy, R. I.	Morgan, Okla.	Seldomridge	Walsh
Kent	Morrison	Sells	Walters
Kettner	Moss, Ind.	Shackleford	Weaver
Kiess, Pa.	Moss, W. Va.	Sherley	Whitacre
Kirkpatrick	Murdock	Shreve	Williams
Knowland, J. R.	Neeley, Kans.	Sims	Winslow
Konop	Neely, W. Va.	Sinnott	Woods
Korbly	Nolan, J. I.	Slemp	Young, N. Dak.
Kreider	Norton	Sloan	

NAYS—86.

Adamson	Crisp	Hayden	Sherwood
Aswell	Davenport	Heflin	Sisson
Bartlett	Dent	Helm	Smith, Tex.
Beall, Tex.	Dies	Henry	Sparkman
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Hill	Stedman
Blackmon	Edwards	Houston	Stephens, Miss.
Borchers	Ferris	Howard	Stephens, Tex.
Borland	Fields	Hughes, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Brockson	Flood, Va.	Hull	Thomas
Buchanan, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Jacoway	Thompson, Okla.
Burnett	Francis	Johnson, Ky.	Tribble
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	Lazaro	Vaughan
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lee, Ga.	Vinson
Callaway	Garrett, Tex.	Lever	Vollmer
Candler, Miss.	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Watkins
Caraway	Goeke	Moon	Watson
Carlin	Gordon	Oldfield	Webb
Carter	Gregg	Park	Wingo
Cline	Gudger	Quin	Witherspoon
Coady	Hardy	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.
Collier	Harris	Rayburn	
Cox	Harrison	Rouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

McKellar

NOT VOTING—136.

Adair	Dixon	Johnson, S. C.	Post
Aiken	Donovan	Jones	Pou
Ainey	Dooling	Keister	Price
Baltz	Doremus	Kennedy, Conn.	Prouty
Barchfeld	Driscoll	Key, Ohio	Reilly, Conn.
Barkley	Dunn	Kindel	Riordan
Barnhart	Eagan	Kinkaid	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Eagle	Kitchin	Roberts, Nev.
Bathrick	Edmonds	Langham	Rothermel
Beakes	Elder	L'Engle	Rupley
Brown, W. Va.	Fairchild	Lewis, Md.	Sabath
Bruckner	Faison	Lewis, Pa.	Scully
Brumbaugh	Finley	Lindquist	Slayden
Bryan	French	Loft	Smith, J. M. C.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gallagher	McAndrews	Smith, Md.
Burgess	Gallivan	McClellan	Smith, Saml. W.
Burke, Pa.	Gard	McGillicuddy	Stanley
Cantor	George	McGuire, Okla.	Stringer
Cantrill	Gittins	Mahan	Sumners
Carew	Glass	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Carr	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Taylor, Ala.
Cary	Gorman	Metz	Taylor, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Ill.	Miller	Towner
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Morgan, La.	Townsend
Connolly, Iowa	Griest	Morin	Treadway
Conry	Griffin	Mott	Tuttle
Copley	Haugen	Mulkey	Vare
Crosser	Hensley	Murray	Walker
Curry	Hinebaugh	Nelson	Wallin
Dale	Hobson	O'Brien	Whaley
Danforth	Hughes, W. Va.	Oglesby	White
Davis	Hulings	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, Fla.
Decker	Humphreys, Miss.	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Igoe	Peterson	Woodruff

So the motion to concur in Senate amendment No. 68 was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. MAHER with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. VARE.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. DALE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. CARY.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. DIXON with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. KINKAID.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. Langham.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. POU with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. MURRAY with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. GUERNSEY.

On this vote:

Mr. BRUCKNER (to concur) with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas (against).

Mr. BARCHFELD (to concur) with Mr. AIKEN (against).

Mr. LOFT (to concur) with Mr. WILSON of Florida (against).

Mr. CANTOR (to concur) with Mr. WALKER (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (to concur) with Mr. FAISON (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SHERLEY, and Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER. Has a motion been made to send this to conference? I wanted to object if unanimous consent was asked.

The SPEAKER. It is too late; it was sent to conference three-quarters of an hour ago. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications bill, with Mr. HOUSTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and for other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are living in the most unusual period of the world's history. Preconceived notions have been swept away by the occurrence of a world war that in magnitude and in consequence is without parallel; and in the face of that condition it is but natural that men should reconsider their conclusions touching civilization, touching the

duty of nations, and particularly touching the preparation that nations should make for and against war.

I believe it is distinctly true that the American people pursue peace as a passion. They have no aims that run athwart the legitimate purposes of any other nation. They have no desires that should necessarily bring them into conflict with other nations, and we are so fortunately situated geographically that it is difficult for us to even appreciate the pressure that has been upon other nations and the need for great armament that they have had to face. Situated as we are, we are unable to fairly judge the motives and fairly to determine the rightfulness of conduct of other nations because of our inability to place ourselves in their position. I believe that it is the peculiar destiny of this Nation to play the rôle of the peace advocate of the world. I know that it does not desire to compel what it can not invite; I do not believe that it will ever seek to enforce its will upon other nations in matters that relate to those nations and not to this country. But just to the extent that it is unwilling to drive, so to that degree is it determined not to be driven. And, in my judgment, no policy that undertook to prevent America from being in a position to sustain her view about those matters that peculiarly relate to her will ever be upheld by the people of America.

I cherish no delusions in this world of cruel fact. I wish it were true that we were approaching an era of universal peace. I wish it were possible that we might look to a period when disarmament would take place and when war and preparation for war would be relegated to the rear and nations or men that advocated them would be considered barbarians and be in such minority as to be ignored.

But prior to the breaking out of this war I had no belief as to the impossibility of future wars, and I have no belief now as to the impossibility of them. When the question of fortifying the Panama Canal was up before this House I took occasion then to call attention to the fact that neutrality would never protect a nation when the stake at issue was sufficient to warrant a stronger nation in disregarding that neutrality. I called attention to the fact that Belgium had preserved her neutrality during the Franco-Prussian War not by virtue of treaty obligation but by virtue of the army that she had upon the frontier; that Switzerland preserved her neutrality by virtue of the citizen soldiery that she could call to arms. I called attention to the violation of the neutrality of Korea, and the fact that no nation afterwards had undertaken to have the old condition restored or the nation punished that had been responsible for the violation of that neutrality. And certainly in the light of existing events that man must indeed be blind to actualities to delude himself that we can rest secure in the belief that because war ought not to be, therefore it will not be. Believing, then, as I do, that there is always the possibility of war, and at times probability of war, I naturally find myself faced with the question of what this Nation should do to prepare, not for war, but, as has well been said, against war, that we might make any nation hesitate before it engaged us in war, and if at last it came to an arbitrament of the sword we might be in a position to give a proper account of ourselves. I recognize that no problem is more difficult of solution and that no question is presented about which it is so difficult to keep one's poise and one's judgment. And I know of no time when there is more need for sober thought than there is to-day. We have had presented here frequently, as we have it presented in the country, two extreme views touching this matter, both, to my mind, equally wrong.

The extreme peace advocates who would have you disband your Army and your Navy and rely upon paper agreements are men who so completely refuse to recognize facts as they are that they think, because a few gentlemen sit around a table and bring their minds into accord touching some national or international matter, that thereby they have brought great nations into accord. And yet the history of the world is replete with instances of how futile such an attempt is. Friendship in the deep sense that it will overlook and disregard material direct national interest does not exist among nations and never has existed among nations. Now, no man regrets that more than I; but, I again repeat, I am compelled to face the world as I find it. On the other hand, there are men disregarding the situation in regard to our country, disregarding the peculiar advantages that we have geographically, disregarding the advantages that we have of wealth and of numbers, who think that any preparation that is not exactly equal to that made by the greatest military powers in the world is totally inadequate and a waste of money. That extreme is, to my mind, just as wrong as the other. And I do not believe that this country ever will undertake to establish an Army equal to that which Germany has had and France and the other great military powers have had; and, on the ocean, a Navy such as that which England possesses. A democracy never can and never will give that direction and control to military affairs that is possible in a monarchy. That single direction which is possible under that form of government never will be possible under our form of government and never should be. [Applause.]

But the great mass of the people of America, with that common sense that has ever distinguished them, occupy, in my judgment, a middle ground. They do not desire such a great Navy that they can compel submission to their viewpoint no matter whether it be just or unjust. They do not propose such a great Army as to sap the vitality of the Nation or to put an undue financial burden upon it. But they do believe in an efficient Navy; they do believe in proper defense; and in an Army that is capable of expansion and which could be successfully used in case of an invasion of this country.

The great mass of Americans do not contemplate that it will ever need an Army of any great size for the purpose of invading some other country. They will never agree to a policy that would be a temptation to us to disregard our rôle of a peaceful friend of the world and turn into that of an aggressor—one who sought to secure by might what it could not invite by justice.

I have said these things that I might make a proper background for what I shall say touching the pending bill. The fortification bill is a small one in volume, as bills of this Congress go. It usually carries a sum between $4,000,000 and $10,000,000, and it has been within that range for many, many years past. But while it is a bill small in volume it is a bill that of necessity involves the entire question of our military policy. In its consideration it necessarily requires a review of what America desires to do and what it is doing in all branches of military preparedness, for the bill not only deals with the fortifications for our coast defense and for our insular possessions, but it carries items relating to the mobile Army—items relating to its artillery and ammunition.

And that in turn involves a consideration of the size of such an Army, the purposes for which it is used, and a consideration of the Navy—its strength and ability to meet hostile fleets—and in fact every problem connected with military science.

How well the subcommittee on fortifications have performed their task in presenting to you the current bill is for this committee to judge. That it has worked diligently it is but fair that I should say. When you come to the technique of modern armament you enter a realm of exceeding difficulty. Men spend their lifetime in arriving at conclusions touching the merit and demerit of particular kinds of armaments, of different guns—their caliber—of the effectiveness of certain projectiles; and yet upon this floor, with the casual study of men suddenly awakened to the realization that there are such bills as the Army bill and the Navy bill and the fortification bill, we have dogmatic statements of certainty as to what should and should not be done, and extreme criticism of those who may not find themselves able to agree in entirety with the views thus vehemently suggested.

Every responsible legislator is confronted not simply with the desirability of doing a particular thing but with the desirability of doing a particular thing having in view the need to do other desirable things. In other words, he must consider not simply the merit of a given proposal but its relative merit, and he must consider not merely the particular bill that he has under consideration but also its relationship to the total expense of the Nation, the income of the Nation, and the burden of tax that will be laid by reason of any increase of expenditure.

Now, I am not one of those who believe that a plain duty in regard to national defense should be neglected because of financial considerations. I recognize that the highest duty of a nation is to prepare itself to continue as a nation. No duty can surpass that which is imposed on us properly to prepare this Nation for its continuance as a nation, and no excuse purely of money ought to have conclusive weight. But this also is true, that in considering what is to be done you must consider the risk that you propose to insure against; or, to put it better, not the risk that you propose to insure against, because insurance looks simply to indemnity and not prevention, but the evil that you should endeavor to prevent occurring. A man may have a number of buildings; they are not built of fireproof construction. It may be highly desirable to have them all of fireproof construction. But in determining whether he will go to the cost of remodeling those buildings or destroying them and erecting others, he has in mind the risk of fire, and the probability is that he will find himself unable, with a due regard to the business itself and its expansion, to make all the changes that he would like in order to prevent the possibility of fire;

and so he will gradually alter and change in order to have his business as little as possible subject to risk.

And so it comes with us. It is not practicable at any one time in any one year to do everything that anyone may suggest as being necessary or desirable to prepare us fully for an emergency if it should happen to-morrow. Men properly consider the probability of such an emergency. This Nation properly considers whether there is an immediate danger or not; and having that in mind, it may go at a slower pace than it would if conditions confronting it made war immediately imminent.

As I took occasion to say last year in connection with the amounts appropriated for the mobile artillery and the ammunition therefor, if we were to have war within a year, I called attention to the fact that the appropriation was not adequate; that it not only ought to be what had been asked, but that it ought to be many many times that; that if we were no to have war in 10 or 15 years it was adequate, and perhaps we were progressing more rapidly than some might consider necessary.

Now, these are not easy questions to determine. It is very easy for gentlemen to criticize. It is very easy for gentlemen who do nothing to hold down expenditures of the Government, and who pay no attention to the bills touching the national defense until the matter becomes exceedingly popular with the public outside, to criticize the judgment of those who have conscientiously undertaken to perform their allotted tasks, and who have worked at a very difficult task with industry, whether they have worked at it with wisdom or not.

Now, I desire, in speaking of the present bill, to notice some of the criticisms that have been made touching the bill as it comes before you. First, let me say to you that the estimates this year total $6,193,642.32, and of that amount we have recommended $6,060,216.90, or a difference, in round numbers, of $133,000, $50,000 of which is represented in the nonallowance of an item for building a wharf at Outer Brewster Island, just outside of Boston. The others represent mostly items touching maintenance matters, where we did not believe there was any need to give the full sum asked.

Criticism is not made of the amounts that we carry, as they relate to the estimates submitted, because criticism could not be laid there. We so nearly approach the estimates that there was very little to be said. But criticism is made because we have not exceeded the estimates, and I shall deal with that matter in a few moments, trying to present what was the committee's viewpoint as to its duty in that regard.

First, let me speak of the hearings. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] took the committee to task yesterday because it had not examined the young officers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] criticizes the committee because they did not summon an officer so old that he has been retired for age.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How long ago was he retired for age?

Mr. SHERLEY. He was retired some time in November, I think. So that the question of age does not seem to be a controlling factor in determining the desirability of witnesses. What does seem to be controlling is the viewpoint of the witnesses, as they agree or do not agree with the particular gentlemen who ask that they be summoned and that their judgment be controlling upon the committee.

Now, the committee had one of two courses before it. It could either look to the War Department, the responsible agency for the determination of the policy in the technical sense as to fortifications, or it could go out on its own hook and undertake to summon every individual officer whose views had not met with the concurrence of the boards that had finally passed upon his recommendations, and establish itself into a court of inquiry to weigh the particular merits of the viewpoints of particular Army officers touching the merits of technical matters.

At times I have been accused, and inferentially in this debate, of having some conceit; but my conceit has never gone so far as to make me believe that either I or the members of my committee were capable, within the limits of time placed upon us, to determine upon the merits of controversies between Army officers touching matters that require a life study even to appreciate the problems involved, let alone to intelligently solve them.

So the committee did what I believe it ought to have done. It sent word to the Secretary of War that it was going to have its hearings upon a given day, and asked the Secretary of War to send proper officers to present the various items contained in the bill. In due time there came the Chief of Coast Artillery. Manifestly he was a proper man to have, because he is the man who is directly responsible for the Coast Artillery and for its personnel. We then had the Chief of Ordnance, and it was manifestly proper that we should have him, because under him are manufactured the guns and their carriages and the ammunition. We then had for the Signal Corps Gen. Scriven, the head of that corps, make a statement as to matters that came under the Signal Corps. Then we had Col. Winslow, who was designated to represent the Engineers, touching the matters that came before him.

There was nothing unusual in this. The same course has been followed for years, and to my mind no other course could produce a satisfactory result.

It may be thought desirable at some time to have a special committee created to consider particular questions and to undertake to arrive at an independent judgment by hearing the conflicting views of men touching these matters. But to ask an Appropriations Committee in a short session, making up an annual bill, to undertake to hear everyone who happened to have a viewpoint touching the wisdom of doing a particular thing, would be asking too much; and if we did not hear everyone, we would be more subject to the indictment brought against us than we now are.

For instance, one of the particular charges brought against us is the fact that most of the guns in our seacoast fortifications, particularly those that have been mounted in recent years, are mounted upon disappearing-gun carriages; and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], speaking with that eloquence that always characterizes him—and he is a very attractive speaker—declared that he had talked to many junior officers, and that every one he had talked to told him that the use of the disappearing-gun carriage was a mistake, and that we ought not to have it, and that this committee should have gone into that matter. Now, the committee did go into it to a limited extent. The committee asked Gen. Weaver what his judgment was touching the disappearing-gun carriage, and we asked him what was the opinion of the junior officers generally, so as to get not only his viewpoint but to get the viewpoint of those officers, as we might arrive at it from his knowledge of it.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. HELM. How far may one of these junior officers express his views, as differing from one of his senior officers? If any junior or inferior officer criticized any particular line of procedure of his superior officer, would he not be liable to discipline or penalties for insubordination?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is my understanding that he not only has liberty to express his viewpoint touching the desirability of any sort of armament, but under the rules it is made his express duty to bring to the attention of his superior officers anything that he considers should be brought to their attention touching the value or lack of value of ordnance.

Mr. HELM. It is his duty, as I understand my colleague, to bring it to the attention of his senior officer; but he can not, on his own initiative, for instance, appear before your committee and take a course which is at variance with the prescribed policy of procedure of the senior officer——

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a moment, now. He could not appear before my committee, and manifestly he ought not. You would have confusion worse confounded if you had hearings conducted by having voluntary witnesses express their views on all manner of technical subjects. Of necessity this Congress can not turn itself into a board of referees on the value of a particular kind of ordnance or upon the science of warfare. There is no more technical subject on earth. I have spent six years of hard work upon the fortifications bill. I have put upon it more work than upon all my other duties as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. At the end of six years I feel that I know only enough to appreciate how much I do not know about the subject matter, and I am very much less sure of my judgment touching these matters than I was when I had studied them for a month or two in the beginning of my service on the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Did the gentleman mean Gen. Weaver when he said Gen. Weaver discussed the efficiency of the Crozier disappearing carriage?

Mr. SHERLEY. I meant that Gen. Weaver expressed an opinion on that, and expressed an opinion touching the view held by the men in the Artillery Corps.

Mr. GARDNER. As it appears in the hearings, the discussion is with Col. Winslow and Gen. Crozier, mostly, is it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am afraid the gentleman has overlooked that part of Gen. Weaver's tertimony. I reread it last night, and I think I may be able to turn to it in a moment.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask the gentleman for information, because I have not been able to find that part of the hearing. It does not appear in the index.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be. I am quite sure my statement is accurate, and I am making it from notes that I have here. It is found on page 69 of the 1916 hearings, and I will insert it in my printed speech. This is the testimony:

Mr. SHERLEY. General, we use now in all of our more modern fortifications a disappearing gun carriage, usually spoken of as the Crozier-Buffington gun carriage, and we have some barbette carriages?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is your judgment as to the adequacy and desirability of the disappearing gun carriage?

Gen. WEAVER. I have always been strongly in favor of it. It has advantages which I believe the nondisappearing carriage does not have. It has especially the advantage of concealment; the enemy can not see the gun, and therefore there is no ranging point on which it can direct its fire; another advantage is, there is a saving of time in loading it, because the gun comes down to the ammunition on the loading platform instead of having to bring the ammunition from the loading platform up to the height of the gun. The accuracy of fire is equal, and I can not see, and never have been able to see, anything to offset these advantages it has over the nondisappearing gun carriage.

Mr. SHERLEY. As far as you know, the view you have expressed is shared by Artillery officers?

Gen. WEAVER. Like any question of that kind, I think you will find a diversity of opinion; but I think a majority of our officers share the views I have expressed.

Mr. SHERLEY. These gun carriages have now been in actual use in the United States for quite a number of years?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do you find any real difficulty in operating them or any defect in their construction or nature such as to interfere in any material way with the accuracy or rapidity of our gunfire?

Gen. WEAVER. No. Nothing material affecting the disappearing principle.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. The gentleman was about to give the opinion of the junior officers on the question of the disappearing gun carriage when he was interrupted by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I simply stated that Gen. Weaver said that in his judgment—I do not want to quote his exact language, because it is not in front of me, but the substance of it was that there was no large minority that differed as to the efficiency of the Crozier-Buffington disappearing gun.

Now, statements were made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that I am sure he thought were accurate but which, according to my information, are at total variance with the facts. The gun mounted on a disappearing gun carriage is capable of more rapid fire than that upon a barbette carriage, and it is claimed—I want to be fair—by those who favor a barbette carriage that it is possible by modernizing such carriage to arrange for a mechanical lift from the platform to the breach of the gun, so as to increase the rapidity of fire and bring it up to that obtained by the disappearing gun carriage.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. The difference between a disappearing gun carriage and a barbette in regard to the rapidity of fire lies chiefly in this: That after the ammunition is raised by an electric hoist to the gun floor the disappearing gun on its recoil is brought down so that the breech is on a level with the ammunition, which is in trays and which can be shoved immediately into the breech of the gun without the need of an additional lift, whereas on the barbette carriages as they have had them heretofore, there would have to be a lift from the gun platform up to the breech of the gun on the barbette carriage. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not a fact that other nations have had a rearranging of the hoist of ammunition to serve guns on the barbette carriage, so that they are more rapid than our disappearing gun carriages to-day?

Mr. SHERLEY. I should say yes to half the question and no to the other half. I think they have made arrangements for mechanical lifts of the ammunition. I have no information, but I question the accuracy of the statement that thereby they have been able to increase the rapidity of the gunfire over that of ours mounted on disappearing gun carriages.

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will permit, allow me to say that they have arranged a mechanical elevation of ammunition, so as to permit the firing of the gun as rapidly as the ammunition can be put in, and it saves the time that it takes for the disappearing gun to move back and then forward again to its place.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hold in my hand a number of reports which are available where there has been an investigation of the efficiency and desirability of disappearing gun carriages. This is not a new controversy. It is a controversy that probably will never be ended. Individual men will hold individual views, but the question has been repeatedly passed upon by boards created for that express purpose. I submit to you gentlemen in common fairness, whether you think our committee would have been warranted in undertaking to pass judgment upon the advisability of using such gun carriages, and whether we would have been warranted in refusing to allow appropriations because some of them went for the manufacture of disappearing gun carriages.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman give us the date of the reports to which he has reference?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the most recent report has been something over 10 years.

Mr. GARDNER. In the Fifty-seventh Congress, was it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think there is one later than that. It might have been the Fifty-seventh Congress. There was a report that was not contained in any Senate document that I know of but can be found in the appendix to a report of the Chief of Ordnance of a later date than that. Perhaps the reason why there has not been a later investigation is on account of the satisfactory service that the gun carriages have given. However, I again submit to this committee as intelligent men whether or not the Committee on Fortifications would have been warranted in going into a subject upon which the committee could not come to an intelligent conclusion, and which would have meant weeks of inquiry.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Was there any testimony before the committee as to whether or not the disappearing-gun carriages in any way affected the accuracy of fire?

Mr. SHERLEY. The testimony was that it did not affect the accuracy of fire, and others have testified to the fact that there was an improvement in the accuracy of fire. There was also testimony as to the rapidity with which gunfire could be had.

Now, there was a statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that the 12-inch guns were not fired at the highest velocity because of the fear that the gun carriage would not be sufficient. The answer to that is that they have been fired at the higher velocity, and the reduction from the higher velocity to the lower velocity was due to the desire to prevent such rapid erosion of the rifling of the gun and thus prolong the life of the gun. It is also to be borne in mind that when gentlemen tell you of the tremendous velocity of projectiles fired from an English or an American naval gun they will find from careful examination that instead of the velocity having increased it has recently decreased, and that some of the older guns on the English battleships and upon the American battleships were fired at a higher velocity and had a longer range than some of the most modern guns now about to be mounted on the English ships or those mounted on the recent American ships.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman if he wants to proceed, but will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman deny the accuracy of the statement that the English guns to-day—the 12-inch caliber guns—are firing a projectile weighing 3,000 pounds while ours fires one weighing 2,250 pounds?

Mr. SHERLEY. I made the statement that the velocity of the projectile fired from some of the earlier English guns was greater than that from some of the modern guns, and in proof of that I call attention to the table found on page 206 of the current hearings.

This table shows that the 12-inch British 50-caliber gun fires a projectile weighing 850 pounds with a muzzle velocity of 3,010 foot-seconds, and it had a range of 24,870 yards; that the 15-inch 45-caliber gun fires a projectile of 1,950 pounds at a muzzle velocity of 2,500 foot-seconds, with a maximum range of 21,193 yards. And I repeat, Mr. Chairman, what I said before, that an examination into the matter will show that some of the earlier type of guns upon both British and American battleships were fired with greater velocity than the modern guns, and with a greater range than some of the modern guns.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman mean a greater range at the same elevation, or was it at an elevation of 45°?

Mr. SHERLEY. I mean at an elevation of 15°. I did not read the 45° elevations, and in that connection the gentleman's

inquiry reminds me of a part of his remarks yesterday when he discussed the question of the alteration of the 12-inch guns. He said they proposed to shoot up in the air, and he gave the impression to this House that there was something extremely novel; that they were practically trying to make mortars out of those guns; that they were to be fired up in the air, and yet the very elevation that was used in order to get the range that the gentleman spoke of in connection with the English guns was that same elevation of 15°. If it is shooting up in the air in one instance, it is shooting up in the air in the other.

Mr. GARDNER. One being a direct-fire gun.

Mr. SHERLEY. Both being direct-fire guns. A 12-inch gun shooting at 15° elevation is as much a direct-fire gun as a 15-inch gun shooting at 15° elevation.

Mr. GARDNER. That would depend on the range; but the gentleman was saying that the British guns, old model, had a greater muzzle velocity. Is not the striking power arrived at by multiplying the mass by the square of the velocity?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. And has not the weight of the projectile gone up from 850 pounds to 1,950 pounds, and is it not just as well to consider that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly; and I have never for a moment said that you should not consider it. I was dealing with the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], that the reason we had not fired guns mounted on disappearing carriages at an increased velocity was because of the fear of the carriage. That is not, in my judgment, an accurate statement.

Mr. GARDNER. Would not the gentleman think it proper to have some officers before his committee who thought it was an accurate statement, so as to hear their testimony?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; and I answer the gentleman again, no—not because I desire not to avail myself of any sort of information that I can get, but because I realize a limitation upon myself, even if the gentleman does not realize one upon himself. I do not believe that either myself or the members of my committee, within the time limit possible, could go into these questions to determine their value, and I do not think our determination after we had gone into the matter would be as good as that of the constituted authorities. The gentleman and I differ in this fundamental particular. He seems to think that anybody who happens now to be at the head of the Army is disqualified for judgment; that those at the top are mossbacked and have become antiquated; that their views are of no value; and that in order to arrive at anything worth while you must listen to all of the younger officers, whereas I believe that the only possible way by which you can have real order and a really efficient Army is by having matters of technique come up in the regular channels and be determined upon by boards constituted of men who presumably have the training and the knowledge to make their judgment worth while.

For this Congress to undertake to take the place of boards in the War Department by passing upon technical matters would be to have bedlam turned loose. Let me say another thing to the gentleman. It is perfectly apparent to every man who has talked with officers in both branches of the service that whenever you get hold of a particular man who has had a theory of his, which may or may not be good, turned down, of course he tells you about the dreadful consequences of rejecting his viewpoint. I am not blaming these men for their zeal, but I do say that in common-sense dealing we have to look at the thing in a practical way, and that the committee could not have determined the question of the value of the disappearing gun carriage.

Mr. GARDNER rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on to some other matters, but I yield for a question.

Mr. GARDNER. I was going to ask if the gentleman felt this House was incapable of voting on the question of the Isham shell or submarines, because that is exactly the issue that has been presented? That was done over the protest of the Navy Department.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think the opinion of this House as to the value of the Isham shell amounts to very much.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but take the submarines and the original adoption of the plan for submarines. Was the judgment of the House right or that of the bureau chiefs?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would have to know their particular judgment and the judgment of the bureau chiefs to answer that question categorically. This of course is true: There are some matters of policy that the Congress can determine, but they are very rare as to technical matters, and my judgment of the function of the Congress is to determine the broad policy of the size of the Army that you propose to have and the size of the Navy that you propose to have, the basic question of a military policy; but that when it undertakes to qualify as competent to determine the technical questions involved in a science as intricate as that of war, then it is undertaking to do what very few sensible men would do in outside life. If I go to a physician and I am ill and he diagnoses my case and says that I have appendicitis, I am not going to put my judgment up against his and say that I do not think I have. If I am not satisfied with his judgment I may go to a new physician, but I at least am not going to qualify as an expert in anatomy.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says that he thinks the proper thing to do is to have the head of the Army before him; that the heads of the Army are not disqualified merely because they disagree with some casual people like myself.

I asked the gentleman to summon the most recent head of the Army, the only head of the Army available, the recent Chief of Staff who went out of office in November——

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I must control my own time, and I will answer the gentleman's question. Why did not we do that? The committee did not summon Gen. Wotherspoon. Why? It did not summon him because he is now not an officer in the service. He is retired, and was not at the time the hearings were had the Chief of Staff. He was Chief of Staff for eight months. I do not desire to do the general an injustice. If I desired, I might say that the positiveness of his views touching matters connected with the Army became evident only when he was leaving the service; but that is aside from the question. We did not believe that it was proper to go out and get an ex-member of the service, especially as we had his viewpoint recently expressed. Now, a good deal was said about his viewpoint having been the result of the experience of the European war. His report was submitted, I think, November 22. The war broke out in August. The amount of valuable information—and I use the word "valuable" properly—the amount of valuable information that was obtained by him or any other Army officer as to the result of the European war touching these technical matters was negligible, and so is the amount of information they now have, and I will tell you why. For instance, you take the question much exploited in the Army bill, and about which the gentleman from Massachusetts had so much to say, the relative proportion of field guns to rifles and sabers in the mobile army.

The Greble Board, acting fully on that matter, fixed 3.16 per thousand rifles and sabers. Gen. Wotherspoon figured it out at 5 per thousand. Now, as to the information we have touching the European war. The general opinion is that artillery is playing a very big part in that war. There is no practical information as to the number of rounds that are being fired from a given battery in a given length of time, and if we had it it would not be of sufficient value to anyone to draw conclusions. Why so? Because you have not only to determine how fast they are using the ammunition, but how wisely they are using it, and in order to determine how wisely you would have to have the report of an observer at the other side to see the effect of that ammunition and whether it was being wasted or not. But I desire to go ahead. I have been severely criticized because of a reputed statement that I am supposed to have made to the effect that we were not only well fortified but perhaps the best fortified country in the world. Let me say in advance that the way to judge a man's viewpoint is not to take a sentence, but to take all that he says on a given proposition. I made no speech in this House and I have made no speech in public in which I have not always pointed out, along with the good things that we have, the bad things, where I thought we were deficient, and what I thought was needed in order to help better those conditions. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts did me the honor to call upon an expert, as he says, to pass judgment upon the reputed interview of mine in the Star of November 28. So far as that day was concerned, I was on the high seas. It being my birthday, I remember where I was. The interview was reputed to have come as a result of a speech I had made in the House.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not think the gentleman wishes to do me an injustice.

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not think I ever said it was an interview; but the article speaks for itself.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right, I will withdraw the word "interview"; but let us not waste time with nonessentials.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman acknowledges he was mistaken, does he?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have here what the gentleman said.

Mr. GARDNER. The interview is here and speaks for itself. I have it here. "SHERLEY is picked to meet charges"——

Mr. SHERLEY. That article! I know nothing about those headlines. What I was quoting from is this:

The article is headed: "Views of experts on United States defenses, Representative SHERLEY among others who expressed themselves satisfied with equipment." Then the article opens as follows:

"The continental United States is not only well fortified, but is perhaps better fortified than any country in the world, said Representative SHERLEY, of Kentucky, in presenting to the House the annual bill for the fortifications of the important and strategic harbors of the country at the session just closed."

Mr. GARDNER. Last year.

Mr. SHERLEY. In that speech the gentleman will find I made a statement touching the matters that he has spoken of.

Mr. GARDNER. I want the gentleman to admit that he was not correctly stating it when he said——

Mr. SHERLEY. All right; let us not deal with nonessentials.

Mr. GARDNER. I think it is very essential.

Mr. SHERLEY. He quotes Mr. Huidekoper, whom he asked to write an article. Mr. Huidekoper is a very estimable gentleman in private life who has spent a good deal of time in writing articles on military subjects. As to the value of them, I have no opinion to express; but he undertakes to compare our fortifications with Germany, and particularly in regard to the fortifications at Heligoland.

I simply wish to say in regard to that, that if he has any information in regard to those fortifications he will find the most receptive crowd at the War Department he ever saw, because they have no information, have never been able to obtain any, and, so far as I know, no one is in possession of accurate information touching German fortifications. Then he goes ahead in a discussion of the land fortifications of Germany and states that we have no land fortifications, and therefore we can not be said to be as well fortified. Of course, we have no land fortifications, and it has been no part of the scheme that we should have land fortifications, speaking broadly. We do not fortify the frontier of Canada, because there is no need, owing to our splendid relations with Canada. We do not fortify the frontier of Mexico, because the strength of Mexico is not sufficient to make it necessary, and parallels that are undertaken to be drawn between interior fortifications and frontier fortifications of European countries, who are confronted with other countries of equal strength and where the feeling is always more or less strained, and our coast defenses have no direct value.

Now, our fortifications are intended for certain purposes—and I speak now of continental United States—and it is well to bear in mind what those purposes are. They are not intended, and never were intended, to prevent the landing on our shores of a hostile army. It is not within the realm of financial possibility to so fortify the coast lines of the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf, as to bring that about. I have never known any serious man, having in mind the cost, who ever proposed anything of that kind. The purpose of our fortifications is to protect a particular harbor or to protect a particular city, and they have served this purpose, according to the view of those that planned the defenses, when they force an enemy to land in order to effect their capture.

Now, these fortifications are open in the rear. Much might be said in favor of certain places having some batteries that would be a defense against land attack. Something might be said in favor of having an all-around fire for some guns.

In the case of the mortars that is usual. But I want you to keep in mind that the defense of these fortifications from the rear is looked upon as a mobile-army proposition and not as a fortification proposition. Everyone who has been a student of the subject knows that.

Now, I have repeatedly said that in my judgment our fortifications would not be put to the test of their sufficiency, because an enemy having control of the sea, which is a prerequisite of any attempt of a landing party of any size, other than one making a sortie, would never undertake to subdue such fortifications, but, instead, would go outside of the range of the guns, effect a landing, and, if necessary to capture them, would undertake their capture from the rear. Now, if they are weak in that particular, the remedy lies, and must lie in large measure, with the mobile army, and there is where we are weak and need improvement.

The gentleman from Massachusetts stated, as if it were a matter of great concern, that there was not even a barbed-wire entanglement in the rear of these fortifications. There is not, and I can not imagine anything more foolish than a barbed-wire entanglement there now; but the gentleman is probably aware that plans have been worked out and are being worked out for the land defense of every one of these fortifications, and it is hoped that these palns will go to such a degree of refinement that there will be for each district officer, in the case of the breaking out of hostilities, such plans and specifications and blue prints as will enable him to go and hire certain labor to do a particular piece of work at a particular point, without the need of any other information than that which upon the opening of an envelope will be available to him.

Mr. GARDNER. Substantially I agree with what the gentleman has just been saying; but there is another thing. Are not harbor or coast fortifications for this purpose as well, namely, are they not to prevent the bombardment——

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman had waited I would have come to that, and I will speak of it right now. I said they were for the protection of a harbor or for the protection of a city. They are a protection for a harbor for two reasons. One is to enable that harbor to be used as a rendezvous for our own fleet, and the other is to prevent its use as a rendezvous for the enemy's fleet and as a base of supplies for a landing party, and as such protection to enable our fleet to be used offensively and not simply on the defense. They are supposed to be a protection for some cities against bombardment.

Now, I want to be perfectly frank in that. The gentlemen who will read my speech of last year with candor will find that there I called attention to the fact that I thought it might be necessary to put additional armament at certain fortifications, due to two things—the increased range of guns upon foreign ships and the growth of cities into outlaying territory that was not occupied at the time the fortifications were planned and erected. It has been just a bit amusing to find myself classed as one of those constantly opposing advancement. I am in favor of heavy armament. I have never thought that a 12-inch gun was equal to a modern 14 or a 15-inch gun, and I have never known of any human being who did. Certainly Gen. Crozier, who is constantly held up as the embodiment of everything that is antiquated, never held any such view. And, in passing, may I say that while Gen. Crozier has his viewpoints, and some of them may or may not be correct, I would that the Army had many men of his industry, of his intelligence, and of his courage. [Applause.] He is a distinct ornament to the service that he has given his life to.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield. I want to agree with him as to Gen. Crozier, and I will add, "his integrity."

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not mention that, because that does not need to be spoken of as to Gen. Crozier.

Now, I made the statement that we were well fortified, and probably the best fortified country on the earth. I made it with the qualifications which I gave—qualifications as to the amount of ammunition—which I shall not be able to touch on now, but I will under the 5-minute rule; made it with statements as to what we lacked in regard to searchlights, as to what we lacked in regard to fire control, as to what we lacked in many other particulars. And why did I make it—simply as my judgment? No. My judgment is of very little value in this matter. But I made that on the statement of officers who ought to know.

The most aggressive, the most persistent, officer who was ever Chief of Staff, in my memory, was Gen. Leonard Wood. Whatever may be his merits or demerits, he was a man who had the courage of his convictions and who never lost an opportunity to express those views and to urge them upon Congress. He was before my committee; and not only before my committee, but I have talked with him many times. And I want to say a thing now, too, namely, that when he was Chief of Staff, in making up the fortification bill, when it became necessary to bring the bill within a certain size financially, I consulted with him as to the items which should be eliminated, assuming that some had to be eliminated, and those bills were made up in detail with his concurrence and his knowledge. He urged upon us the doing of certain things as being things of most importance, and the committee followed his judgment in that, and I think it was wise in following his judgment in that. It was not able to do everything, but it did the things as best it could that were urged as being most necessary.

Now, Gen. Wood has testified as to the value of fortifications. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] undertakes to break the force of his testimony by saying that he submitted a list at the same time he made the statement of additions to armaments that were needed. He did. He simply took a list of what had been reported in the old Taft Board, but it was a list that he has never urged upon us and never has submitted an estimate for.

And while I think some of them are needed, that list was not submitted with the idea of qualifying his statement that he thought we were well fortified. I say another thing, that if you were to get a consensus of opinion of the Army and Navy men of America they would tell you there is less reason to be alarmed over the condition of our fortifications than over any other matter. They will tell you that your trouble in regard to your Army is not half so much in the matériel as it is in men. They will tell you that the need is more for men than it is for the matériel that the men are to use. They will tell you that the trouble is not with our fortifications; the trouble is elsewhere.

All things are relative in this life, and we can not do all at once, even though we may wish to. I know of no period during the 12 years in which I have served in this House when I have not been willing to go faster than I believed Congress was willing to go in regard to Army and Navy matters. But I have tried to adjust myself somewhat to an environment. I have tried to be practical; and if the committee has erred, it has erred as the result of an honest effort and a consistent effort that has not simply been manifested when it became popular to talk about this subject matter.

Now, I will try and get Gen. Wood's statement into the RECORD. If I do not read it, I will put it in the RECORD. It is found on page 18 of the hearings for 1915. Gen. Wood was asked there——

Mr. GARDNER. What year was that? I did not get the year.

Mr. SHERLEY. The year 1915. I asked him touching the estimates. I read:

General, your estimates this year are about $9,000,000, as against approximately $7,000,000 estimated last year, and against an appropriation last year of $5,000,000. The large increases are those for the mobile artillery and for ammunition?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir; in fact, all of it, or the bulk of it, is due to that.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, there has been stated each year heretofore the opinion of the department as to the relative importance of the various items that are submitted in this bill. Would you make a statement to the committee now as to what you consider the most important matters to be provided?

Gen. WOOD. I should say ammunition above all things.

He is there speaking of ammunition for the mobile artillery. He asked:

Do you mean under this particular subject?

Mr. SHERLEY. I mean particularly the bill as a whole.

Gen. WOOD. I should say that the most important things dealt with by this bill are, first, ammunition for Field Artillery; second, guns for the Field Artillery; third, the completion of the work in the Hawaiian Islands; and fourth, the coast defenses and fortifications work in the Philippines. That is very largely completed.

Mr. SHERLEY. And after those things you have enumerated would come matters relating to continental United States?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir. Except with reference to the work at San Diego and the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay we are very well taken care of here.

Now, in the 1914 hearings his statement was more pronounced than that. On page 13 I read:

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been testified heretofore that so far as the continental United States was concerned we were not only adequately fortified, but in many instances overfortified.

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. And you concur in that general proposition?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. In your judgment would it ever be necessary, as to the large proportion of fortified places, to make any change in the armament that has been provided?

Gen. WOOD. No, sir; except possibly in the type of mortar carriages and some other minor changes which might involve the placing, possibly at an advanced point, a battery or two of a heavier type of gun, but essentially the present armaments will remain intact so far as we can see.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is, then, the opinion of the War Department now that, with the exception of the possible need of increasing the armament at San Diego and providing for the armament now authorized at San Pedro and Cape Henry, the coast of the continental United States is adequately fortified?

Gen. WOOD. The Taft Board project, which Congress approved, still remains. Some portion of it we do not think will ever need to be carried out. Other portions of it, we think, will need to be carried out, but, generally speaking, it can be said, with the exception of the places you have mentioned on the Pacific coast and the work at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, that the essential features of the coast defenses have been completed. Now, as was stated awhile ago about the coasts being overfortified, that is apparently true, or at least we so regard it now. We put in more guns than were perhaps absolutely necessary, and in that we exercised supercaution. However, there are certain things which still remain to be done, and, with your permission, I will insert a statement of them in the record.

The gentleman from Massachusetts read the rest of the lines.

Mr. GARDNER. What is the date of that evidence? What is the date when it was given?

Mr. SHERLEY. The date when it was given was December, 1912. I read what he said the next year. The gentleman from Massachusetts wants to produce the impression upon this House that there has been such a complete revolution in regard to the range of guns upon modern battleships within the last year or two that it has totally altered the conditions in regard to the fortifications. I deny it. I say it has modified it in some particulars, but it has not in any very substantial way. There were guns then, at the time those words were uttered, mounted with just as far a range as the guns that are now to be put on the *Queen Elizabeth* type of English battleships. There were American guns of just as far range as there are upon American battleships now mounting guns of 14-inch caliber.

I had the pleasure of dining out the other night with an officer of the Army and a distinguished naval officer, and in order that the Army officer's credibility may not be impugned I want to say that he was not one of those who have testified in this hearing. Both of them concurred in the general statement that the best evidence of a novice touching the science of war was his immediately asking as to the range of a gun, as if that was the all-important factor. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman wish some more time?

Mr. SHERLEY. When the bill is read, after the first paragraph is read, I shall endeavor to speak, with the indulgence of the committee, for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to continue available until expended, namely.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not delay the committee but a little longer, but there are one or two things that I think I ought now to say, and I can then amplify them a little later on. One of the things I want to call your attention to is this, that there is a very great advantage with a fortification in a battle with a fleet, and the advantage is very easily recognized. In the first place, the fort shoots at a plainly visible target that is vulnerable. In the second place, it shoots with the advantage of a long base line in connection with its range finding. You gentlemen, of course, realize that firing is not done simply by sighting, but that the range of the object to be hit is determined by the principle of triangulation and the determining of the angles at the end of a long base line. Manifestly, the longer the line the less error will result in accurate range finding due to any error in your observation.

Not only is that true, but a ship in firing at a fortification fires always at an obscure target, and frequently at a hidden one. If any of you gentlemen have gone down the Potomac River and have undertaken to find or even had pointed out to you the fortifications on that river you will realize the difficulty of seeing them within ranges of 2 or 3 miles. Not only is that of advantage, but in order to do appreciable damage to the fortification you have either to hit the gun for the fraction of a minute—assuming that it is a disappearing gun—that it is over the rampart in firing or you have to hit on the inner crest of the fortification so as to cause damage either to the personnel or the gun, or you have got to have a shell explode at the particular moment that it is passing over these fortifications.

Now, all of these are a distinct advantage. I do not believe there is any danger of our fortifications being put out of business by an attack from a hostile fleet. In the first place, I do not believe a hostile fleet is going to attempt it. It is not going to waste ammunition by standing off and shooting at a range of 21,000 yards or anything like it, and if it has control of the sea it is not going to bother about the reduction of the fortification from the sea, anyway.

It is true that there might be danger of the bombardment of certain cities. Some danger is an incident to war and must be undergone. For instance, we have not fortified all the coast cities of the country, and we shall probably never try to do so. There are any number of cities that have no fortifications, and it would be possible for an enemy's fleet to bombard them if you assume a number of things. And, by the way, that is a good thing to bear in mind when gentlemen are getting the buck ague. Remember all of their premises are necessary before the catastrophe happens. They always lick our fleet first. They put our submarines out of business. They clear up the mines and make an open channel, and then, having won every stage of the fight and being left alone to choose their time and place, they proceed to demolish the fortifications and to land an army and capture the country. But, assuming their premises, it is possible that at certain cities they might be able, if they got in at a certain place where on the map there is indicated water enough to float them, to bombard part of a city and be out of range of our guns. It was my intention at this session to have

gone into the condition of each unit in the fortifications of America. I think that ought to be done. I had hoped to do it at this session.

More than a year and a half ago, when there was no war scare, when it was not popular to dig into all these matters, I saw what I thought to be the wisdom of considering these subjects. I took the matter up with the Chief of the Coast Artillery. He went into some study of it. But this was the condition that confronted us this year. I would have had to take practically his single judgment as to what was necessary at these various places.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed until he concludes. I suppose that will not be very long.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want to impose upon the committee. It is a big subject, and it is difficult to cover. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky be allowed to proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would have had to take from the general his statement as to what he thought was necessary, according to the judgment that he had from the reports of the local officers. Had I done that, I would have been subject to the very criticism that I think properly applies to the viewpoint of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and others who criticize the committee because they did not examine individual men. We have been working under what is known as the Taft Board report. The Taft Board was convened under an order by President Roosevelt, and it took as its basis the old Endicott report, the report of a board convened when Cleveland was President. The report of the Endicott Board had become in many ways obsolete. Rifled and more powerful cannon and smokeless powder and many other things had made the findings of that board no longer valuable.

The Taft Board undertook to modernize it and bring it up to date, and they made a report which is a very remarkable document—remarkable in its thoroughness, remarkable in the detail with which it went into questions. Now, in large measure we have been following that Taft report, as modified from time to time by boards that have considered these matters. Part of what the Taft Board have recommended is now thought to be unnecessary. Some things that they did not recommend are now plainly necessary. If I had undertaken to have Gen. Weaver report, I would then have had the report of a man for whom I have the highest respect and admiration; but that would have represented simply his viewpoint. Now, it might be that a great many other men would not agree with him at all. They would either think that additional armament was not needed or they would think that armament was needed in greater amount than he thought, or that it ought to be emplaced at one point instead of another. I do not believe we ought to spend great sums of money without careful consideration of what we are doing. I talked to the Secretary of War about the matter, and I am glad to say that he has created a board, which is to be a continuing board, which is not to go out of existence after the performing of a particular duty, but is to be a continuing board to consider just these questions. I have no doubt that next year the committee will be in a position to obtain not the viewpoint of a particular officer, but the final judgment of the War Department touching the needs of additional armament at particular places.

There was no condition confronting us so alarming as to make it necessary that we should disregard the ordinary prudent and sensible course and simply appropriate money out of fear, because gentlemen will bear in mind that even assuming that the present world affairs were such as to make war with us imminent, no sums that are carried in this bill will have any appreciable effect upon our situation should war come upon us; and if war should come, this Congress, like all previous Congresses, would immediately vote sums that would make any amount carried in this bill insignificant and negligible.

Then, too, armament is not built in a day. Now, it may be said, "Yes; but you lose a year," and it may be said, as it has been said, that we simply spend our days in considering and reporting and reconsidering. I do not believe that is altogether a fair indictment of the War Department. It is mighty easy for gentlemen to determine what ought to be done who are not charged with the responsibility and know nothing about the science that they undertake to criticize. Gentlemen, I usually find that the War Department is particularly alert to take advantage of new matters, and that we have gone to a degree of refinement in Coast Artillery that is probably not approached by any other nation. The refinement that we have gone to in regard to all of the supplements to our guns, in the way of fire control, in the way of many auxiliaries, is such as to make me think that these gentlemen are by no means asleep, but that they are very wide-awake.

And this all means money. There is always a question when we shall throw aside something which is not as good as the most modern, but which may still be of value. Men differ as to what should go to the scrap heap. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and I differ in this particular, that he would give the impression that because our guns are not of the greatest range and largest caliber for that reason they are negligible and can be disregarded. He may not have said just that, but that has been the whole tone and color of his criticism. I do not believe it. I believe that in many instances our fortifications have more guns than necessary, put there out of abundant caution. I repeat, that we are not in danger of having the fortifications put out of business. It may be necessary—I think it will be necessary—to put certain additional fortifications at points farther out in order to protect portions of cities from long-range bombardment. I hope that we will have an accurate report touching that matter next year, and I believe if we have it we will have action taken by Congress on it.

Some criticism has been made as to the fortification of Cape Henry. Cape Henry is an old story. Its fortification was recommended by the Endicott Board, and it was most strongly urged by the Taft Board. It was urged every year that I have been on that committee. I remember when my predecessor was chairman of that committee, Mr. Walter Smith, of Iowa, a man of great industry and very great, hard, common sense, he did not concur with the War Department about the need of fortifying Cape Henry and he would never give his consent, and the matter was thrashed out on the floor. I rather concurred in his view. I took a trip down there right after I got on the committee. As years went on and these men kept insisting on their viewpoint, I came to realize that I was not warranted in putting my judgment against the judgment of every Army and Navy officer that talked about the matter. It is true that we had been very much disturbed by the frequent views which the Army had as to what was necessary to fortify the mouth of the Chesapeake. Originally you were to have monitors anchored at the mouth. Then you were to build an artificial island. Japan went to building islands, and the habit became contagious, and for a while everybody was talking about islands upon which to place fortifications; and they are exceedingly valuable, for the very plain reason that they are not subject to capture by land assault.

Then they had a proposition to fortify Cape Henry and Cape Charles both, but finally the increased range of guns made them come to the conclusion that it was possible to fortify Cape Henry and have guns of sufficient caliber to reach across the channel and prevent a run by.

In that connection I want to say that the size of the armament that is to be had at a particular fortification does not measure the size of the armament needed at another fortification. All fortifications do not need the biggest guns. The armament necessary is determined by the topography and hydrography of the particular vicinity. At one place the fortification is to prevent a run by, and at another place it may be to protect a city, and they have to be adapted to each particular locality. It is a most technical matter and a matter about which men do not learn the last word in a few hours' study.

I finally came to the House with a report from my committee in favor of the fortification of Cape Henry. There had been some division in the committee on that matter. It was not easy to get the committee to come to an agreement about it, and when it came out on the floor the colleague of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT, made a speech against fortifications on Cape Henry, and advanced what many thought were good arguments as to why it should not be done, and he got quite a considerable following. But the House supported the recommendation of the committee and we determined to fortify it. There then came the question of the purchase of the land. It took time to get this land, and, to make a long story short, we finally got it and got it without paying an exorbitant price through condemnation proceedings.

Then there came the question of what armament should be put there. There had been a good deal of dispute about that; some gentlemen, one of whom is now being quoted as the chief apostle of heavy armament and a vast amount of mobile artillery, and others thought that 12-inch guns were sufficient, and there was a considerable difference of view in regard to it. Several years ago I stated my lay opinion for whatever it

might be worth, that we ought to have 16-inch guns there. At that time there was no 16-inch gun mounted anywhere, or proposed to be mounted. My reason was that there was a particular object to be served by fortifying at Cape Henry, and that was to close the mouth of the entrance of the Chesapeake and prevent a run by, and to prevent the use of Lynnhaven Bay as a rendezvous for a hostile fleet, and thereby the landing of an army, repeating the happenings at the time Washington was burned in the War of 1812.

So that it is not to-day and it is not even yesterday that I saw the wisdom of heavy armament at particular places. But because you see the wisdom of heavy armament at particular places, because you see the desirability of doing it when you start on a new project, is no reason for condemning something that was done at an earlier period, of determining that because it is not the equal of what can now be done that it is totally inadequate. These are conclusions that do not follow, and they need only to be stated for one to see that they do not follow.

What was the situation in regard to Cape Henry at this time? There had not been such a final agreement in regard to Cape Henry at the time the estimates were made so as to enable the Secretary to submit estimates for this work to Congress. Since then I think there has been an agreement as to the armament that should be there, and that armament will have in its major batteries guns of 16 inches. In view of the demands that were made in other regards, not only in this bill but in other bills, and in view of the general condition of the Treasury, the Secretary of War did not feel warranted in submitting supplemental estimates that would have amounted to close to $2,000,000. The committee, in the absence of such estimates, did not feel warranted in recommending the appropriation. The work there will take about three years. When it is started it ought to be carried on just as rapidly as possible, and the thing that I have tried to insist upon is that when we enter on new projects we should carry along everything that goes with the project, so as to try and get a finished unit, and not have something that is part done here and part done there. It may be that the committee has erred in not bringing in that amount. That is for this Committee of the Whole to say. I do not believe that the Committee on Appropriations would have been warranted in disregarding what was recommended and going outside. I think it has performed its highest function when it gives what information it can to the Committee of the Whole and makes recommendations that represent its judgment within the estimates. The very moment you get to going outside of your estimates you will find that there will be constant pressure from all sorts of sources to do all sorts of things, many of which may prove to be very unwise, and there will be very great extravagance. In the House of Commons it is not in order to move to increase the estimates of the Government. I have never asked that the judgment of the Appropriations Committee should be the judgment of the Committee of the Whole. We have presented the bill according to our best judgment. If we have erred, it is for you to correct.

Now, let me say just a word about ammunition, and then I shall close.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman goes to that will he yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Surely.

Mr. MANN. And if it is not a proper question I do not ask for an answer. Great Britain or the allies have possession of the sea at this time, and I suppose have the strongest naval vessels in the world. Why is it that they do not attack German fortifications? Why is it that during the Spanish War our fleet did not capture Havana?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I can give the gentleman only my judgment for what it may be worth, and that is this: I do not think thinking men undertake something that even if successful would accomplish a given thing of less value and at greater cost than could be accomplished by other methods. In other words, it is a good deal better for them to undertake to bottle up Germany's fleet and to control the avenues of trade than it is to take the risk of not only going up against Germany's fleet but also against these fortifications, with the almost certainty that they would not be able to subdue them from the sea. In the Dardanelles there is a different proposition. They are there undertaking to attack those forts because it is necessary in order to get to a given place; but whether their attack will be successful or not remains to be seen. The information that we get in the newspapers is not of sufficient detail to warrant anybody in drawing any conclusion. During the Japanese-Russian War the Japanese fleet lay off Port Arthur, which was not a modern fortification in the sense of some that could be mentioned. After a bombardment of a short time they ceased to attempt its capture from the sea, but undertook its capture from the land, a very difficult operation, too, because Port Arthur from the land was no easy place to take. They did that because they did not believe it was practicable in the proper sense of the term to subdue that fortification from the sea.

As I have said repeatedly, I do not believe our fortifications will ever be put to the test. That is aside from the question of the distant bombardment of cities, but so far as the attempt to subdue those fortifications from the sea is concerned, having the prerequisites that would be necessary to such an attack, I do not believe that any commander of a fleet with ordinary judgment would undertake the task.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman said it would take three years to complete the Cape Henry fortifications. As I understand it, unless we appropriate the whole $1,750,000 that was suggested this year it would not be worth while appropriating anything. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that is about true.

Mr. GARDNER. But if we did appropriate all, the project would be complete one year earlier than if we begin a year from now. Is that correct?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not sure that that is altogether correct. That would seem to be correct, but there are probably some things that need to be done touching the manufacture of ordnance in advance of its manufacture that would not enable us now to immediately go forward, even if we had the money available.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman mean having a new lathe and such things?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not only a new lathe, but there are a number of things. It is a question of capacity, and it is a question of whether other work would not be delayed. All of these matters would control. I am unable to say, but I think there would be some saving, although I do not think it would be a full year.

I want now, Mr. Chairman, to say a word about ammunition, and just a word, because I have delayed the committee too long, and I will try to take up such of these items as may be necessary as we read the bill. For continental United States the estimate of the ammunition desired was that sufficient should be had to supply all the guns for one hour of fire, and that was determined, not by the question of the life of the guns, though that would put a limit to the number of rounds, although that limit is not approached, but it was determined by the time in which a fleet passing a given fortification would likely be engaged. We have of that amount that is deemed requisite something over 73 per cent for guns and mortars. For guns we have of some of the heavy sizes over 100 per cent, and for other guns it runs down. In order to be accurate I will repeat what I read yesterday about that, though I dislike to take the time of the committee unduly. What I read is to be found on page 193 of the hearings. It is as follows:

These seacoast guns range from 6-pounders up to 16-inch. We have 12-inch mortars besides the 6-pounder gun; the allowance is 200 rounds per gun, and we have that all on hand.

The allowance for the 3-inch (15-pounder) guns is 200 rounds per gun, and we have 70 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 132 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4.72-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 85 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 5-inch guns is 125 rounds, and we have 118 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 6-inch guns is 125 rounds, and we have 76 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 8-inch guns is 90 rounds per gun, and we have 91 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 10-inch guns is 60 rounds per gun, and we have 101 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 12-inch gun is 45 rounds per gun, and we have 110 per cent of projectiles on hand, but only 85 per cent of powder.

For the 14-inch guns, it is now under manufacture, because there have been no 14-inch guns yet mounted in continental United States. They are in process of manufacture and of being mounted.

For the 16-inch guns we have only one that will be sent down to Panama, and the carriage for it will be finished this coming summer. Now, I do not think that is altogether a most desirable condition in regard to ammunition. I am going to be perfectly frank with this committee. I do not think it is an alarming condition, because I do not think you are ever going to have anything like all of your guns on one coast, let alone on both coasts, in action or involved.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Without referring to any present fortification, take the fortification at the entrance to Chesapeake Bay which

is proposed, is it designed under the plan now in operation to have at that point ammunition only for one hour's firing?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I would not say that.

Mr. MANN. I am not speaking now of any particular place, but of the plan.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think so. I think it was in contemplation an hour's supply for all guns, but that does not necessarily mean that that would all be equally distributed in percentages for all the guns. There are a number of guns—for instance, guns here at the Potomac—that would not need to have any ammunition, in my judgment, and that ammunition, so far as it was of a size suitable for other guns, will be put at other places.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the fleet was on the Atlantic Ocean at some place and we might not know just where it was and it should appear off the coast of New York or Chesapeake Bay or some other place farther north or south, what good would it do to have a lot of ammunition in Washington?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I do not think it would do any. I do not think they ought to have any at Washington.

Mr. MANN. What good would it do to have it anywhere else except the point where the fleet appeared?

Mr. SHERLEY. That would depend upon how soon it could be gotten there and how soon needed. If the gentleman by his questions means to imply that he thinks there should be a sufficient quantity at each place, except those so placed where nobody expects them to be attacked, and where they could not be without the reduction of other forts, why I quite agree with him.

Mr. MANN. I do not mean by my question to imply anything, but I will say to the gentleman I have heard the statement made several times to the House that while the design was to have ammunition for one hour's firing of all the guns that, of course, did not mean that all the guns would be fired at once, but I have not been quite able to understand what advantage it is to have a lot of ammunition at San Francisco when the fleet was at New York.

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply wish to say that the theory upon which the allotment was made was not so much the transfer of ammunition from point to point on a given coast as it was the transfer of ammunition from one coast to another with the idea that before we are attacked you would know, according to the country you are having a war with, what coast was going to be involved. Now, I am free to admit I do not altogether share that reasoning. I think Gen. Weaver's position is perhaps the sounder one, and I am inclined to think that the total we ought to aim to have is a supply enough for two hour's continuous firing, and I believe that when the matter is reviewed that will be probably the judgment that will be had touching the matter.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Two hours' continuing firing for the 12-inch guns that it is proposed to mount? That would be how many rounds?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think I could answer the gentleman, but I think it would be something like 90.

Mr. CALDER. That is correct.

Mr. GARDNER. As they are to be remounted, what is the life of the gun, does the gentleman remember, the remounted 12-inch gun with a 700-pound projectile?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not sure in regard to the life of the gun, considering the wear that might have taken place from practice, but with a new gun I think it would be something over 300 rounds.

Mr. GARDNER. At all events, it is adequate?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think so.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Would that apply to the 16-inch gun?

Mr. SHERLEY. It would in a measure, but not entirely so. We have had no experience as to the actual erosion that takes place in the 16-inch gun, because we have not had any that has been fired sufficiently to know it. Presumably the erosion would remain about the same, with a probability it would be a little bit greater in the heavier gun. It also is dependent somewhat upon the foot velocity of the projectile as fired, and one of the reasons why the Army and our Navy, and the English Navy, and others have seen fit to increase the weight of the projectile and lessen the foot velocity has been to get the same force of impact with less wear upon the gun itself so as to prolong the life of the gun, which is very short.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there such a thing as dead shells after long storage?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not say that I know there is; but, so far as I know, the ammunition that we have is all available. Now, the powder that is used is being renewed every year. They use the oldest powder for target practice, and constantly supplant that which is taken out of reserve by the use of the money appropriated for target practice in procuring more; hence you are turning over, to a considerable extent, your powder every year.

Mr. FOWLER. What I am trying to get at is as to what is the average life of the shell in storage?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I do not know; but, so far as I know, there has been no deterioration of the shell as such.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, the ammunition that is placed in a shell. Is it taken out at intervals or is it allowed to remain until used?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I do not think that the shells are always completely loaded that are in reserve. I am rather inclined to think that in many instances they are not, but the gentleman will appreciate it is very difficult for me to keep all these matters in my head.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In connection with the amount of reserve ammunition that was under discussion a few minutes ago, this was determined by a board at some time in the not far past, was it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was determined by the Taft Board.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. About 1906?

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been modified somewhat from time to time, by increasing the allowance for the mortars.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. One other question. Was not the quantity determined by the supplying of a sufficient amount of ammunition for each gun for practically the life of the gun?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think not. I think the amount that was allowed was considerably under the life of a new gun and somewhat under the life of even a gun that has been used quite a bit in practice. And the determining factor was not the life of the gun. In arriving at this amount they determined it on the time that a fleet would be within the range of the guns under battle conditions, as I recall.

Mr. MANN. Might I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman and I recently visited the fortifications in Panama. I do not desire the question answered unless it is a proper one to ask. My recollection is that at one place there, at least, we saw them filling shells—I do not know whether that is the proper term or not—and it seemed to me from what they said that they must be preparing to keep a much larger supply of shells there than could be used in an hour or two hours of continuous firing, unless they can fire these guns much more rapidly than I had ever supposed.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the amount estimated for Panama is the amount estimated for the insular possessions, and that is a two hours' supply.

Mr. MANN. How fast can they fire one of these 8 or 12 inch guns? Does the gentleman happen to remember?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is testified to. I think two shots in a little over a minute in the heavy guns.

Mr. MILLER. I notice in the hearings Gen. Weaver testifies, on page 57, that a two-hours' allowance for a 12-inch gun is 90 rounds; for the 14-inch gun, 80 rounds; and for the 16-inch gun, 70 rounds.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman was asking me about the rapidity of fire.

Mr. MILLER. I understood that was about the maximum rapidity.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, by dividing you would get about the amount.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. Has an estimate ever been made of how much ammunition the producers of ammunition could supply the United States if they were forced to do so?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; quite elaborate statements have been made about that in the hearings. I do not want to trust my memory now, but whatever the quantity may have been at the time the estimates were made, I think it has been very greatly increased by virtue of the tremendous activity in America in the manufacture of munitions of war. So that of the evils that have come from the European war, one thing that might be of benefit has occurred, and that is an increase of the capacity of the country for this output.

In regard to the ammunition, I want to say this: Looking back over it, it may be that the amounts that were asked for

were not large enough and that the amounts that were given were not large enough. But, again, men are presented with relative propositions. The things that have been hammered at our committee as being the most important have been those relating to mobile artillery and ammunition and in regard to the defenses of the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines. Now, we have undertaken to follow the judgment of these men as to the relative importance of matters. In doing that of necessity men do not quite pay the same attention to some matters that they do to others, because of the pressure that is put upon them. Now, we have this situation confronting us at this time. There was an estimate of $200,000 for this ammunition. The committee allowed it. There was some discussion as to whether we should allow an additional sum. The committee was of the judgment that it was not in a position where it ought to go outside of the estimates; that it could present to this committee the facts, and if this committee saw fit to do it, that was with this committee.

Now, I do not desire to detain the committee longer. When we can come to the reading of the bill, to the extent of my ability I will endeavor to answer questions in regard to the various items. I expect to be able to present before this bill is finished a statement touching the Philippine defenses.

I desire now to say that I do not at all concur in the conclusions reached by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] touching the inadequacy of those defenses. I hope to be able to show where in my judgment he is in error, and I desire to say on behalf of the War Department that this matter has not been neglected. It has not been the result of the opinion of a few men sitting in Washington. The plans for that defense have perhaps received more detailed and repeated consideration than that of any defense either in the insular possessions or here, and men who are on the ground are the men who presented, and in a large measure determined, what should be done in regard to those fortifications. I can not enter into it now without going into a speech of some length, and I am not only tired myself, but I am sure the committee is tired, and when we get to it in the bill I will hope to present a plain statement. But it is perfectly manifest that our committee could not follow with any degree of success the plan suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota. He wanted us to summon an officer who was stationed there and who had certain views about what should be done. Some of those views have been in a great measure concurred in by other officers. Others of them have been concurred in by some other officers, and the matter had been passed upon by a board qualified to judge.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. I did not simply suggest one officer alone. I suggested his name because he was here. There are others here also of the same opinion, and if the gentlemen of the committee had desired to enter upon an investigation I should have been pleased to furnish their names. I do not want it understood that this is the only man that held those opinions.

Mr. SHERLEY. This is the only officer I recall the gentleman mentioning to me.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say, again, that we are confronted with a proposition of whether the committee should sit as a board of inquiry upon whether the defense plans passed upon by the Regular Army board were sufficient or whether the judgment of some officer who had not had his view accepted was to be taken. I submit, in all candor, that the committee followed the common-sense course. And I say another thing, namely, that whenever you get a committee undertaking to listen to and air the views of any officer who happens not to have his viewpoint accepted, you will be traveling far afield, and have a herculean job on your hands, with no result or benefit to the country at large.

Complaint is made of the fact that the flanks of these fortifications are not defended by fortifications. If they had been, I suppose complaint would then have been made that the flanks of those flanks were not defended, and so on ad infinitum. As a matter of fact, they put the fortifications on islands, and not on the mainland, because of the well-known superiority of an island for a fortification as compared with the mainland, and without now going into the matter, I desire to repeat that I do not think the criticisms that the gentleman made are well founded.

Touching the Hawaiian Islands and the land defense there, in justice to myself I should say again that I accepted the viewpoint of the War Department over considerable opposition of some gentlemen who did not want to do anything in regard to the land defenses, and this was at a time when men, then Members of Congress, were silent as to the need of these things being done.

Let me say in justice to the Fortifications Committee that we have for several years past given the money for every gun asked for the insular possessions. We have given the money for all accessories, the searchlights, fire-control mines, and ammunition, and as to ammunition, the supply is a two hours' supply for all the guns. The fortifications of Hawaii are completed except as to a small part of the land defenses, which are provided for in this bill. As to the Philippines, the money has practically all been appropriated, most of the work is done, and the rest is being done as fast as physically possible, and the same statement can be made as to Panama, and the defenses are modern and adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I have detained the committee very much too long. I am very much indebted to you, gentlemen, for your attention, and I shall be glad, as far as I may, to answer inquiries when we come to the consideration of the items. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the negative of the motion to strike out the last word. I am going to discuss under the five-minute rule later most of these items.

The gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. SHERLEY] read the evidence of Gen. Wood, and then said I was trying to give the House the idea that the situation had changed of late years; that there was a sudden and marked increase in the attacking power of the war vessels which we might regard as possible opponents. That is correct. I had intended to give that impression, and I had intended to give that impression because it is true. There are built and building and authorized in the wide world to-day just 39 ships that carry 14-inch guns and heavier, and of those 39 ships just 9 are now sailing the ocean, and the other 30 are in process of construction or have been authorized.

Now, that is the reason why this change has come, and at the time when Gen. Wood gave his evidence I do not think that his evidence on its face shows that he completely understood the question that was asked of him. As a matter of fact, when he gave that evidence, in December, 1912, the condition did not exist that exists to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to this whole question of guns and fortifications, as to the question of how soon you shall put the guns into the scrap heap, the question of how soon you shall put the old fortifications into the scrap heap, that is all only a question of degree. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] thinks you should be a long while about it. I believe you should be a short while about it. I believe, no matter what the expense is of rapidly throwing out the old equipment as it becomes partially antiquated, it should be done, and I believe in rebuilding fortifications much more rapidly than does the gentleman.

Now, what is the situation? When I was a red-headed boy of 19 years of age the Endicott Board began its life, and we are still proceeding to fortify under the plans of the Endicott Board, somewhat modified by the plans of the Taft Board, and here and there by an occasional change in addition.

Oh, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] smiles; but that is one of his favorite methods of arguing. But we are proceeding, as appears from the evidence, on the plans of the Endicott Board. That board was instituted when I was a red-headed lad of 19 years old, and now I am a white-haired man who will be half a century old on my next birthday. Yet in these many years we have not yet come within sight of the completion of the project of the Endicott Board. It is nowhere near completed. The Secretary of War testified the other day, according to page 25 of the hearings, that we need $40,000,000 more to bring these plans of fortifications to completion. Yet we have been appropriating in the last 10 years an average of only $1,150,000 toward our fortifications. At that rate, Mr. Chairman, it will be 34 years more before this project will be complete, and instead of being a man of 50 years old I shall be a lean and slippered pantaloon of 84. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that the committee did not want to go outside the estimates, in spite of the fact that the Secretary of War testified on page 42 that if he were making the estimates to-day he would make them greater. The gentleman from Kentucky says that the committee would be put under pressure if it went outside the estimates. That is true. We all are put under pressure all the time by people who wish us to spend money. So is the Committee on Naval Affairs under pressure. The Committee on Naval Affairs, however, went outside the estimates, because the members knew that the national defense demanded that they should go outside the estimates. They were not willing to lie back and put the responsibility on the Secretary of the Navy for making low estimates when they knew that more money ought to be expended on our Navy.

That is the situation which faced the Committee on Fortifications, with this exception, that the Secretary of War told

them that the estimates would have been higher if made later in the year, while the Secretary of the Navy never told the Committee on Naval Affairs that his estimates were too low, although that certainly was the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT.

For construction of gun and mortar batteries, $585,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARDNER: Page 2, line 4, strike out "$585,000" and insert "$1,835,000."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if that amendment is adopted it will allow the expenditure of one million and a quarter of dollars for the fortifications of Cape Henry, at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, and later on I shall offer another amendment to allow $500,000 to be expended on the armament of those fortifications, making in all the one million and three-quarters which the Secretary of War told the committee that we ought to provide if we provide anything at all.

Here is what this Taft Board said nine years ago, in 1906, about this question of Chesapeake Bay:

Commercially and strategically Chesapeake Bay is to-day, as it has always been, of the very first importance. With the entrance as it is now, unfortified, a hostile fleet, should it gain control of the sea, can establish without coming under the fire of a single gun a base on its shores, pass in and out at its pleasure, have access to large quantities of valuable supplies at all times, and paralyze the great trunk lines crossing the head of the bay.

That is what the board said nine years ago, and not one spade full of earth has been turned since that day to remedy that state of affairs. Now, the land has been bought and paid for. We have put all that through. The plan for fortification and armament is complete. We know what it is going to cost. Why not appropriate? Because it would require a supplemental estimate; because the plans were not ready until after the regular estimates were made up last June? Is that a sufficient reason, Mr. Chairman?

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will perhaps say, as he did a little while ago, that the enemy must first dispose of our fleet before its fleet can enter the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, and that the enemy will first have to dispose of our submarines. The fact is the enemy will not have to do all that. The submarines on the Atlantic coast have mostly disposed of themselves, except those at the Panama Canal. They tried to mobilize under the order of Admiral Fletcher last November. When the commander of the flotilla, Commander Yates Sterling, jr., reported, he announced that only one of the submarines was in condition to dive. It was not his fault. He had called the attention of the Navy Department over and over again to the condition of the submarine fleet, and what had happened? He was reproved by the Secretary of the Navy for so doing.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If Congress nine years ago had appropriated for fortifying the Chesapeake, does the gentleman contend that those fortifications would now be such that he would be willing to accept them to-day?

Mr. GARDNER. No; we should probably have had to change them two or three times. They would be just as much out of date as your other old fortifications are that I am trying to get brought up to date.

Mr. GOOD. Then, it was the part of wisdom to postpone, at least for nine years, the commencement of that work.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, by the same rule it would have been the part of wisdom if I had not insured my automobile last year, because I did not run into anybody. I should have saved that amount of money. No; the part of wisdom would have been to have completed the fortifications then, and, as they became antiquated, renew them, instead of waiting.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows, of course, that the plan of the War Department at that time and for a number of years thereafter was to build an artificial island in the mouth of the Chesapeake that would have cost a number of million dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Thirty million dollars.

Mr. GARDNER. That may very well have been the best plan. I do not know. But I know this, that if you wait until you get a perfect plan you will never do anything at all; and that would just suit a great many people. There is nothing that is not growing old. Gentlemen say, "Wait until we see what happens in Europe. Wait until we see what happens next." We have been waiting nine years for a better plan for the defenses at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay down below here. We have been waiting a good while, and we will go on waiting from now until doomsday if we are going to wait until we get a perfect plan.

Mr. MADDEN. We have been at peace with all the world during the nine years, have we not?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And we are likely to be.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says we are likely to be. If everybody agreed with the gentleman, what would be the use of spending any money at all on defenses?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this question of preparation is all a question of degree. We all agree that there must be reasonable and proper preparation for the possibility and eventuality of hostilities. The only differences arise out of the different views we hold as to what at a certain time and under certain conditions constitutes reasonable preparedness. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] takes a rather extreme view of the matter. I do not altogether disagree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. For, while I would not be inclined and am not inclined to follow him to the length to which he would go, I think the gentleman has performed a helpful and patriotic service in calling attention to some deficiencies and in urging a little more earnestness and possibly just a little more rapidity in carrying out our plans of defense. But we have not neglected this in the past.

We have expended for fortifications in the last 10 years something more than $75,000,000 in addition to all our other war expenditures. In 10 years we have spent on our national defenses, including the bills now reported, $2,754,000,000. And as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has just suggested, we have been at peace with all the world all this time. Therefore, so far and up to date, so far as the expenditure has had any effect on our relationship with the world, it has not seemed to be altogether necessary. And yet it has been wise and proper expenditure, and it should be continued in a reasonable, sensible way.

I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in his view that there is any condition now existing which justifies a special speeding up in the matter of preparation for war or in matters of defense, for two reasons: First, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] very clearly pointed out, no expenditure that we could now make, for permanent fortifications at least, could avail us anything in the improbable case of our becoming embroiled in the troubles now going on in Europe; and, secondly, because I view this as a peculiarly proper time for us to emphasize the fact that while we believe in proper preparation for defense we are not a military people. We do not believe in great armies and great armaments; and with all the world of Europe illustrating the frightful losses and the fearful devastation of war, this is an excellent time for us to emphasize our love and desire for peace. While we should not check our proper preparation for defense, this is not, in my opinion, the time for us to embark upon sudden, extravagant, and ambitious schemes of militarism.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it on account of the state of the Treasury that the gentleman opposes this particular amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all.

Mr. GARDNER. That was the Secretary's reason for not submitting the estimate, was it not?

Mr. MONDELL. My view of that is this, that while there are many expenditures which we might make properly, which we need not make when the Treasury is in its present unfortunate situation, if, as a matter of fact, we need to expend money for defense or preparation for defense, we ought to do it without regard to the condition of the Treasury. [Applause.] So that my view of the matter is not in any wise affected by the condition of the Treasury. We should sell bonds or raise money by further special war taxation if it were necessary, beyond a peradventure, for us to prepare for a more perfect defense. I do not think it is true that conditions are such as to demand or warrant any further speeding up than is contemplated, but I do not arrive at that conclusion because the Treasury is well-nigh empty.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The most hopeful sign that I have seen recently is the calm, serene, and peaceful condition which now seems to possess the soul of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The country is indeed safe. The storms that were lowering upon our fair land but a short season ago have vanished. I recall distinctly, in our recent apprehended troubles with Mexico, the perfervid manner of my pleasant, my much-admired friend from Wyoming, a gentleman whom I esteem very highly indeed, when he was appealing and praying for a strong hand to stop the unspeakable atrocities, as he then described them,

that were being perpetrated in Mexico. I can see him with his muscles quivering, with his face as florid as the setting autumn sun, screaming and shouting for the time to come when the administration would cease to hesitate to intervene and stop the unparalleled and awful outrages in Mexico. It was something really appalling. You would have thought that the occasion was one in which our Army and our fleet should at once be mobilized and go instanter into Mexico. But times have changed, I am glad to say, and peace reigns.

For some good and substantial reason the gentleman from Wyoming has grounded arms, and we are not to have this war that he was pleading for. War has suddenly come to be unpopular. There was a time when men over on that side of the aisle were groping around this way and the other trying to find something out of which to make an issue. At one time it looked like it would be a popular thing to intervene in Mexico and to stop all of these outrageous cruelties that the gentleman from Wyoming was painting in such a lurid fashion before the House at that time. But now we have had object lessons of war and the people have grown wiser along that line. The administration's course, I apprehend, in keeping out of Mexico, has met with approval somewhere, or else the gentleman from Wyoming would be the last man to hoist the white flag, as he has here to-day, and wave the banner of peace instead of the red flag of intervention.

As I say, this war is not as popular as it was, and now on the other side of the question he is preaching peace. It is a popular thing now to preach peace, and no better indication of the drift of sentiment throughout the country at large than the present attitude of my good genial friend from Wyoming could be had, because he has his ear especially tuned to the popular wave, and I take it that we are not to have this war in Mexico that loomed up threatening on the horizon.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman does not think that the American people would consent to have one of their wars in the middle of the newspaper when other wars were on the front page?

Mr. HELM. The gentleman is getting me out into deep water; he will have to make things a little more plain to me.

Mr. GARDNER. Does not the gentleman think that a war between the United States and Mexico would be on the inside of the newspaper?

Mr. HELM. Decidedly; in other words, a Mexican war would be like a side show compared with Barnum & Bailey's circus under the main tent.

Mr. GARDNER. And the self-respect of the American people would not consent to have their own war confined to the middle of the newspaper while other wars occupied the front page.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman from Massachusetts will not be confined to the inside of the newspaper, because he occupies the first column on the front page. I do not know how it happens, but I think it is fine entertainment; we all like to get up in the morning and read something in box-car letters on the front page as to what the gentleman from Massachusetts is doing. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman from Wyoming will allow me, I would like to ask unanimous consent to limit debate on this item to 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know but that I would like 10 minutes myself, and then the gentleman from Kentucky may want more time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope we may proceed with the bill with some rapidity, because it is desirable to finish it to-day.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the suggestion, because it is possible that I may ask for more than five minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then make it 15 minutes. I will say to the gentleman that there are other items that gentlemen can speak on, on the general subject of fortification, unless the gentleman from Wyoming desires to speak to this particular item.

Mr. MONDELL. I made the suggestion because I may ask for more than five minutes on this one item.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this item close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this item close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes when the gentleman from Wyoming has completed his remarks. I do not think the gentleman from Kentucky would object when he knows what I am going to say.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will give the gentleman two minutes out of my five, for I want but three.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am never so charmed as I am in listening to my genial and eloquent friend from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] who has just taken his seat. He has many splendid qualities, but he shines above all other things in the possession, first, of a marvelous imagination and, second, of wider, broader, deeper, and more illimitable information in regard to things that are not so than any gentleman of my acquaintance. The gentleman is disturbed because I am not preaching war and bloodshed and insurrection. I am not one of those people who have made a profession of love of peace at any price; but if the gentleman from Kentucky had followed me, as one would imagine he had from what he has just said, he would know that I have never been much enamored of war and military establishment. I look upon military establishments as an unfortunate, a sad, necessity, as a necessary evil. The gentleman illustrated his marvelous genius for imagination by his reference to what I have said at one time and another in regard to our attitude touching Mexico. Evidently the gentleman did not do me the honor of listening to what I said yesterday on that subject. As a matter of fact, it is altogether evident that he has never listened to what I have said on the subject at any time, much less read what I have said on the subject.

The gentleman's imagination leads him to infer from some mention I have made of the situation in Mexico that I have been preaching intervention, war, bloodshed, and that I have been desirous of having armies sent across our southern border to devastate the land. If the gentleman had relied upon the facts more and his imagination less, he would have recalled that I not only have never preached intervention in Mexico, but that I voted against the little, inglorious war that the President brought on with Mexico—a war which, but for the glorious gallantry and heroism of the men wearing our uniform, was as inglorious as it was brief.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman appears to know a great deal with regard to what I have said about Mexico which is not so. From the very first mention I made of the blunders—I might almost say the crimes—of this administration touching Mexico and her people, one year ago the 27th of this month, I have insisted that there was no necessity, demand, or reason for our intervening in Mexico.

The policy adopted by the administration was a policy which led inevitably to intervention. It was intervention, unarmed and indirect, but intervention, nevertheless; intervention in behalf of one of the contending parties, and intervention that led to war and cost us the lives of something like a score of splendid young fellows and, in addition, something like fifteen to eighteen millions of dollars cash and great deterioration and loss to our Atlantic Fleet lying down there in the waters of the Gulf for well-nigh a year. The only reason why we did not have a big war with Mexico when the President brought on the little inglorious war was that the faction we struck in Mexico was not strong enough to strike back. Then, like the King of France, who, with a hundred thousand men, marched upon the hill and then marched down again, we, after losing the lives of 20 fine young fellows, killing several hundred Mexicans, and spending $15,000,000, marched home again without having accomplished anything. There was a lot of talk about an insult to the flag. Was there any reparation? Was anyone compelled to salute the flag? Was there ever any demand made and enforced that that alleged insult to the flag should be apologized for or that there should be reparation made? No. We sacrificed 20 good lives, young, vigorous, hearty fellows; we killed a lot of folks who had done us no harm; we spent our money like water and kept our men and ships down there in the rotting climate of the Mexican Gulf, and then sailed away with the question just where it was when we started. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, within a few days I shall have been a Member of this body for 12 years. During that time I have never risen to a question of personal privilege, and do not now, but I hold in my hand a paper published at Staunton, Va., under date of Tuesday, February 23, 1915, and in it are some headlines that do an injustice, in my

judgment, to one of the distinguished Members of this House. I am quoted as declaring in the discussions that took place on Saturday last that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is a "featherweight" and a "bootlicker." Anyone reading the text knows that I did not in any degree refer to the gentleman from Virginia, and anyone who heard the controversy knows that that was not the case. So far as the gentleman from Virginia is concerned, he was vigorously defending his bill, which it was his duty to do, and I think he was doing it in a proper and in a gentlemanly manner, and instead of calling forth any condemnation on my part I had only praise for the manner in which he did it. I think it only right to make this statement in behalf of the gentleman from Virginia, whom I esteem as my friend, and whom I believe to be one of the ablest and most gentlemanly Members of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have already said so much about Cape Henry that it is unnecessary that I should say much more. If we are going upon the theory of carrying in this bill everything which is desirable, we will have a bill that will carry not $6,000,000 but several times $6,000,000. As I undertook to say in my general statement, Congress must consider not only the desirability of doing a thing, but the relative desirability of doing things, and must consider total expenditures that are to be made at any given time. I have no doubt that the committee will be urged, and will doubtless see fit, to recommend at the next session of Congress the initiation of the emplacement and armament work for Cape Henry, and that, having undertaken it, it will be pushed as fast as is physically possible. I question whether we ought to now appropriate this money. If I were going to appropriate additional sums, I think that there are other matters that could be urged with much more insistence than this; and I believe, as has been repeatedly said, that there is nothing in the situation that now confronts the country to warrant us in losing our judgment or undertaking to greatly accelerate the speed with which we are providing armament for continental United States.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the gentleman in his address this morning to indicate that an appropriation at this time in relation to the fortifications at Cape Henry would not expedite the consummation of the scheme.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would not put it that strong. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asked me if it would expedite it to the extent of a year, and I said I thought not. I think, even if the money were at hand at the present time, that there would be considerable delay touching the manufacture of the guns, and that is the thing that will control that would prevent our getting the benefit of a full year over a next year's appropriation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman means that it will take approximately a year to make the guns?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, no; it will take nearly three years to make the guns, but it would be necessary to get certain machinery and be prepared to undertake the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is authorized to grant to the Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, a perpetual right of way through the lands which have been or which may be acquired for fortification purposes at Cape Henry, Va., on such location as he may approve, in exchange for all of said company's lands and rights of way lying within the boundaries of the lands acquired or to be acquired for said fortification purposes: *Provided*, That the said railroad company may be reimbursed from appropriations which may be applicable to the construction of defenses at Cape Henry, Va., for the expense which may be imposed upon the said railroad company in changing the location of its tracks, stations, or other buildings and appurtenances from their present location on the said lands and rights of way of the said railroad company to the right of way hereinbefore authorized to be granted to the said company by the Secretary of War.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he will tolerate my addressing the committee for 8 or 10 minutes?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I have something that I would like much to say to the committee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be an alarmist. If I should attempt to be, I would be dissatisfied with myself; but events have happened and words have been said within the last few hours touching our relations with belligerent nations calculated to fill us with apprehension. I do not want to say in these few minutes anything that may be misunderstood or misleading, but when a gentleman of the great ability and capacity for statesmanship, well recognized the world over, the former President of the United States, Mr. Taft, tells his countrymen that they are approaching a danger, I think the time is here to take heed lest an awful calamity may befall us. Within the last few hours an American ship has been sunk in the North Sea. It is true she carried cotton and, fortunately, no passengers. It is said she was insured by this Government. That I do not know, neither, for this time, do I care; but I do know that she was an American ship and sunk by some force without. That force I do not attempt to describe or the nation applying it do I attempt to indicate, therefore I do not hold anyone responsible for the loss or invasion of an American right. That ship, in my judgment, was where she had a right to be, but it was where she ought not to have been. Is not there some one in this country strong enough to take the part of our own people by keeping them from harm? I was greatly pleased, I even applauded the declaration which the President made some time ago cautioning all of his people to neutrality, to moderation of speech, to temperate language, and good behavior. In my judgment the wishes of the President as expressed in that proclamation have been largely complied with by the American people. I believe that he ought now to go further.

I wish the President of the United States could see it to be his duty to make another proclamation, to warn these shipowners, to warn those who sail ships and carry produce upon the seas to these belligerent nations, to keep away from this death zone. A few minutes ago I was in conversation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. He and I are two men who recall well the effect the destruction of American property and the destruction of American lives has upon the American people, for we sat here in 1898 when the American people crowded around this Capitol and forced men like the gentleman and myself who had determined, for ourselves, that there should be no war, into a declaration in favor of it. Why can not the President of the United States make another proclamation in which he might say, if he would permit a humble individual like me to suggest it, what our rights are according to the numerous treaties; that we have the right by reason of them to be where we now are; that we have the right to go beyond this dead line marked out by these belligerents. It is true it may be agreed by that that we should attend the markets of belligerents and our safety was thereby guaranteed while we delivered our products. Why does he not go further and say, if you go, you go upon your own risk. [Applause.] Why does he not say to these market men, if you lose your ship it goes down as your ship and we will not redden the waters of the Atlantic with the blood of American soldiers and sailors in order to make good what you have lost. [Applause.] Why does he not say to these belligerents, you are avoiding and violating the laws of neutrality, the specifications and stipulations found in your agreements with us, and when this war is over, when peace once more comes and brings a return of the composure and calmness which you had before this war began, we will hold you responsible in the tribunal already established to the end that you will make good the loss you have put upon our American people. These crafty—I withdraw the word—the American is hunting for trade. The cotton man has cotton to sell, the corn farmer has corn to sell, every American has something to sell. It is much better that it should waste and rot where it grew, even our Nation paying the grower in some measure for it, than in any way to involve ourselves in a war by endeavoring to deliver it to these belligerent nations. [Applause.]

Do not think, my friends, for a minute, that I am begging the question or that I am taking the part of cowardice. It is not true. I strive to do no more than call your attention to the great danger that confronts us and one we are likely to be in at any minute because of the persistent attempts which these men of trade may bring to us. It seems to me that our statesmen and our great men in whose hands our safety lies should at this time do all they know how to do in order to avoid even the possibility of trouble on account of our trade with these belligerents. Ex-President Taft has told us of our rights. He told us of the violation of them, but like many others who have spoken upon the same subject, he did not point out how to avoid the dangers that confront us. Here is what he said, in part:

In preserving the commerce of the United States with the belligerents, however, we are face to face with a crisis. We are threatened with a serious invasion of our rights as a neutral in trading with the belligerent countries. What certainly is an innovation upon previous rules in respect to neutral commerce and contraband of war has been initiated by the belligerents of both sides. The planting of mines in the open sea and the use of submarines to send neutral vessels to the

bottom without inquiry as to their neutrality, when found in a so-called war zone of the open sea, are all of them a variation from the rules of international law governing the action of belligerents toward neutral trade. When their violation results in the destruction of lives of American citizens, or of American property, a grave issue will arise as to what the duty of the Government is. The responsibility of the President and Congress in meeting the critical issue thus presented in maintaining our national rights and our national honor, on the one hand, with due regard to the awful consequences to our 90,000,000 of people of engaging in this horrible world war, on the other, will be very great.

Perhaps I am wrong in suggesting that this warning should come from the President of the United States. I know of no other authority that would command as high attention. It ought surely to come from somewhere, from some of our officials in supreme authority. If not from them, then it should come by resolution from this House [applause], that we will not vote the necessary money, that we will not ask soldiers to enlist for a war made necessary only through the cupidity of the American people. If these belligerents want our goods, contraband or otherwise, let them come in their own ships with their own crews and get the loads on our wharves. Is there no one but me to advocate the use of the strong arm to prevent the risk we are running? Yes, use force, if it can be legally employed, to keep us from the place we are told not to enter. I am perfectly willing to stand by what I have said if I stand alone. Let me repeat, the young American ought to understand that he will not be expected to enlist to punish either of these belligerent nations for acts committed in this death zone upon our commerce which we are endeavoring to carry on with them. They are mad and in great anger—nations that observe their treaty rights in time of peace, but can scarcely be expected to observe them under present conditions. It is beyond reason to expect it. Mr. Chairman, this little ship which went down, as I have said, was an American ship.

I have seen it stated somewhere that the owners of the ship claim she was lost at their own risk. Thus we have escaped. Anyhow, I do not imagine that our Government would hold the destroying power responsible for her loss. To-morrow there may be another. Perhaps the next day still another. How long will the Americans remain patient? Do not put them to the test with too frequent experiments. It was stated this morning that some of her crew were lost. Poor fellows, their destruction did not provoke much comment. But why further tempt us? After a while perhaps one of these belligerents may charge the other with the commission of these wrongs upon our people and our commerce. Oh, the side upon which this Government should throw her power would win in this war. Can it be possible that any of these belligerents would purposely involve us? Heaven forbid this affliction to come to us.

Gentlemen who were Members of this House when the *Maine* was sunk remember distinctly that few questions were asked. Three hundred Americans had perished. The loss of the ship we could account for, but the loss of Americans inflamed the people, until they arose and demanded that the deaths of their sailormen should be avenged. No power can resist such a force. We could not do it then. I feel we are under better restraint now, but let us not be tempted.

Is there no one to speak? Is there no one in authority strong enough to say the right word now, so that the nations may understand and the belligerents may know that if our ships are torpedoed in those waters into which these madmen warn us not to come the sons of America shall not for that cause alone enlist to punish the guilty, and thus perhaps take the part of some belligerent. These belligerents are not affronting us. They have not invaded our territory, disputed our boundaries, nor willfully assaulted us. It is true they agreed we should go into the North Sea. They made the contract that the ocean should be open to us upon certain conditions. Are we not reasonable men? Can we not understand that when men are mad and inflamed with passion they will not reason? We can not expect these belligerents to parley with us now. They are beyond that point. They are spilling the blood of each other. They have defined this death zone. They have told us to stay away from it. Then, in the name of God's service, for the safety of our people, and for the love of humanity, let some one, and the right one, tell these American traders they must stay away from these fields of death. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my distinguished colleague, Mr. BUTLER, has said finds a very responsive chord in the hearts of most of us, whether we vote with him or not. It is especially interesting to me because this morning I took occasion to introduce two resolutions, one requesting of the Secretary of the Treasury information as to the insurance of the steamship *Evelyn*, which was destroyed by a mine day before yesterday, and the other seeking information and particulars as to the ownership of the vessels and cargoes, the premiums paid, and so forth, of all vessels insured by the United States War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks if anyone will rise and say the word that is necessary now to be said to foreign nations as well as to the people of the United States to stop our being drawn into a possible conflict. The gentleman suggests it might be the President. Well, how can the President of the United States rise and say that word now? He urged this Congress to pass a bill in order that we might further the export trade, that we might further the individual fortunes that are to be made by reason of the war necessities of our friends upon the other side of the water. The President had rushed through this House a bill taking the people's money to establish an insurance company in the name of the Government of the United States to encourage American traders and the manipulators in cotton, in arms, and in grain to use foreign as well as American ships, thus inviting the very disaster that occurred over yonder near by the port of Bremen day before yesterday.

In addition to this the President of the United States had rushed through this House a bill requiring us to take $30,000,000 of the money of the people to buy foreign ships to still further encourage American as well as foreign traders, manipulators, and speculators in cotton and grain and in the munitions of war to challenge the destruction of ships, violate neutrality, and disturb the peaceful relations for which my friend from Pennsylvania pleads so eloquently. How can the President of the United States speak that word the gentleman from Pennsylvania hopes for now? He has gone too far. He has listened to the voice of the trader, to the voice of the speculator, to the voice of the manipulator; he has listened to the voice of the money-maker, and he has put it up to the people to pay the loss upon their ships. I wish with my colleague that the President might rise to the situation and tell the exporters and the traders to keep out of forbidden territory. I hope he will do this before it is too late.

Of what concern is the loss of the *Evelyn* to the gentlemen who owned the ship? Nothing compared to ours. The Government insured them. The loss is not their loss. No; it is not the manipulator's loss; it is not the speculator's loss. We assumed their responsibility. They have unloaded on the Government of the United States. The President of the United States and this Congress, acting at his dictation, swallowed the bait. It is the American people who are liable for this sort of manipulation, for this speculation, for this risk. The President and Congress have made the people of the United States the surety for those who are speculating in cotton or in grain to make money.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, I wish somebody would rise now and explain why we ventured upon this hazardous business. Why was this War Risk Bureau established at the expense of the people of the United States to protect speculators? I wish some one who favored this legislation would rise now and tell us why we want to buy more of these old hulks. The *Evelyn* was 32 years old; she had been a wreck, and yet we passed a wrecking bill a few days ago to admit more of her kind to American registry. She was wrecked in 1897, and got the American flag because she was a wreck. I wish some one would rise now and tell us why we passed that bill. Why, gentlemen, everything we said in opposition to the war-risk bill, everything we said in opposition to the wrecking bill, everything we said in opposition to the shipping bill has been proven by this one incident of the mining of the *Evelyn*. It is your ship, the kind of a ship you wanted the Government to own. It belonged to your speculators; it belonged to the men in New York who wanted to make money, and for whom the President and the Democratic Congress stood sponsor. I sincerely trust it is not too late to stop this kind of business. I hope it is not too late to listen to the appeal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. Some one in authority ought to say that the United States will no longer stand for this sort of manipulation, this speculation and money-making. Some one should be firm enough to tell these people who want to go into these war zones to make money, whether they involve us in war or not, that they go in at their own risk, and that the United States will not assume the responsibility for their acts. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of mining casemates, cable galleries, torpedo storehouses, cable tanks, and other structures necessary for the operation, preservation, and care of submarine mines and their accessories, and for providing channels for access to torpedo wharves, $31,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

At this point in the estimates appeared a provision for the construction of landing facilities at Outer Brewster Island, Boston, Mass., $50,000. As I understand it, the purpose of that landing facility is to improve the adjuncts to the existing fortifications; that is to say, it is proposed, in order to increase the efficiency of existing fortifications in Boston Harbor. I find on page 143 of the hearings that Mr. SHERLEY says to Gen. Weaver:

In other words, you are simply proposing now to use it as a site for searchlights?

He is there speaking about Outer Brewster Island. Gen. Weaver says:

Yes; and range-finding station. We can improve thereby very much the accuracy of fire, particularly of the mortar battery at Peddocks Island at Fort Andrews.

He then goes on to say that, in his opinion, later on there will have to be some primary guns installed at Outer Brewster Island, but that, ad interim, Outer Brewster is to be used for approved existing defenses. The Secretary of War thought that that was so necessary, in spite of the fact that he cut down the estimates to the bone, and in a great many places far below the bone—nevertheless in this particular instance the estimates ought not to be cut. This is one of the few items where the committee did not appropriate that which is recommended by the Secretary; and I shall be glad if the chairman would explain the situation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not recommend the $50,000 asked because it was expected to be expended in a wharf for Outer Brewster Island, and as no provision was made or asked for either the searchlights or the range-finding matériel for the island we felt that we could properly postpone this item for the wharf and let it be carried at the time the other items were carried and there would be no resulting delay. I am inclined to agree with what the Chief of the Coast Artillery said as to the probability that next year there will be presented to us a scheme for the fortification of Outer Brewster Island, perhaps with a primary battery. In that event it is very likely the landing facilities might be something different from what is now contemplated, and in view of the fact that no delay would result thereby, the committee felt warranted in eliminating this item of $50,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman give me any idea as to what class the primary guns would be, the number of calibers or the diameter?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not, except to this extent: I do not think any plan has been worked out, but the gentleman is familiar with the report of the board recently assembled as to the character of primary armament that should be used in the future, in which they recommend the use of guns of not less than 16-inch diameter and mortars of not less than our most modern 12-inch mortar. Whether it would be desirable to put guns or mortars there I am not advised.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has for the second, and possibly for the third, time referred on this floor to the sinking of the American cotton steamer *Evelyn* at a time when neither he nor even the officials charged with the duty of investigating know anything about the facts in the case. But he continues to demand why there was a cotton steamer in a place where it was liable to be sunk, as near as I can make out.

Now, as a matter of interest, I would like to know what the gentleman would say if all the cotton of the United States were still held in storage in this country and had no foreign outlet at all. I am very curious to know exactly what kind of a speech the gentleman would make under those circumstances.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman refer to me?

Mr. BORLAND. No. I refer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. That is the ultimate logic of his position, that we still ought to have our cotton, and not so much as to attempt to find a foreign market for it by the aid of war insurance or any other method. So many of these things are quoted by our distinguished friends on the Republican side, showing that business conditions must be in a terrible condition in this country, that I want to call their attention to the trade report of last week, as published in the Kansas City Star of Sunday, February 21, in which it is stated that—

Exports of merchandise in January exceeded imports by $145,536,103, the largest balance on record for any month. This is what the completed figures show: Exports were $267,801,370, about $64,000,000 more than a year ago, and imports were $122,265,267, or thirty-two and one-half millions less than in January, 1913.

So that it is not true that a flood of imports is coming into this country to demoralize American business. I read further:

In December and January the excess of exports was $276,000,000. Net gold imports last month were $6,204,889.

But gentlemen will say that is all war material. Gentlemen will say that somebody is sending abroad war materials; that nobody is sending abroad anything on earth except war materials. Let us see whether that is the case. Last week nearly 390,000 bales of cotton went abroad; nearly three times as much as in the corresponding week a year ago.

But these gentlemen come from the manufacturing States. How about our friends from the agricultural States? This article that I have in my hand shows that the total farm value of farm products for the year 1914 is $4,936,000,000—$300,000,000 more than the average for the preceding five years. So that the American farmer to-day is $300,000,000 richer than in any year during the preceding five-year period. And can it be possible, with the American farmer $300,000,000 richer than he was and 390,000 bales of cotton going abroad in a single week, that business is going to smash in every locality in this country?

Certainly not. Here are the bank clearings in the last week. It shows a decrease in the clearings in New York City, which is the index of the general business of the country; but it shows 13 cities of the country where there was an increase in clearings over last year, beginning with 1 per cent in the city of Richmond and running to 60 per cent increase in Oklahoma City.

Mr. MADDEN. How much would an increase of 60 per cent in Oklahoma City be? Not over $125,000.

Mr. BORLAND. It would be very substantial for Oklahoma City. The gentleman can make fun of Oklahoma City if he pleases, but it is a very substantial increase. The clearings every week of Oklahoma City are nearly $4,000,000. The clearings of Kansas City show an increase of 43.8 per cent, and the clearings of Kansas City are $75,000,000 a week. Let us see where these cities are that had an increase. St. Louis had an increase; Kansas City, Baltimore, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Houston, Memphis, Fort Worth, Richmond, Washington, D. C., Wichita, and Oklahoma City. It shows that in the great Central West of this country business is on the increase to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I do not desire in any way to unduly cripple debate, but manifestly we ought not under the five-minute rule to be going outside the scope of the bill. There has been a speech both pro and con on this matter. Without desiring to interfere with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I shall have to insist hereafter, with a view to expediting the disposition of the bill, that the debate be confined to the bill. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from Illinois should speak five minutes. I have no desire to make my point personal.

Mr. MADDEN. I think, however, inasmuch as this debate has gone so far afield, Mr. Chairman, there ought not to be any restriction now on this particular item of the bill. However, I shall confine myself to the bill. We are dealing with war, munitions of war, and preparations for war——

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that I have no objection to his having five minutes. I am trying to be fair. I want to get this bill through.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that is all right. I do not want the gentleman to understand that I think he wishes to be otherwise than fair.

I want to suggest to the House, Mr. Chairman, that if I had my way—and I do not expect that I shall have my way—I would use every power in the Government of the United States to protect every citizen of the United States, no matter where he is, but I would not use the power of the United States to protect the investment of a citizen of the United States outside of continental United States and its possessions. [Applause.] I believe we ought to encourage business at home and prosperity at home by compelling our people to invest their money at home, where they have the right to the protection of the flag.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just for a question, because the gentleman has made a very interesting distinction.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why should you use the powers of the Government, not to protect investments outside of continental United States, and by implication use them to protect investments within continental United States?

Mr. MADDEN. I think that every man who lives within the United States, who is a citizen of the United States, investing his money in the United States and paying taxes to maintain the Government of the United States, and to promote the welfare of the United States, is entitled to every protection that the Government of the United States can give him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps I used the wrong word and misled the gentleman. The gentleman said "continental America."

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I meant continental United States and its possessions. But when a man begins to feel that he must go beyond the borders of his own country to make investments, and expects the Government of the United States to follow him with the flag and with the Army and with the Navy, he is expecting that which he ought not to receive. As a citizen of the United States, entitled to every protection that his citizenship justifies, every power within the Government of the United States should be placed at his disposal; but I would once for all discourage men from going into foreign countries, where the laws are not certain, for the purpose of speculation, and then expecting this Government to stand behind them with a gun.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the gentleman is not in sympathy with the agitation in certain quarters in this country that the United States ought to use its Army and Navy to protect American investments in Mexico?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. MADDEN. I never have been and never will be in favor of that, and I do not believe it is any part of the business of the President of the United States or of the Congress of the United States to indicate who the head of the Government of Mexico is to be. I believe we should confine ourselves in our politics to saying who shall govern the people of this country, and not embroil every man, woman, and child in America by endeavoring to dictate the domestic policies of any other country. And I hope that in the present crisis the President of the United States will reiterate his warning to the people of America, not only those who live here and not attempting to do business abroad to maintain the strictest neutrality, but that he will call attention to those who, in their desire for gain, sail into dangerous seas, publicly declared by the belligerent nations to be war zones, should do so at their own peril, and should not rely for protection in their hazardous undertakings on our country, and thereby help to emphasize the neutrality of the United States, and enable us to keep at peace with all the world. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ADAIR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2642) entitled "An act authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. PERKINS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 21318) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMAMENT OF FORTIFICATIONS.

For purchase, manufacture, and test of mountain, field, and siege cannon, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, $450,000: *Provided*, That the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, is authorized to enter into contracts or otherwise incur obligations for the purposes above mentioned not to exceed $300,000 in addition to the appropriations herein and heretofore made.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 4, line 21, by striking out "$450,000" and inserting "$900,000."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, we have on hand or building or authorized 852 field guns. What we are aiming at under the so-called Greble Board report is 1,292 guns, so that we are now 440 guns short. That is the Greble Board estimate, the one which has been adopted, the one which the committee is aiming to meet. Now, Gen. Wotherspoon's estimate is 2,834 guns, or 2,000 more guns than we now have. But let us first look at the situation on the basis of the Greble Board estimate and see what we lack. We are short 440 guns of the supply recommended by the Greble Board. How long would it take to make 440 guns if we had unlimited appropriations?

On December 4, 1913, Gen. Wood testified that the entire capacity of this country, working night and day, is 500 guns in one year. That number could be turned out if we had unlimited appropriations. Now, as the gentleman from Kentucky said a little while ago, it is very clear that if we are not to have war for 15 years, we are going ahead quite as fast as we ought to go. If, on the other hand, we are going to have war in one year, we are not going ahead fast enough. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that at the rate at which we are going, according to Gen. Crozier, the rate at which he asked us to go and the committee asks us to go, it will take six years to complete the Greble Board project. I ask whether it is good judgment to go ahead so slowly that it will take us six years to acquire the full number of guns which every one admits that we ought to have as an accumulation.

Next, let us see whether the Greble Board's estimate is ample.

The Greble Board's estimate calls for only 1,292 guns, whereas Gen. Wotherspoon's estimate calls for 2,834 guns. In commenting on Gen. Wotherspoon's estimate, the gentleman from Kentucky says quite properly that the information which we have as to what is going on in Europe is very recent and very incomplete. We can not, as he points out, come to conclusions based on such insufficient information as we have from the European war. Nevertheless, we can not altogether reject authentic information. We have reports that the European combatants are firing away artillery ammunition at a preposterous rate. According to Gen. Crozier's testimony, one report—I think it was Lieut. Hunsaker's—told of a battery which for four successive days fired 600 rounds a day for each gun. Think what that means. It means 2,400 rounds for each gun in four days. It means that three of those guns in a single day fired away as much ammunition as Uncle Sam can produce in a day. Uncle Sam can produce from 1,600 to 1,800 rounds per day at the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says that the capacity of the United States for one day is 1,800 rounds. Does the gentleman mean the Government, or the private plants engaged in the manufacture of ammunition?

Mr. GARDNER. The 1,600 to 1,800 rounds estimate was for the Government plant. Gen. Wood's evidence was that we could produce 350,000 rounds in the first six months of war from all sources, including the Government plant. The testimony can be found on page 14 of the fortifications hearings last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not take into account the increase in the private establishments since the European war?

Mr. GARDNER. No; the Secretary of War wrote me on December 23, 1914, that he could not give me information as to this increased capacity. He said, however, that it appeared that Gen. Wood had overestimated and that 1,400 rounds per day about represented Uncle Sam's capacity to turn out artillery ammunition. But this amendment relates to guns, not to ammunition.

We have discussed a little this question of the adequacy of the reports which have been received from officers and others in Europe. Perhaps they may be incomplete, but at all events we have complete reports of the Russo-Japanese war. I find that in the battle of Mukden alone Russia had 1,204 guns engaged, and yet we have only 588 guns, built and building, in the entire country. Japan had 922 guns engaged in that same battle of Mukden.

On page 13 of the hearings held in December, 1913, on the fortifications bill for that year, it appears that at that time, roughly speaking, Russia had 6,000 guns; Germany, 5,000 guns; France, 4,800 guns. That testimony was offered long before the European war broke out. So you can see that when it is said that Gen. Wotherspoon takes an exaggerated view of the situation, at all events, as compared to foreigners, his recommendations are particularly modest. My reason for specifying the sum of $900,000, instead of $450,000, to be appropriated for artillery, is that $900,000 is the amount which was asked for last year by the Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] presents no new question to this Congress. The mobile artillery is supplied from funds carried in the Army and in the fortification bills. The matter was very thoroughly thrashed out in consideration of the Army bill, and this House then gave its approval to an appropriation that contemplated the finishing of the project in the Greble Board report within six years.

The Committee on Fortifications has made a recommendation of the amount that will be in accord with the policy approved by the House in connection with the Army bill. I do not desire to detain the House in any elaborate discussion of this matter, because it has been very thoroughly considered not only this year but in previous years.

The gentleman from Massachusetts gave correctly the figures touching the guns that have been appropriated for. We have appropriated for 213 batteries of four guns each, and we have remaining 110 batteries of four guns each to supply. The present item will provide for the making of one battery of 3-inch guns and for the making of four ammunition batteries, and then, under the item which is carried touching the alteration of the 3.2-inch guns into 3-inch guns, funds are provided for the conversion of four such batteries.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Is not there one battery of 3.8-inch howitzers—I mean the one new battery—to be made out of the $450,000 appropriation?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I was mistaken. It was one 3.8-inch howitzer and four 3-inch gun batteries that are to be altered into 3-inch guns.

But, Mr. Chairman, without going into the details of that, I desire simply to say that I took occasion to read some of the old debates in connection with the fortifications bill. That bill has never been a political bill and ought never to be. I read it not with the idea of raising any political issue, but with the idea of ascertaining what had been the thought of those who went before me touching the matter. I found that the original project had contemplated 1 gun for 1,000 rifles and sabers. Then it was 2 guns, and then it was 3.16 guns. The present project is 3.16 guns for 1,000 rifles and sabers. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks it should be 5 for each 1,000 rifles and sabers, and that predicated on an Army of 500,000 men. The gentleman from Massachusetts thinks it ought to be predicated on a larger Army.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I am taking Gen. Wotherspoon's opinion. I am not giving my opinion. He thinks an army of 205,000 Regulars, or 800,000 men in all, would be necessary; that is, he counts on 600,000 reserves and militia.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not mean a standing army of 500,000, and I do not think anybody misunderstood me, because it has been so much discussed that they know what I meant. It means an army considered requisite in order to properly meet a force that it is assumed a first-class power could land on our shores, assuming they had control of the seas. That army was figured roughly at 500,000. When you work out the details of their figures and the detail of the guns, not only for the United States but the insular possessions, it runs considerably above that.

But I am not going to undertake now to go into the details of the matter. We acted upon the Greble Board report, which is the only report we have on the matter, or rather the last report on the matter. We did not accept simply the fact expressed by Gen. Wotherspoon. Whether that view be wise or unwise is a matter of opinion. I think the general showed his zeal in all of these matters, as I said earlier, only when he was leaving the War Department, and if that be his present, fixed opinion, it may or may not agree with the opinions of other men; but our committee felt we were making very rapid progress considering the past. This is a matter that was much neglected for a number of years. The situation I think was rather bad, to put it mildly, and the committee in the recent past has strained a point to make liberal allowances for the guns and the ammunition. When we come to the ammunition I may call attention the very rapid increases that have been made in the past few years, jumping from the usual appropriation of about $150,000 to $300,000 in the 1912 bill, then $600,000 in the 1913 bill, then $900,000 in the 1914 bill, then $1,200,000 in the 1915 bill. We are now proposing to go at a rate which will complete the supply of guns within six years. If I shared the viewpoint of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I should not offer an amendment doubling the amount, but I should offer an amendment which would carry a sum sufficient to supply the maximum amount that could be manufactured within the year.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment there?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. Not sharing his viewpoint and having in mind the relative value of things——

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. And having in mind the risk proposed to be provided against, I think we are making very good progress in this branch of the service, particularly when you consider the men that you have to use the material that you are proposing to supply and the time that it takes to get men properly drilled so as to be able to use such equipment. I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I was going to call the gentleman's attention to a matter of which he spoke a moment ago. He said that if he entertained my viewpoint he would offer an amendment for a much more substantial sum. I am only offering an amendment which was equal to the estimate made by the War Department last year.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, of course I do not know the basis on which the gentleman acts.

Mr. GARDNER. I so stated.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps I should put that in another way. I do not know the reason that makes him adopt the basis that he takes for his action; but manifestly I would not be controlled in a present appropriation by what was asked for the year before, because I would have in mind something that has been done during the year.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman last year turned them down and gave them only $450,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. And they are $450,000 better off than they were last year, and they are therefore not now necessarily needing to ask for $450,000 more.

Mr. GARDNER. On that basis you would never complete it.

Mr. SHERLEY. We never will. There never will be a completion of any of these things. The gentleman had considerable quarrel, and he thought a good deal of fun with Gen. Crozier's testimony because Gen. Crozier had stated that they had figured on a six years' completion last year, and as there was no reason for changing that viewpoint he figured on a six years' completion this year. The gentleman intimated that at that rate we would always be six years away from completion, but it is also true that the degree we would be away from completion would be so slight as to have to be figured in parts of a gun after a number of years. We are making substantial progress in this matter and are proceeding very much more rapidly than we ever have in the past. In view of the fact that this matter was thoroughly discussed heretofore and the House expressed its clear conviction by an overwhelming vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, I do not feel that I am justified in further detaining the committee now.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has an amendment pending now.

Mr. GARDNER. This is an amendment to the amendment. I do that for the purpose of asking the gentleman if he will tell us whether an ammunition battery has as a matter of fact a complete cannon in it?

Mr. SHERLEY. It has one spare gun.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it all in condition to mount or is it simply separate parts to make up one unit?

Mr. SHERLEY. They have an actual gun, speaking now of the gun as distinguished from the carriage. They also have spare parts in regard to the carriage. The gentleman will find a detailed statement about that.

Mr. GARDNER. I did not quite understand the statement. That is why I asked the question. What I want to get at is this: Suppose they make these four ammunition batteries and suppose by any chance we should have a war, would each of

those batteries be able to supply a gun of its own out of the spare parts—a mounted gun?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not sure as to that, but in figuring the number of guns that we have we are not counting these guns at all.

Mr. GARDNER. I quite understand.

Mr. SHERLEY. They are simply that much additional reserve.

Mr. GARDNER. I was asking for my own information.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not positive, and I could not tell the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith and the machinery necessary for its manufacture at the arsenals, $1,160,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 5, line 6, by striking out "$1,160,000" and inserting "$3,000,000."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, is based on the same principles as its predecessor. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defense, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, $300,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 5, line 10, by striking out "$300,000" and inserting "$800,000."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, that is an amendment which, if adopted, would provide sufficient money to begin the armament of the fortifications at Cape Henry. Inasmuch as the committee has refused to consider the appropriation for the construction of those fortifications, this amendment of mine is merely offered for the purpose of putting it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, and for modernizing projectiles on hand, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, and the machinery necessary for its manufacture at the arsenals, $200,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 5, line 15, by striking out "$200,000" and inserting "$400,000."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of officers not occupying public quarters at the proving ground, while employed on ordnance duty thereat, at the rate of $2.50 per diem while so employed, and the compensation of draftsmen while employed in the Army Ordnance Bureau on ordnance construction, $18,700: *Provided*, That hereafter the occupancy by such officers, providing themselves with quarters elsewhere, of one room in the building at the proving ground locally known as the brick house shall not be construed as occupancy of public quarters within the meaning of this act and of the law authorizing allowance and commutation of quarters: *Provided further*, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are directed to reimburse Lieut. Col. Jay E. Hoffer, Ordnance Department, United States Army, the sum of $118, and First Lieut. Alfred H. Hobley, Ordnance Department, United States Army, the sum of $156, refunded by them to the United States on April 22 and May 21, 1914, respectively, on account of moneys received by them as commutation of quarters during part of the period June 1 to October 31, 1913, from the appropriation from which payment was originally made and to which the funds were credited when refunded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I understand this new provision is to make an arrangement for a peculiar condition existing at Sandy Hook whereby the officers only occupy one room and not to consider that one room if occupied in the so-called brick house as really officers' quarters.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true. It is simply to confirm what has been the practice there for a good many years which a recent ruling of the comptroller made necessary. I think the system that is in vogue there is a system that promotes to a very great degree the efficiency of the Ordnance Department. These men are practically at school even when they are not working.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the department has recommended this paragraph for several years, but the committee has not heretofore reported it.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; that has not been recommended before and never was necessary before, because there has never been any question raised as to the practice, but a recent ruling of the comptroller made it necessary to either get an authorization or suspend the practice, and these small sums, as the gentleman notices, are cases where the ruling of the comptroller came at such a time that it required a repayment by these men of moneys that they had been allowed and which the comptroller held were not justly allowed under existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any other similar cases where officers have been compelled to make reimbursements where they were entitled to consideration?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; because this matter only recently occurred. These are the only instances.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBMARINE MINES.

For purchase of submarine mines and necessary appliances to operate them for closing the channels leading to our principal seaports, and for continuing torpedo experiments, $190,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, as soon as they bring in a map I want to ask a question about the fortification of the Pacific coast. I want to ask for some information, and I think this is a very proper place to do it under the head of submarine mines. In the Straits of Juan de Fuca the waters here are very deep and the current so swift that it is impossible to use these submarine mines. I want to call attention to the fact that while there is a fort at the entrance to Puget Sound there is nothing to protect Bellingham, which is situated about 90 miles north from Seattle. Now, when you come down the Pacific coast, starting at the Straits of Juan de Fuca, you come to the mouth of the Columbia River. I think there are some mines there. Coming on down to San Francisco, almost 1,000 miles farther, you find fortifications there. Coming on down to Los Angeles, about 400 or 500 miles farther, you find some fortifications there, but up here at Grays Harbor and also at Willapa Harbor it is absolutely unprotected, and at Bellingham also it is unprotected. Now, the question I would like to know is, what is the advantage of having fortifications under a situation of that character? For instance, here at Bellingham are two great transcontinental railroads, and the largest battleship fleet could come to the wharves without coming within 15 miles of any gun. They could have control of these two transcontinental railroads. They have fine roads from there down to Seattle, reaching to Portland and all that country, and I wondered what was the benefit of having any fortifications where you leave the other places open and entirely unfortified. The same condition exists at Grays Harbor and Willapa Harbor, which are totally undefended.

None of these fortifications on Puget Sound or elsewhere on that portion of the coast could protect themselves from an attack from the land. All the guns on Puget Sound are absolutely useless in a land attack, and I have wondered whether it was not an absolute waste of money to spend it on these fortifications and leave open our defenses at these other places. I want to know what is the theory of protecting the coast in spots. It does seem to me it would be about as effective as it would be to chain up a mad dog with the loose link in a broken chain. I have taken the matter up on different occasions with the department, but the answer I have always received heretofore was that Bellingham and these other towns which are unfortified need not be uneasy because they would not be attacked in case of war.

But recent events have demonstrated that that was an error. I remember I took the matter up on two occasions and called attention to the fact, not on my own information, because I am not an engineer and know nothing whatever about military affairs; but out in the harbor of Bellingham there is an island especially well located, according to engineers, to be fortified, where the guns could not only protect the Straits of Juan de Fuca, but also that harbor. I have never been able to get any

satisfactory information as to why this island is not fortified. I should like to know if the gentleman can tell me what the theory is? I see my friend, Capt. HOBSON, here. I should like to know, and our people out there would like to know, on what theory it is argued that we are protected.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I endeavored to set out in my speech during general debate what the purpose is of seacoast fortifications, as I understood it. And very briefly it was this, that it was not contemplated to protect all coast cities or to protect all the coast, but that they were contemplated to protect certan harbors and certain cities where the importance warranted such protection, the protection of the harbors being with two ideas in view, one that they might be used as a safe rendezvous for our own fleet and the other that they should not be used as a rendezvous for an enemy's fleet and as a base of supplies for any mobile army of an enemy that might be landed.

Now, I am not sufficiently familiar with the topography of the country, to which the gentleman has just alluded, to answer him as to just what particular function the particular ports of Puget Sound are supposed to perform. I do know in a general way there is both an outer and an inner defense there. I do also know that what the gentleman stated as to the difficulty of putting mines in some of those waters, on account of their great depth and the current, is correct. While they are still experimenting, they have not yet come to a satisfactory result. And the Taft Board report contemplated as a part of the defense of Puget Sound the aid by the Navy in the way of submarines and other craft.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is one reason why I wanted to bring it to the gentleman's attention and to the attention of the committee. Upon the Pacific coast we have practically no submarines as yet. We have very few torpedo-boat destroyers. They have no battleships and have not had them. We have never had any battleships around there but once, when they came around on that fleeting visit and stayed a few days and then disappeared. And as we do not have the coast fortifications and the harbors could not be mined, I want to call attention to just how helpless we are.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are very superior fortifications up on Puget Sound.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I probably was indefinite in my expression. I mean that we have no coast fortifications at Bellingham and at these two exposed harbors on the coast.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are a number of harbors and a number of cities—I do not know the number—that are not protected by fortifications—a majority of them. It is not anticipated they will ever be protected, not only on the Pacific but on the Atlantic.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On the Atlantic coast the situation is somewhat different, because there they have a large number of submarines, and I imagine that most of the harbors can be mined. We have not the submarines out there, and you can not use the mines.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, I am not in a position to go afield as to the question of whether there should be submarines stationed on the Pacific coast or not, and I do not feel that I ought now to go into the question as to the number we should have. I want to say to the gentleman for his additional information that the Taft Board project contemplated some additional armament for that part of the western coast, and, as I stated in the general debate, I very much hope, although it is a great task, that by next year we shall have some detailed report touching the particular fortifications on both coasts, and at that time the Fortifications Committee may be better prepared to give the gentleman detailed information. At one time I went very thoroughly into that matter, but it has been some years since I did so, and I should not like to trust my memory now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. May I have two minutes more, inasmuch as I yielded to the gentleman, and which I was very glad to do?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to add this statement, that I am very glad to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky and to the members of the committee the situation on the Pacific coast. We are hoping for better things, but I think it is now perfectly apparent to anyone who has given attention to the matter now and during the time the naval bill was under consideration that we are practically without any defense upon that coast. Here is Puget Sound, that can not be mined, that is without torpedo-boat destroyers, without submarines, and without fortifications with which to protect that portion of the coast, and where they can come right in and seize these two great transcontinental railways and come down the coast and capture all these great coast cities of the Northwest. While we from the Pacific coast have always voted for fortifications and for the Navy, and expect to continue to do so, I feel it is my duty and privilege now to call attention to the fact that the Pacific coast is practically helpless. We are not prepared for war. We are not prepared to defend ourselves. If we should have war on the Pacific coast to-morrow we would be helpless. They could land, and would undoubtedly land, and take those cities, and we might just as well face that fact. I am not stating it as an alarmist. I am calling your attention to the fact that the condition exists, so that if you wake up some day and war is declared you will be prepared for what is going to happen, because you are going to lose the Pacific coast cities.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to have go unchallenged the statement that the Pacific coast is not at all fortified. I hold in my hand a book that contains information as to the fortifications at every place in the United States and in every insular possession. Manifestly there is a lot of this information that ought not to be made public and, so far as I am concerned, will not be made public. But I speak of having it in order that I may not be considered as speaking without some knowledge of the matter. The fortifications of the Columbia River and at Puget Sound are exceedingly elaborate. As I stated, they contemplated in one instance the protection of not only the outer entrance but, because of the importance of the harbor, there is an inner line of defense; and while what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said is true as to the difficulty of mining certain of those waters, it does not follow by any means that the fortifications out there are negligible or that the Pacific coast is subject to any sort of invasion, no matter how slight the force.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is entirely correct, so far as the fortifications of Puget Sound are concerned. I think they are probably the best in the country. The point I was making—and I might make another point—was that there is another way of coming into Seattle by way of Bellingham that is not fortified, although they may have put one small gun there recently. But wherever the fortifications are I admit that they would do some good.

Mr. SHERLEY. It must be borne in mind—and I have stated it so often that I think everyone must appreciate it by now—that the fortifications were not planned with the idea of protecting all the coast from an invasion. The defense of the country against a landing party is a mobile-army proposition. The fortifications will have served their purpose when they shall have protected a given area, and when they are of sufficient magnitude as to require an enemy to land in order to effect their capture.

Now, I could recite numerous towns along the Atlantic, as well as along the Pacific coast, where there are no fortifications, and where, assuming control of the sea and the desire of an enemy's fleet to do it, they could lie off the shore and bombard those coast cities. But some things are taken as the necessary risks in war. It is not expected that you could prevent any sort of damage to your country. What is undertaken to be done by fortifications is to prevent either the use of harbors or such damage to the places of first magnitude as would not be considered a proper and a to-be-expected loss in case of war.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Just a moment. I hope my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will give that matter of the Bellingham proposition some study between now and the next bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that I shall have occasion to consider fortification bills again. If I do, I hope I shall give it, as well as other matters, my best attention.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] did not feel content to allow the statement of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to the defenses of the entrances of Puget Sound to go unchallenged, I do not feel inclined to allow the general inference from his statement that the Pacific coast is well defended to go unchallenged. No apologies could make out a case of any standing for the security of the Pacific coast. A number of assumed conditions of war have been worked out at the war colleges. One condition was that if an Asiatic nation in control of the sea making war upon us without wishing to disturb its shipping to India, Australasia, or to Europe, using for transportation of troops only the vessels engaged in trade with America. It was assumed that all the militia, as well as the Regular Army, available in our country were mobilized, with a concentration and cooperation that would really be impossible in war time. Giving our country the advantage of every possible doubt, the war was fought through, and within 60 days the enemy had landed just where my friend from Washington pointed out, had sent an expedition down those roads and taken all the important cities in the Puget Sound region. Simultaneously another expedition had landed at Monterey, and by operating in the rear had taken the fortifications and the city of San Francisco. It proved absolutely impossible for us to make any effective resistance.

What I have cited is a good illustration of the condition of the Pacific coast and of our coasts generally. Without a mobile army, as the gentleman from Kentucky has pointed out, and having such a vast coast line, it is impossible to provide an adequate defense from coast fortifications, even where they are efficient. Without control of the sea we may as well realize that we are at the mercy of any first-class military power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For land defenses in the Hawaiian Islands, including the procurement and installation of searchlights and the acquisition of land and rights of way, $150,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I understood from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] some time ago that he had some observations that he desired to offer to the committee with respect to the fortifications of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SHERLEY. I stated that I hoped to have here a statement with regard to those fortifications. It has not yet arrived, so I am advised, and under leave to extend my remarks I will put it in the RECORD. I stated in a general way that I did not agree with the gentleman, but I did not feel then, and I should not like now, to go into the details of it when I can give to the committee something that is so much better than my statement and which will be accurate as to all the details; and inasmuch as the matter is not involved in any proposed legislation, as I understand it, I presume that will be the better course.

Mr. MILLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, not having the statement before us, of course anything like a discussion of what it contains is like talking blindly in the dark. From the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], made in general debate, however, I gathered that it is his intention to put in the RECORD a statement from the board that has control finally of these coast-defense matters—these fortification matters.

I do not know what the board will say. I have nothing to say about it except to call attention to that method, which I do not think is a very good one, but which very likely is the only one that can now be followed. It is the vice and the curse of the bureaucratic method wherever found. A matter comes up through the regular channel, and the final place in the bureau questions the efficiency or accuracy of the report, or the recommendations, or the advisability or wisdom of them. Then it sends back through the same channel, to the same man who originated the scheme, and asks him if he thinks that is a good scheme.

Of course there is but one answer to be expected, and there is but one answer that will be received. I think I can predict in advance about what the statement will be. It will be that the fortifications in the Philippine Islands are on islands; that it is one of their main elements of strength; and that there is no necessity for constructing any fortifications or protecting works on the land. Now, that is exactly what they did about Hawaii—absolutely the same identical thing—and about the protection of Pearl Harbor, and if they are full and complete in the report which they send, the statement will contain an exact account of their attitude toward the fortifications in Hawaii identical with their attitude toward the same problem in the Philippine Islands. But when they thought a critical test was likely to come they found it necessary to change their ideas respecting the Hawaiian Islands, recommended and received last year a large appropriation for land defenses, and we have further evidence of it in the paragraph just read. If I am correct in my recollection, last year's bill carried about $550,000, and this carries a further item of $150,000, making a total of about $700,000, a very large sum, and one that will be sufficient to provide ample land defenses.

They have the same problem in the Philippine Islands, if they will only admit it; and they do admit it in this bill, and the hearings admit it practically, when they say they are going to send four mortars of an earlier type to protect Corregidor from a land attack. That is what the hearings say. I do not think any military man will say—though I do not think any man who studied the conditions there will say—that the four mortars will be a sufficient protection to Corregidor Island from a land attack.

Now, the gentleman has correctly stated that when these fortifications were constructed it was thought that their location on islands was a source of great strength, and it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I should like three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. When those fortifications were planned and constructed it was thought that no gun could be mounted on the land on either wing of sufficient carrying power to reach those islands and those fortifications; but now they know, because they have tried it; and if they have not tried it, common sense would tell them, from the experience of the warring nations during the past five months, that it is a simple feat to mount guns on either wing that will command the fortifications all along the line of the islands excepting El Fraile. They can not reach El Fraile, thank God; but they can reach and command every gun on Corregidor and on Caballo; and on Carabao it is just like throwing apples at a cow. You could not miss it if you tried.

The gentleman seems to think that my suggestions relative to these fortifications came from some officer there. They do not come from one officer. Let no stigma be cast upon one man by the insinuation of the gentleman from Kentucky, saying he has been overruled by his superiors and therefore probably he was in error. It is the word of every man who built the fortifications with whom I conversed—and I tried to converse with all the officers superintending the physical construction of these elaborate fortifications—that the features I have mentioned are features of marked weakness or of doubtful efficiency. Some of these features these officers, almost with their very souls and hearts in their voices, had pleaded should be changed, but their recommendations were turned down by a board which now, I presume, will bring in a report, handed in in the bureaucratic, official way by the very distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, saying that the recommendations of these men who know, who were there on the ground, were not well made, and therefore should not be followed. In passing let me add that of all the military men I have ever met I consider Col. Ruckman, who had charge of the construction work of these elaborate fortifications, one of the most highly skilled in military science and one whose judgment on matters within his realm would be second to none.

Now, I do not suppose there is anything of immediate value to be gained by a discussion of this item, but I will tell you one thing. I make a little prediction—that within a short period of time the gentleman's committee will report out an item for the correction of these fortifications in the Philippine Islands, just as it has done in respect to Hawaii. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition touching the land defenses of the Hawaiian Islands and the land defenses of the islands in Manila Bay are manifestly very different, for one basic reason. The fortifications at Honolulu and at Pearl Harbor are on an island of very great extent, where it is possible to land at numerous points outside the range of the fortifications, and to attempt the reduction of those fortifications from the rear. Necessarily a project had to be worked out for such land defense. That project has been worked out. It went through many stages of evolution, and finally resulted in a series of fortifications in the shape somewhat of a crescent, taking advantage of the topography of the land and a range of hills, with the points of the crescent practically at Pearl Harbor at one end and Honolulu at the other.

The fortifications in Manila Bay consist of those on Corregidor Island, an island of considerable size, on Caballo Island,

Carabao Island, and El Fraile. El Fraile is so small that it corresponds in size about to a battleship, and when completed will be very much like an armored battleship, with heavy armament, and with the guns mounted in turrets. The idea has never been that we could permanently hold the Philippine Islands in the event of the loss of the sea and the landing of any considerable force in those islands, but it was and is contemplated that if necessary Corregidor could be held for quite an indefinite time, and if at the outbreak of the war we should not have any aid from an American fleet, Corregidor could keep the flag flying until such time as aid might come.

These islands were chosen because as islands they had a marked advantage over the mainland in that they were not subject to subjection by direct land assault. The scheme was very carefully worked out, and considerable attention was given to the danger that the fortifications might be in from fire from the shore. Of course, it is not contemplated that no effort would be made by a mobile army stationed in the Philippines, and by mobile artillery, to hold some of these heights that overlook the islands.

But assuming that our force was dislodged and their position occupied by a hostile force, it is still thought that protection should be had against such hostile force. Manifestly mobile artillery on those shores would be better than permanent fortifications, better because of the fact that it would be mobile, and therefore adaptable somewhat to the circumstances presented by the attacking force, and also because, in case of defeat, it would not necessarily fall into the enemy's hands to be used by them against the island fortifications.

But, in addition to that, the armaments of the fortifications cover a very great part of the terrain on either side; it is covered by some of the guns, and to a large extent by the mortars, and now it is proposed to put an additional number of mortars on Caballo Island to aid further in defense against land attack.

The gentleman states that these mortars are to be old, worn-out mortars. I do not know where he gets that information, because the bill carries an item for the actual building of these mortars, and therefore they will not be old and worn out, but will be newly built.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The hearing states that these are four mortars and states where they are to be taken from in the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is unfortunately confusing the mortars in connection with the Hawaiian Islands with the mortars for the Philippines.

Mr. MILLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I refer to the hearings where it is stated that the mortars are to be taken and placed on Caballo Island as a defense, not to the attack of ships, but for the fortification against a land attack, and uses those words, and the amount of $110,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. The answer to that is that we carry $110,000 in this bill to build them.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. They are going to be mortars having a range of nineteen thousand and some-odd yards, or a little less than 11 miles, instead of being mortars with a range of about 7 miles, as the gentleman from Minnesota stated.

Now, I could not in the absence of a map which I have not available, point out the various islands and the relation they bear to each other. It may be, as the gentleman making a prophecy states, that something will come in in the nature of an additional proposal for the fortifications in the Philippines. It would not surprise me at all, and would not indicate that the gentleman's present position is right. All I desire to impress on the committee is that this matter was not hastily entered into, the conclusions finally drawn were the result of much thought, they were not immature, they were not simply the result of a bureaucratic or autocratic governmental action. Officers here had not simply undertaken to put their will against the thought of the officers on the ground.

The officers on the ground made a number of recommendations, some of which have been acquiesced in. The officer who had much to do with the recommendations acquiesced in was Capt. Embick, who is now in Washington, but in making the plans he went out on the ground and, instead of giving merely a few days to it, studied weeks there. He was detailed there with other officers.

Now, I submit to the committee and the House that we have a right to assume, notwithstanding the views expressed by the gentleman as the result of his trip and conversation with certain officers, that the fortifications that are erected and to be erected are adequate. Certainly I would not feel warranted in declining to go forward by virtue of the suggestions made as to the futility of these fortifications.

In considering these island fortifications it might be well to call to gentlemen's minds the history of Fort Sumter. That was a fortification on an island of less than 30 acres. It was bombarded by a fleet for two years and, though garrisoned with only about 300 men and subject to attack from shore batteries, held out for this long period.

I submit herewith memorandum from Capt. Embick touching these fortifications, in accordance with the promise I earlier made. I also, under leave to print, submit the report of the Committee on Fortifications:

Memorandum for the Chief of Coast Artillery.

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, February 24, 1915.

1. Representative SHERLEY, chairman of the subcommittee on Fortifications, House of Representatives, has called attention to the remarks made yesterday on the floor of the House relative to the defenses of Manila Bay and has asked that a general statement in regard to these defenses be furnished him.

2. The first project for the seacoast defense for the entrance to Manila Bay was contained in the report of a board of Engineer and Artillery officers convened upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. This project, which was approved by the Secretary of War on February 4, 1902, contemplated the installation of heavy guns and mortars on (1) Mariveles shore, (2) Corregidor Island, (3) Caballo Island, and (4) the south shore of Manila Bay, and also of smaller guns on Carabao Island.

3. The next project for these defenses was a preliminary one, submitted by the National Coast Defense Board on January 11, 1906, which called for the installation of the seacoast armament on (1) the Mariveles shore, (2) Corregidor Island, (3) Caballo Island, and (4) the south shore of Manila Bay. Subsequently to this report Gen. J. P. Story, a member of the National Coast Defense Board, was designated as a committee of one to visit Manila Bay and other localities in the insular possessions for the purpose of perfecting the projects of that board for such localities. Gen. Story was assisted in his investigations by the commanding general, Philippine Division, and other officers stationed in the Philippine Islands, all of whom concurred in the view that the occupation of the south shore of the bay as a site for seacoast batteries was inadvisable on account of the exposure of such site to direct land attack, and that in lieu thereof these batteries should be emplaced on Carabao and El Fraile Islands.

4. Subsequently to the report of the National Coast Defense Board there arose a number of questions in connection with the installation of seacoast batteries at Manila and Subic Bays. With a view to arriving at a decision as to these questions, the Secretary of War, in September, 1907, appointed a board of officers consisting of Lieut. Col. F. V. Abbot, Corps of Engineers, and the undersigned, to visit the Philippine Islands and to investigate and report on all questions connected with seacoast defense that were then under consideration by the department. Having completed its duties, this board, on January 17, 1908, submitted a report to the War Department, which report was concurred in by the commanding general, Philippine Division. In this report it was recommended that all the seacoast armament for the defense of Manila Bay be located on the four islands lying at the entrance, and that the armament that the National Coast Defense Board had proposed for Lasisi Point be emplaced on Corregidor Island instead.

5. Upon the receipt of this report the Secretary of War convened a board consisting of the Chief of Staff, the Assistant Chief of Staff, the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief of Engineers, the Chief of Coast Artillery, and the president of the Army War College, for the final determination of the projects for both Manila and Subic Bays. This latter board concurred in the view that no armament should be emplaced on Lasisi Point on account of its exposure to land attack and adopted a project for Manila Bay that is substantially in accord with the present project.

6. So far as known to the undersigned the wisdom of not occupying any portion of the mainland as a site for seacoast defenses has not been seriously questioned by anyone. The reason for this is that such fortifications installed on the mainland would be open not only to the objection which obtains in the case of the Corregidor batteries—that is, of being capable of being commanded by an enemy's batteries located on the higher neighboring hills—but also to the graver objection of being exposed to capture by direct assault by a land force, an objection which does not obtain in the case of fortifications on the islands. Under the adopted project, therefore, the defense against occupancy of the mainland by the heavy guns of an enemy is intrusted to the mobile forces in the Philippine Islands, supported and supplemented by the fire of the seacoast armament on the fortified islands. Much of the armament now installed on these islands has a range of over 8½ miles, and the item in the pending fortification bill for armament for the insular possessions is to cover the construction of mortars that will have a range of approximately 11 miles. The plans for the land defenses of these fortifications were drawn up in the Philippine Islands, and the full amount of the estimates asked therefor was appropriated by Congress. All of the armament supplied for these defenses was not, however, of the latest type, as, for example, the 5-inch rifles and the 7-inch howitzers. The armament of this character that was provided was of the model 1898; that is, the type just preceding those now being manufactured. In range and ballistic power these guns are equal to those of the present type, and they are inferior thereto only in mobility and rate of fire. Inferiority in these respects is not regarded as of importance in this particular case, as the guns are to be fired from fixed emplacements, and the necessity for conserving even the most liberal supply of ammunition during the continuance of a siege would preclude advantage being taken of the higher rate of fire of the guns of the present type.

STANLEY D. EMBICK,
Captain, Coast Artillery Corps,
Assistant to Chief of Coast Artillery.

[House Report No. 1416, Sixty-third Congress, third session.]

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 21491:

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the accompanying bill making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based aggregate $6,193,641.32, which sum includes $5,863,641.32 submitted in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1916 and $330,000 submitted in House Document No. 1529. The accompanying bill appropriates $6,060,216.90, which amount is $432,516.90 more than was appropriated for the same purposes at the last session of Congress, and $133,424.42 less than the estimates submitted.

During the Forty-ninth Congress (fiscal years 1887 and 1888) no appropriations were made on account of fortifications, their maintenance and armament, and for the 12 fiscal years 1875 to 1886, inclusive, the appropriations by Congress on this account averaged only $540,750 per annum, and only $463,500 per annum for the 14 years, including 1887 and 1888, for which latter two fiscal years no specific appropriations were made, as stated.

The bill reported herewith contains appropriations in continuance of the policy adopted by the Fiftieth Congress in the passage of the acts approved September 22, 1888, and March 2, 1889, and continued at the succeeding terms of Congress in acts approved August 18, 1890, February 24, 1891, July 23, 1892, February 18, 1893, August 1, 1894, March 2, 1895, June 6, 1896, March 3, 1897, May 7, 1898, March 3, 1899, May 25, 1900, March 1, 1901, June 6, 1902, March 3, 1903, April 21, 1904, March 3, 1905, June 25, 1906, March 2, 1907, May 27 1908, March 3, 1909, June 23, 1910, March 4, 1911, June 6, 1912, February 13 1913, and June 27, 1914.

The appropriations by said acts for the 27 fiscal years 1889–1915 aggregate $152,584,696.72, of which sum $131,597,432.72 was appropriated for the United States and $20,987,264 for the insular possessions, an average of $5,651,285.06 per annum.

The fortifications appropriation acts enacted during the Fifty-fifth Congress (fiscal years 1899 and 1900) appropriated $14,287,396, in addition to which amount sums aggregating $8,674,898 were provided in deficiency appropriation acts for fortifications and the armament thereof, and the further sum of $13,049,751.86 was allotted for the same objects from the general appropriation of $50,000,000 made for the national defense in the act of March 9, 1898, making in all $36,-012,045.86 available for fortifications and the armament thereof under appropriations made during the Fifty-fifth Congress. In addition to the above, the sum of $2,500 was appropriated for fortification purposes in the act making appropriations for the support of the Army dated September 22, 1888; $35,000 by the act making appropriations for the support of the Army dated March 2, 1901; $259,200 by the act making appropriations for the support of the Army dated June 30, 1902; and $389,000 by the act making appropriations for the support of the Army dated March 2, 1903; total, $685,700.

There was also appropriated by the act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government approved April 28, 1904, $591,046.25; under the act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government approved March 3, 1905, $40,000; under the act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government approved June 30, 1906, $158,953.75; by the deficiency act of July 7, 1898, $0.70; by the deficiency act of February 14, 1902, $2.68; by the deficiency act of July 1, 1902, $4.38; and by the sundry civil act of March 4, 1911, $154,667; total, $944,674.76.

The urgent deficiency act of February 14, 1902, carried $3,000 for fortifications and the deficiency act of March 4, 1907, $977,79.

The joint resolution approved June 23, 1914, appropriated $31,000 to complete the purchase of necessary land at Cape Henry, Va.

The total appropriations made for fortifications and other works of defense since 1888, and since the recommendations of the Endicott Board of 1885, including the appropriations made in deficiency and other acts, including the Army bills dated September 22, 1888, March 2, 1901, June 30, 1902, and March 2, 1903, the sundry civil bills dated April 28, 1904, March 3, 1905, June 30, 1906, and March 4, 1911, and allotments made from the national defense fund, amount to $175,-974,699.13, of which sum $154,682,768.13 was for the United States and $21,291,931 for the insular possessions, and has included the necessary cost of maintenance; $59,198.66 of the amount appropriated for the United States was expended for maintenance of submarine mines in the insular possessions.

The scheme of seacoast fortifications for the continental United States contemplated by the Endicott Board, as modified by the National Coast Defense Board (see S. Doc. No. 248, 59th Cong., 1st sess., for report), and as revised to date, it is estimated, will cost in the aggregate $159,-982,534.43, of which amount the sum of $126,112,068.50 has been appropriated and $1,043,998.81 has been returned to the Treasury, a more particular discussion of the details of which will appear elsewhere in this report.

The scheme of fortifications for the insular possessions contemplated by the National Coast Defense Board, as revised to date, it is estimated, will cost in the aggregate $30,177,536.71, of which there has been appropriated the sum of $21,291,931, the details of which are also discussed more at length elsewhere herein.

The difference between the estimated whole cost of the so-called Endicott scheme of fortifications, as modified and revised to date, for continental United States, $159,982,534.43, and the appropriations made therefor to date, $126,112,068.50, less amount returned to Treasury, amounts to $33,870,465.93.

The difference between the estimated whole cost of the scheme of fortifications for the insular possessions, as revised to date, $30,-177,536.71, and the appropriations already made therefor, $21,291,931, amounts to $8,885,605.71.

The difference between the combined estimated cost of both schemes, $190,160,071.14, and the combined appropriations therefor to date, $147,403,999.50, less amount returned to Treasury, amounts to $42,-756,071.64.

The difference between the $147,403,999.50 already provided toward the scheme of the Endicott Board, modified by the National Coast Defense Board, and the sum total of appropriations, $175,974,699.13 for fortifications since 1888, amounting to $28,570,699.63, is represented in expenditures for erecting and equipping the gun factory at Watervliet, the gun-carriage factory at Watertown, the powder factory at Picatinny, N. J., the Ordnance and Fortification Board, the manufacture of mountain, field, and siege guns, and ammunition therefor, and for sundry other objects incident to providing and maintaining a system of seacoast defenses, and the amount returned to Treasury.

In addition to the foregoing general statement as to the history of and appropriations for the scheme of seacoast fortifications adopted by Congress in 1888 and prosecuted by annual appropriations since that year, it is deemed pertinent at this time to discuss somewhat more in detail the subject of these very considerable expenditures.

By the act of Congress approved March 3, 1885, the President was directed to appoint a board to formulate plans for seacoast defenses. This board later became known under the name of the Endicott Board, and its report, transmitted to Congress on January 23, 1886, formed for many years the guide from which the Secretary of War determined the ports that should be fortified and the amount and type of armament required for each. It will be understood that these plans required many modifications of detail in accordance with the development of commercial and strategic importance of the different ports and emplacements and changes in modern armament. In addition, no provision was made for reserve ammunition, probably due to the fact that the development of satisfactory powder was at that time in an experimental stage. On March 5, 1906, the President of the United States transmitted a message to the Congress in which he inclosed a report of the National Coast Defense Board, which had been appointed by him on January 31, 1905. This report modified and brought up to date the report of the Endicott Board and added a scheme for the fortifications of the insular possessions of the United States, and is usually referred to as the Taft Board report. In pursuance of the plans and projects recommended in that report estimates are submitted annually by the Secretary of War of the sums needed to carry on the work, and the items containing such estimates constitute the bill as submitted to this committee.

It should be stated in passing that the estimates for the fortification of the Panama Canal are submitted as a part of the general canal estimates and are carried in the sundry civil bill and are not included in any of the figures used in this discussion.

These items of appropriation may be roughly divided into three general classes, namely:

1. Fortification of seacoast forts, including ammunition.
2. Supply of field artillery material, including ammunition.
3. Miscellaneous items related to the above, but not strictly forming parts thereof.

The first classification can be subdivided into three items: (a) Items pertaining to new armament and installation, including reserve ammunition. These items embrace guns, gun carriages, emplacements, sites for defense, electrical installation, searchlights, sea walls, submarine-mine structures, fire-control instruments and structures, and ammunition; (b) items pertaining to maintenance, repair, and alterations of property embraced in subdivision (a), except ammunition; and (c) items pertaining to seacoast target-practice ammunition, including appliances for same, and subdivisions (a) and (b) should also be segregated according as they relate to continental United States and the insular possessions.

Under these three subdivisions of the first general division there has been heretofore appropriated for continental United States, including practice ammunition used in the insular possessions, $126,112,-068.50. Of this amount, under subdivision a, items pertaining to new armament and installation, there has been apportioned $89,013,055.59; items relating to reserve ammunition, $15,252,885.98. Under subdivision b—that is, the item for maintenance, repair, and alteration—there has been appropriated $15,113,070.12. Under subdivision c, seacoast target-practice ammunition, there has been appropriated the sum of $5,689,058. There has been covered into the Treasury unexpended $1,043,998.81.

Under subdivisions a and b there has been appropriated for the insular possessions $21,291,931. This total includes under subdivision a items pertaining to new armament and installation, $18,072,209.12; items for reserve seacoast ammunition, $2,800,000. Under subdivision b, for maintenance, repair, and alteration, there has been appropriated $419,721.88. So that the total of appropriations for both continental United States and the insular possessions, under heading No. 1, amounts to $147,403,999.50.

The second general classification, to wit: Supply of Field Artillery material, including ammunition, can also be subdivided into three classifications similar to that of item No. 1. In other words, (a) those pertaining to new material, including reserve ammunition; (b) those pertaining to maintenance, repair, and alteration; and (c) those pertaining to target-practice ammunition.

The total appropriated has been $11,880,800. The total of the above that is included under the subdivision a, new material, including reserve ammunition, is $10,388,800, of which $4,201,600 was for such reserve ammunition, leaving $6,187,200 as the amount that has been appropriated for new material. Of this latter sum, $1,005,000 is counted as being for new material, though it is literally for the purpose of making new batteries out of old ones.

Under subdivision b, for maintenance, repair, and alteration, there has been appropriated $441,000. Under subdivision c, for target-practice ammunition, there has been appropriated $1,051,000.

The third general classification, to wit, miscellaneous items related to the preceding but not strictly forming parts thereof, consists of the following items, totaling appropriations of $16,689,899.63.

Board of Ordnance and Fortification	$2, 585, 000. 00
Proving ground, Sandy Hook	1, 690, 978. 00
Machine guns not used for seacoast defenses	385, 073. 00
Ordnance establishments, buildings, gun factory, powder factory, etc	3, 376, 952. 00
Machinery for ordnance establishments	451, 397. 83
Experimental guns, carriages, and ammunition	653, 041. 03
Testing experimental guns and carriages, armor plates, etc	148, 085. 84
Implements, equipments, alteration, and maintenance of old armament	519, 038. 00
Field material and ammunition of old designs	6, 331, 819. 75
Returned to Treasury	110, 928. 69
School submarine defense	16, 500. 00
Amount expended for temporary batteries (national defense fund)	302, 817. 99
Construction of post buildings, act June 6, 1896	100, 000. 00
Repair and maintenance Fort Monroe, Va., acts Mar. 2, 1895, and June 6, 1896	18, 267. 50

This statement does not include estimates of the cost of the additional seacoast defenses needed to complete the fortification projects in accordance with the plans of the National Coast Defense Board,

for the reason that the department has now under consideration the subject of modifying the plans of that board so as to provide that the large-caliber guns to be emplaced in future as additions to existing defenses will be of 16-inch instead of 14-inch caliber as recommended by that board. In view of this fact, it is not deemed practicable to furnish estimates at this time as to the cost of completing the seacoast defenses.

In addition to the above for the continental United States, it is estimated that there will in the future be annually required $1,000,000 for maintenance, repair, and minor alterations, and $425,000 for target practice.

And, in addition, it is also estimated that $70,000 will be annually required for maintenance, repair, and minor alterations, plus a proportionate increase due to the installation of new armament as it is supplied for the insular possessions.

Under the second general classification, first noted, it is estimated that remaining items, coming under subdivision a will be as follows: For new matériel, including funds for the alteration of 3.2-inch batteries, $3,861,718.07; for reserve ammunition, $5,347,812; making a total of $9,209,530.07.

In addition to the above, it is estimated that there will be required annually $55,000 for alteration, maintenance, and repair, and $140,000 for target practice.

It should be stated in connection with the foregoing items for Field Artillery matériel and ammunition that it is also estimated by the War Department that for such remaining matériel and ammunition for the use of the militia there will be required a total of $22,411,239.43; for which latter sum, however, it is expected that estimates will be submitted and appropriations carried in the Army bill.

In the present estimates there is asked, under the first general division for continental United States, subdivision a, new matériel, etc., $1,746,324.42, of which sum there is recommended in the accompanying bill $1,673,000, under subdivision b, maintenance, repair, etc., $1,068,500, of which amount the bill carries $1,038,500; and under subdivision c, target-practice ammunition, $425,000, and $26,100 for submarine-mine practice, all of which is recommended in the bill, except $100, making a total estimate of $3,265,924.42, of which the bill carries $3,162,500.

In the insular possessions, under subdivision a, there is asked for new matériel, ammunition, etc., $763,678, of which there is recommended in the bill $753,678; and under subdivision b, maintenance, repair, etc., $99,000, of which the sum of $89,000 is recommended; making total estimates of $862,678, of which $842,678, as above stated, is recommended; making a grand total of estimates of $4,128,602.42 for both continental United States and the insular possessions under the first general division, of which there is recommended $4,005,178.

Under the second general classification there is asked, under subdivision a, new matériel, etc., including alteration of 3.2-inch batteries, $1,780,000, all of which is recommended, with an authorization of $300,000; under subdivision b, maintenance, repairs, etc., $55,000, of which $50,000 is given; under subdivision c, target-practice ammunition, $140,000, of which $135,000 is given; making total estimates of $1,975,000, of which the bill carries $1,965,000, with authorization of $300,000 as above.

Under the third general division there are asked the following items:

Current expenses, ordnance proving ground, Sandy Hook, N. J.	$56,200
Expenses of officers at the proving ground and compensation of draftsmen	18,700
Board of Ordnance and Fortification	15,000
Total	89,900

All of the estimates under the third general division, $89,900, is recommended, and in addition thereto an item of $138.90 for reimbursement of Col. Frank Green, retired.

The funds appropriated under the fortification acts are expended by or under the supervision of the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief Signal Officer, and the Chief of Engineers. In general terms the Chief of Ordnance has charge of those items pertaining to seacoast cannon, including their carriages, sights, implements, and equipments; mountain, field, and siege cannon, including their carriages, sights, implements, and equipments; ammunition for seacoast cannon; ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon; ammunition, subcaliber guns, and other accessories for seacoast artillery practice; ammunition, subcaliber guns, and other accessories for mountain, field, and siege artillery practice; alteration and maintenance of seacoast artillery; alteration and maintenance of mobile artillery; current expenses of the ordnance proving ground, Sandy Hook, N. J., necessary expenses of officers at the proving ground, and compensation of draftsmen. In addition he has charge of the accounts, although not of the disbursements, pertaining to submarine mines, and the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, and expends the funds allotted him by the Secretary of War for fire-control instruments.

The Chief Signal Officer has charge of the operation and maintenance of fire-control installation at seacoast defenses and the expenditure of such funds as may be allotted him by the Secretary of War for the procurement of wiring and instruments for communication service from the appropriations for fire control.

The Chief of Engineers has charge of the construction, maintenance, repair, and modernization of emplacements for seacoast armament; installation and replacement of electric light and power plants and searchlights at seacoast fortifications; procurement or reclamation of land for sites for fortifications; preparation of plans for fortifications; tools, electrical, and engine supplies for operating electric light and power plants in seacoast batteries, and reserve lights therefor; construction, maintenance, and repair of sea walls and embankments; construction, preservation, and repair of structures for torpedo defense; land defenses of seacoast fortifications, exclusive of electrical communications and armament; and the expenditure of such funds as may be allotted him by the Secretary of War from fire-control appropriations for construction of fire-control stations and accessories and purchase of lands and rights of way.

The estimate for fire-control stations and accessories, electrical communications, and range finders, and other instruments for fire control at the fortifications is submitted by the Chief of Coast Artillery, and the appropriation when made is carried on the books of the disbursing officer of the War Department, expenditures being made by the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief Signal Officer, and the Chief of Engineers in accordance with allotments made them by the Secretary of War for particular purposes. The estimate for submarine mines is prepared by the Chief of Coast Artillery and disbursed under his supervision; the accounts are kept by the Chief of Ordnance.

LIMITATIONS.

The following limitations not heretofore imposed on appropriations are recommended:

On page 2:

"The Secretary of War is authorized to grant to the Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, a perpetual right of way through the lands which have been or which may be acquired for fortification purposes at Cape Henry, Va., on such location as he may approve, in exchange for all of said company's lands and rights of way lying within the boundaries of the lands acquired or to be acquired for said fortification purposes: *Provided*, That the said railroad company may be reimbursed from appropriations which may be applicable to the construction of defenses at Cape Henry, Va., for the expense which may be imposed upon the said railroad company in changing the location of its tracks, stations, or other buildings and appurtenances from their present location on the said lands and rights of way of the said railroad company to the right of way hereinbefore authorized to be granted to the said company by the Secretary of War."

On page 4:

"The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to pay to Lieut. Col. Frank Greene, Signal Corps, United States Army, retired, the sum of $138.90."

On page 7, with reference to officers on duty at the Sandy Hook Proving Ground:

"That hereafter the occupancy by such officers, providing themselves with quarters elsewhere, of one room in the building at the proving ground locally known as the brick house shall not be construed as occupancy of public quarters within the meaning of this act and of the law authorizing allowance and commutation of quarters: *Provided further*, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are directed to reimburse Lieut. Col. Jay E. Hoffer, Ordnance Department, United States Army, the sum of $118, and First Lieut. Alfred H. Hobley, Ordnance Department, United States Army, the sum of $156, refunded by them to the United States on April 22 and May 21, 1914, respectively, on account of moneys received by them as commutation of quarters during part of the period June 1 to October 31, 1913, from the appropriation from which payment was originally made and to which the funds were credited when refunded."

On page 10:

"The transfer of four 12-inch mortars and their carriages and accessories, having an approximate value of $110,000, from fortifications in the United States to the insular possessions, is approved."

On page 12:

"That the payment of rent for offices heretofore leased in the District of Columbia for the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, and the payments heretofore made for rent of such offices, are hereby authorized."

On page 13:

"SEC. 5. That the several appropriations herein made and heretofore made in fortification appropriation acts shall be available for the payment of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to civilian employees when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914."

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

The following shows, by items, the appropriations made in the last fortification act, the amounts submitted at this session in the annual estimates, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill:

Fortifications appropriation bill, 1916.

Object.	Appropriations for 1915.	Estimates for 1916.	Recommended for 1916.
FORTIFICATIONS AND OTHER WORKS OF DEFENSE.			
Gun and mortar batteries, construction of	$250,000.00	$585,000.00	$585,000.00
Modernizing older emplacements	(1)	100,000.00	100,000.00
Fire-control stations and accessories, construction of		133,974.42	130,000.00
Coast Artillery war instruction	25,000.00	500.00	500.00
Electric light and power plants at seacoast fortifications	50,000.00	60,000.00	50,000.00
Searchlights for important harbors	100,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00
Protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications	(2)	200,000.00	200,000.00
Torpedo defense, preservation and repair of structures for	20,000.00	30,000.00	
Plans for fortifications	5,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Electric light and power equipment and searchlights, maintenance, repair, tools, etc	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
Sea walls and embankments, construction of	25,000.00	35,000.00	27,000.00
Fire-control stations, operation and maintenance	130,000.00	130,000.00	130,000.00
Submarine mines, operation, preservation, and care of, including mining casemates, cable galleries, etc		31,000.00	31,000.00
Outer Brewster, Boston, Mass., landing facilities		50,000.00	
Greene, Frank, payment to		138.90	138.90
Total, fortifications and other works of defense	645,000.00	1,555,613.32	1,453,638.90
ARMAMENT OF FORTIFICATIONS.			
Mountain, field, and siege cannon:			
Purchase, manufacture, equipment, etc	(3) $450,000.00	(3) $450,000.00	$450,000.00
Ammunition for	1,200,000.00	1,160,000.00	1,160,000.00

[1] Reappropriation of $100,000 from unexpended balances of appropriations for protecting defenses of Pensacola, Fla.

[2] Reappropriation of $165,000 from unexpended balances of appropriations for protecting defenses of Pensacola, Fla.

[3] In addition to this sum, authority was granted for 1915 and is asked for 1916 to contract for the further amount of $300,000.

Fortifications appropriation bill, 1916—Continued.

Object.	Appropriations for 1915.	Estimates for 1916.	Recommended for 1916.
ARMAMENT, ETC.—continued.			
Seacoast cannon:			
Purchase, manufacture, equipment, etc	[1] $336,800.00	$300,000.00	$300,000.00
Ammunition for	140,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00
Subcaliber guns, seacoast artillery, ammunition for	425,000.00	425,000.00	425,000.00
Mobile artillery, alteration and maintenance	45,000.00	55,000.00	50,000.00
Subcaliber guns, mountain, field, and siege artillery, ammunition for	130,000.00	140,000.00	135,000.00
3.2-inch batteries, alteration, sights, etc	175,000.00	170,000.00	170,000.00
Submarine mine material, purchase, manufacture, and test		26,100.00	26,000.00
Seacoast artillery, alteration and maintenance of	300,000.00	300,000.00	500,000.00
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 1529)		200,000.00	
Total, armament of fortifications	3,201,800.00	3,426,100.00	3,416,000.00
PROVING GROUND, SANDY HOOK, N. J.			
Current expenses	56,200.00	56,200.00	56,200.00
Expenses of officers and pay of draftsmen	18,700.00	18,700.00	18,700.00
Total, Sandy Hook Proving Ground	74,900.00	74,900.00	74,900.00
SUBMARINE MINES.			
Submarine mines and appliances, purchase of	100,000.00	191,350.00	190,000.00
Submarine mine material, maintenance of	68,000.00	68,000.00	68,000.00
Total, submarine mines	168,000.00	259,350.00	258,000.00
FORTIFICATIONS IN INSULAR POSSESSIONS.			
Seacoast batteries, construction of, Philippine Islands	300,000.00		
Protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications:			
Hawaiian Islands	1,000.00	3,000.00	2,000.00
Philippine Islands		3,000.00	3,000.00
Torpedo structures:			
Hawaiian Islands	2,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Philippine Islands	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Land defenses, Hawaiian Islands	457,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00
Reserve equipment:			
Hawaiian Islands	50,000.00		
Philippine Islands	100,000.00		
Electric light and power plants and searchlights, maintenance, operation, tools, etc.:			
Hawaiian Islands	1,000.00	2,000.00	1,500.00
Philippine Islands	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
Sea walls and embankments, Hawaiian Islands		21,000.00	21,000.00
Submarine mines, preservation, operation, and care of, including mining casemates, cable galleries, etc		17,000.00	17,000.00
Fire-control installations, operation, etc	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Seacoast cannon:			
Purchase, manufacture, equipment, etc	100,000.00	[2] 110,000.00	110,000.00
Ammunition for	400,000.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
Seacoast artillery:			
Alteration and maintenance	35,000.00	46,000.00	60,000.00
Supplemental estimate in H. Doc. No. 1529		20,000.00	
Installation, supervision of	500.00		
Submarine mines:			
Purchase of		50,000.00	40,000.00
Material, maintenance of	7,500.00	10,000.00	7,500.00
Fire-control stations, construction, etc	55,000.00	15,678.00	15,678.00
Total, fortifications in insular possessions	1,523,000.00	862,678.00	842,678.00
Board of Ordnance and Fortifications	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
Grand total, fortifications	5,627,700.00	6,193,641.32	6,050,216.90

[1] In addition to this sum, authority was granted for 1915 and is asked for 1916 to contract for the further amount of $300,000.
[2] Estimated in H. Doc. No. 1529.

The Clerk read as follows:

The transfer of four 12-inch mortars and their carriages and accessories, having an approximate value of $110,000, from fortifications in the United States to the insular possessions, is approved.

Mr. MILLER. Is this the item the gentleman referred to in relation to mortars for the Philippines?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; the item is on top of page 10, where $110,000 is appropriated to manufacture these mortars.

Mr. MILLER. Those are for Hawaii?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; those are for the Philippines.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman refers to the paragraph at the top of the page?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and I will tell the gentleman how it came about. The paragraph says:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of seascoast cannon for coast defenses, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, $110,000.

That includes mortars.

Mr. MILLER. It might.

Mr. SHERLEY. The language is sufficient to embrace mortars. Here is what happened: They found that they had an additional balance that they could use for emplacements, and they have begun and are completing the emplacements, and because they did not need to come in and ask for an appropriation for emplacement the need for an estimate for the ordnance was overlooked until, in checking up the matter, it was found that it was necessary to get $110,000 to build the four mortars, and that is the reason I am so sure that I am correct, and I verified the matter this morning.

I assure the gentleman they are going to manufacture these four mortars that are to go out there, and that the item that has just been read with reference to a transfer is simply an authorization of a transfer already made of mortars in regard to the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the gentleman is absolutely correct. If he has looked it up, I know he is. I certainly have that much confidence in the distinguished gentleman, but I do recall distinctly that one of the witnesses in the hearings testified that the four mortars that were at former fortifications here were to be transported over to the islands.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be so. There may have been some confusion. The fact that there were four mortars for Hawaii and four for the Philippines, and that both were for land defenses, would naturally lend itself to confusion.

Mr. MILLER. In that case, if they are manufacturing four new mortars, I am quite sure that they will have an increased range over the four old ones contemplated in this paragraph. I want to ask another question. Has there been any firing of mortars at a distance of 19,000 yards that may be called efficient?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of our new mortars that have that range.

Mr. MILLER. That is very much in advance of the maximum range that I have been informed by artillery men mortars usually have.

Mr. SHERLEY. We are building a mortar now that is so much longer than the previous mortars that it looks very much like a gun, and those mortars do have a range such as I have indicated, and their effectiveness in the use of either shrapnel or high-explosive shell in the way of covering a terrain against a land attack would be very, very great.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question. I think the gentleman very clearly and vigorously stated the situation this morning on one important matter, when he said that we should always consider whether or not the enemy had command of the sea when we are considering a fortification. That is basic, of course, and absolutely essential to any consideration. Are not the fortifications of the Philippine Islands based on the fact that we will not have command of the sea and that the enemy will, and is not that an exact reversal of the situation that exists respecting our fortifications generally?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not entirely so. If we had command of the sea it would be impossible for continental United States to be invaded, unless Canada or Mexico should go to war with us, so that the sea control is one of the primal matters in either instance. I think what the gentleman has in mind is this, that a situation might arise in the Philippines, in case of sudden war, where no decisive naval engagement was had and where our fleet was not so immediately available as to protect those islands, and that——

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. And that it ought to be possible to make a stand there pending relief and succor from our fleet and from the United States, and in that particular I thoroughly agree with the gentleman as to the importance of having unusually strong fortifications there.

Mr. MILLER. That is the only reason that I have advocated it, and that advocacy is based on recommendations of military men that we have some fortification to protect against the landing of troops and the siege of our island forts by such landed troops operating from the land against both wings of the fortifications.

Mr. SHERLEY. Wherein I think the gentleman is mistaken is this: It was at one time sought to put batteries on those shores, but they would have been subject to a land assault, and it was so much better to have them on the islands that they discarded that idea and fortified Caballo, Carabao, and El Fraile, in addition to making of Corregidor a great fortification that would be the last stand in case everything went against us. As I stated a few moments ago, it is not to be supposed that there will be no aid from mobile troops or that there will not be any use for mobile artillery; but it is not believed advisable to put permanent fortifications on those two sites, and if they were put there, then it could be said that they are subject also to attack on the flank.

Mr. MILLER. But their presence would locate the enemy, and that is the point.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken in another thing. The gentleman is reaching some conclusions in regard to a war game that was played there. I think war games have great value in that they enable men in a measure to anticipate what might arise in case of actual war.

But they are not of such value as to warrant men in drawing fixed conclusions always as to what would actually happen from a theoretical happening. For instance, in one of the war games which was played over in the Philippines they put out of commission and had captured by assault batteries which were on the top of a cliff which was almost perpendicular for 200 feet, and it was so absurd that afterwards there was a correction made and a statement that the decision of the war umpires was altogether out of reason, because you can not even get a barrel of cement up there without hoisting it up by derrick.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit one question, and I will not go into detail——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask for the additional three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER. In order that the element of theory might not exist in this case, they fired the actual shots, not one shot, but many.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, there is some of that country where unquestionably guns could be brought up, but it is not an easy proposition, and after they got there it would not be a very healthy place to stay. I do not think the gentleman's conclusions that these fortifications could be readily put out of business would be substantiated by the judgment of a great majority of the men who have studied the matter.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Kentucky spoke about these new mortars. Does the gentleman refer to the mortars in the report signed by Assistant Secretary Breckenridge and others? It appears on page 29 of the hearings, at the top of the page. The range of the mortars recommended is 21,000 yards.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I took my size of mortars from the table, found on 206, because I always like to be conservative, where the 12-inch mortars, latest models, have a range of 19,319 yards. Now, I am not prepared to say that these new mortars might not have a range of 21,000 yards. It only makes my case that much stronger.

Mr. GARDNER. What I was getting at is this: Of these motars with a range of 19,319 yards are there any outside of the Canal Zone?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there are, but I would have to refer to the record. If the gentleman will wait a minute, I can tell him, I think.

Mr. GARDNER. In place?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, we have some few mortars over in the Philippines.

Mr. GARDNER. Installed?

Mr. SHERLEY. And I am not sure about the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. GARDNER. There are some provided?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; there are a number of mortars emplaced in the Philippines and have been for quite a while.

Mr. GARDNER. Are those the long-range mortars?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think so.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

For all needful and proper purchases, experiments, and tests to ascertain, with a view to their utilization by the Government, the most effective guns, small arms, cartridges, projectiles, fuses, explosives, torpedoes, armor plates, and other implements and engines of war, and to purchase or cause to be manufactured, under authority of the Secretary of War, such guns, carriages, armor plates, and other war material as may, in the judgment of the board, be necessary in the proper discharge of the duty devolved upon it by the act approved September 22, 1888; salary of the civilian member of the board and for his necessary traveling expenses when traveling on duty as provided by the act of February 24, 1891; necessary expenses of the board, including rent of offices in the District of Columbia at not exceeding $900 per annum and a per diem allowance to each officer detailed to serve thereon, when employed on duty away from his permanent station, of $2.50 a day; test of experimental guns, carriages, and other devices procured in accordance with the recommendation of the board, $15,000, the expenditure of which shall be made by the several bureaus of the War Department heretofore having jurisdiction of the same, or by the board itself, as the Secretary of War may direct: *Provided*, That before any money shall be expended in the construction or test of any gun, gun carriage, ammunition, or implements under the supervision of the said board, the board shall be satisfied, after due inquiry, that the Government of the United States has a lawful right to use the inventions involved in the construction of such gun, gun carriage, ammunition, or implements, or that the construction or test is made at the request of a person either having such lawful right or authorized to convey the same to the Government: *Provided further*, That the payment of rent for offices heretofore leased in the District of Columbia for the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, and the payments heretofore made for rent of such offices, are hereby authorized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get the statement in the RECORD that the amount of ammunition for the seacoast cannon of continental United States on hand and under manufacture, which has hitherto been provided, is only 66 per cent of the total amount estimated by the Taft Board as the necessary minimum for our continental seacoast armament when complete. However, this ammunition amounts to 73 per cent of the quantity estimated as necessary for that part of our continental seacoast armament which has hitherto been provided. I shall read a passage from the evidence of Gen. Crozier. I do so because there has been some confusion as to whether the 73 per cent of which we have been speaking means 73 per cent of the ammunition estimated as requisite for the entire armament of seacoast cannon after the whole project is complete or 73 per cent of the amount estimated as necessary for that part of the armament which up to the present time has been authorized. On page 192 of the hearings Gen. Crozier said:

The total value of the full allowance of ammunition for the cannon which have already been provided for continental United States is $16,487,000, and the total amount in value which we have on hand is $12,099,000. I think that figures out about 73 per cent.

In order to clear this question up in my own mind, on February 12 I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War. He replied as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 16, 1915.

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

DEAR MR. GARDNER: Referring to your letter of February 12, 1915, in which you request certain information pertaining to the value of ammunition for seacoast cannon, it is assumed from your reference therein to your letter of January 25, 1915, that your queries relate to the armament of continental United States, and the following data are based upon this understanding:

1. The value of the ammunition on hand and under manufacture is $12,099,000.
2. On the basis of the ammunition allowance recommended by the Coast Defense Board, the value of the full allowance of ammunition for armament provided and contemplated is $18,216,000.
3. For the armament provided to date, the value of the additional ammunition necessary to bring the supply up to the full allowance recommended by the Coast Defense Board is $4,388,000.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

This letter shows that we have on hand or under manufacture 66 per cent of the ammunition for the whole continental coast defense project, or 73 per cent of that part of the project for which money has hitherto been appropriated. It is understood, of course, that this statement refers to the requirements estimated by the Taft Board, or, more properly speaking, the National Coast Defense Board.

Mr. SHERLEY. I desire to say to the gentleman that I have never questioned that, and I have never made any statement questioning that.

Mr. GARDNER. But if the gentleman will read his statement this morning he will find that the matter, or so it seems to me, was left in some doubt. Furthermore, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] yesterday evening made an observation which did not seem to me entirely to clear the matter up. I simply desire to make everything plain in the RECORD.

Mr. SHERLEY. There was not any confusion in my mind. I knew the 73 per cent was of guns not mounted.

Mr. GARDNER. I think if the gentleman will read over his notes this morning he will find it as I have said.

Mr. SHERLEY. I said I had no doubt as to the matter, and I agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GARDNER. That is that the ammunition in question is 73 per cent of the amount required for the armanent hitherto authorized?

Mr. SHERLEY. And not 73 per cent of all that is expected to be put in the authorization. The only question I have with the gentleman touching ammunition is the statement he made in regard to guns, and I called attention, by reading testimony as to the situation as to some of the guns which showed that in some cases that were over 100 per cent, whereas others were down lower, and with the mortars, all averaged about 73 per cent.

Now, the reason the gentleman is able to make his statement in regard to two hours' supply on a transfer from the Pacific to the Atlantic is due to the fact that there are a great many more guns on the Atlantic than on the Pacific. Manifestly, when you send your Pacific supply over to the Atlantic you do not increase the Atlantic supply 100 per cent.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER. It is true, as the gentleman says, that of certain kinds of ammunition we have over 100 per cent of the Taft Board requirement, provided that it is our Pacific coast which is attacked and provided we are successful in shipping to that coast all the ammunition accumulated for the supply of the guns in our Atlantic coast fortifications. But suppose that it is our Atlantic coast which is attacked and suppose that we entirely strip the Pacific defenses of every ounce of seacoast ammunition and transfer it to the threatened Atlantic defenses, how shall we stand as regards a sufficiency of ammunition on the Taft Board basis? On that basis it is supposed that we should have as a minimum amount two hours' battle supply for each gun after this transferring business is complete. But would that be so? By no means. Let me read you Gen. Weaver's statement about the various sizes of ammunition. It is to be found on page 198 of the hearings:

> If they were shipped from one coast to the other the percentage for a two hours' supply would be as follows: For 3-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 4.7 inch guns, 74 per cent; for 5-inch guns, 96 per cent; for 6-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 8-inch guns, 55 per cent; for 10-inch guns, 70 per cent; for 12-inch guns, 71 per cent; and for 12-inch mortars, 34 per cent.

In other words, we should be, to an alarming extent, short of the minimum ammunition supply recommended by the so-called Taft board if the war should develop in such a way as to bring the attack on the Atlantic side.

When Gen. Weaver made that statement, Mr. SHERLEY said:

> That would depend upon what coast they were shipped from?
> Gen. WEAVER. Yes.
> Mr. SHERLEY. That is, if shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic?
> Gen. WEAVER. Shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast.

I admit at once that if you take all the ammunition from the Atlantic coast and ship it to the Pacific coast, then you have a good deal more than 100 per cent ammunition supply for a great many of the guns on the Pacific coast; that is, on the Taft board estimate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SHERLEY. I just want to take a minute to say this: On the Atlantic there are a great many fortifications that, under no conceivable conditions, to my mind, would ever be involved, and, therefore, in figuring the percentages for those guns you are figuring with an abundance of caution, and if you eliminated those guns from consideration your percentage as to other guns would amount to considerable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee what the plan is as to the reserve ammunition of these respective guns in various fortifications?

Mr. SHERLEY. I went so fully into that this morning——

Mr. STAFFORD. I listened to the gentleman an hour and a half, and then I was called out of the Chamber. If that was the case, I will read the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there was a very considerable addition that could be made to the supply of coast-artillery ammunition by discontinuing certain useless fortifications?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman understood me to say practically that. I know what the gentleman is going to do. He is going to read a statement in which a remark is made as to what the percentage would amount to.

Mr. GARDNER. I am going to read a statement from Gen. Weaver that totally disagrees with you.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand. I want to say in response to that, and after that I shall not undertake to further review this matter, that there is no agreement as to what fortifications are needed to-day. Now, what the general had in mind was simply guns that he thought could be taken down and the fortification not kept, but what I have in mind are the many fortifications that would be in no case involved.

That makes a different premise and therefore a different conclusion.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, I think the general's opinion needed no particular elucidation. Here is what he says, on page 68 of the hearings:

> Gen. WEAVER. The number of guns that may be abandoned is so small a percentage of the total number mounted that the abandonment of such armament will result in but slight increases in the amounts of ammunition available for the remaining armament.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes. The gentleman is talking about abandonment and I am talking about something else.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Kentucky tried his best to get Gen. Weaver to say the opposite. I read:

> Mr. SHERLEY. Now, in point of fact, there are a great many guns that are mounted in continental United States that under practically no conceivable condition would ever be needed?
> Gen. WEAVER. There are a number.
> Mr. SHERLEY. But there are quite a number?
> Gen. WEAVER. Yes; quite a number; but the number is not large in comparison with the total number of guns mounted.
> Mr. SHERLEY. So that when you have gotten a one hour's allowance for all of the guns in the United States you actually have a considerably greater allowance for all of the guns than will ever be needed?

Then Gen. Weaver answered in the way I just read. How he could possibly have misunderstood what the gentleman from Kentucky was talking about I can not understand.

Mr. SHERLEY. I said that the premise upon which the gentleman from Massachusetts is now proceeding was not the premise of the General.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. While I understand the bill does not so expressly specify, I gathered from the remarks of the gentleman in general debate and in reading the hearings that it is not intended to manufacture any Gathmann or torpedo shells to be used in ranges of 10,000 yards and under.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know of no proposal to manufacture Gathmann shells.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, torpedo shells.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not quibbling with the gentleman. I do not think they propose to manufacture the type of shell that the gentleman speaks of as the Gathmann shell, or the type that is spoken of as the Isham shell.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not ask the question because I disagreed with the gentleman on that point, because, on the contrary, I entirely agree with him.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand that they are not going to manufacture any of them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say at this time that I thought it was a great mistake to even authorize those in another bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. He says there are a great many guns that will probably never be used. I presume he referred to fortifications like Forth Wadsworth and Fort Hamilton, the second line of defense after Sandy Hook. If Sandy Hook were taken, we might have to rely on Fort Wadsworth and Fort Hamilton.

Mr. SHERLEY. I had not in mind those cases, but cases that are more pronounced. We have a lot of fortifications down here on the Potomac River, for example, where there is not a modern warship that could get near them, and nobody except a person fit for an asylum would ever undertake to bring anything of any size up there to attack those fortifications. What is true there is also true of a number of other fortifications, so far as their importance is concerned.

I am not going to quarrel with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as to whether my statement is technically to the letter accurate. I still think that it remains true that in a practical sense there are a number of fortifications for which percentages have been figured that do not need to be figured. That does not interfere with the fact that we need to more

nearly approach the totals to have a desirable amount of ammunition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if necessary, I move to strike out any number of words. [Laughter.] I would like to ask about the last proviso about rent. What is the occasion for this? Has there been some ruling about that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. They have rented quarters here, not to any great extent, but they have certain rooms where they keep some of their maps, in a fireproof building, and where there is vault protection, and the comptroller ruled that there was no authority for the payment of rent in the District of Columbia because it was not expressly stated. As a result, it is necessary not only to carry a provision for the future payment of rent, but also to cure any question as to past payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the several appropriations herein made and heretofore made in fortification appropriation acts shall be available for the payment of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to civilian employees when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section at the bottom of the page.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, at the end of section 5, add as a new section the following: "All unexpended balances, amounting to $13,531.50, of the appropriations heretofore at various times made for the development and manufacture of the so-called Emery disappearing gun carriage are hereby covered back into the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the history of the Emery disappearing gun carriage has been an exceedingly strange one. The first appropriation for this Emery gun carriage was made in the year 1893, and additional appropriations have been made from time to time since that date. In other words, for a period of some 22 years the United States has been making appropriations of larger or smaller sums for the Emery carriage.

A. H. Emery, the would-be inventor of this disappearing gun carriage—or nonappearing gun carriage, as they call it in the War Department—achieved a considerable reputation perhaps 25 years ago by making a very elaborate testing machine for the Watertown Arsenal. That met with great success and won the inventor a wide renown. Since that time several additional machines of his invention have been installed and put to good use out at the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. Emery was fortunate in possessing the confidence and the ear of conspicuous Members of Congress both on the other side of the Capitol and on this side, and as a result he was enabled, in 1893, as I have said, to get his original appropriation for this purpose, amounting to $130,000. Then, in 1896 he got $10,000 more; in 1900, $40,000 more; in 1903, $40,000 more; and in 1908, $30,000 more; so that in the quarter century which has elapsed since this project was first brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States he has received in appropriations an even quarter of a million dollars.

The various enactments have in the main relieved him from the necessity of giving any quid pro quo, and from the first day when this authorization was made down to the present day the War Department has not received a single cent's worth of equivalent in return. We have been pouring out this money as the days and years have passed, and we have been getting nothing whatever to show for it. Out of that original quarter of a million dollars there is to-day remaining in the Treasury of the United States $13,531.50. There seems to be no real possibility that anything can ever be done by Mr. Emery toward the ultimate completion and delivery of the gun carriage. I am told by officials of the War Department and officials of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications that even if Mr. Emery should be successful in building this gun carriage along the lines of the present endeavor, it would not be of the slightest value for our coast defenses; that designs have come on since 1893, have been installed in the coast defenses, and have in turn become obsolete and been superseded by more advanced and more efficacious inventions. So that if the miraculous should happen, if Mr. Emery should succeed after the lapse of all these years in completing a practical carriage, it would not be of the slightest value to the United States Government.

The original appropriation and every appropriation since have been made in direct disregard and in direct violation of the recommendations of the War Department and of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification. I have in my hand a reference to various reports which prove that my statement is true, but I will not take the time to refer to them now. I will just refer to one or two of the very recent ones. For example, in the letter of transmission of the report of the board by the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, in 1912, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, under date of February 3, 1912, the following appears:

Attention is invited to the statement of the board regarding the Emery disappearing carriage, * * * and in this connection Maj. Gen. Wood, president of the board, in submitting the report, remarks as follows: "The possibility of any useful result being obtained from Mr. Emery's 20 years' experimentation does not warrant continuation of his contract and possibly payment to him of a further $13,500." The matter is therefore submitted to Congress, with a view to action looking to the cancellation of the outstanding contract and the saving to the Government of at least a portion of the money heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

In the report of the board for 1913 the following appears:

Nothing has occurred in the last year that would indicate the eventual completion and delivery of this carriage * * *. Of the quarter million dollars appropriated there remains unexpended $13,531.51, but as some affirmative action on Mr. Emery's part is required to enable him to draw this money from the Treasury, it is likely to remain undisturbed unless Congress authorizes cancellation of the contract and allows the money to revert to the general funds of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize the fact that the United States has never had the slightest benefit of any kind, real or theoretical, from Mr. Emery's scheme, and that there seems to be no possible reason why this sum, even though small, should not be saved to the Federal Government.

In this connection I wanted to call the attention of the committee to what has resulted from the repeated appropriation by Congress, in direct violation of the recommendation of experts to whom we pay large salaries and who have claimed throughout that the plan was not feasible. Congress took the bit in its teeth, ignored the recommendation of experts, with the result I have indicated. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this recommendation and this amendment may be adopted. I believe that Congress ought to save what little it can out of the wreck of this quarter of a million dollars.

EMERY DISAPPEARING GUN CARRIAGE.

The following appropriations have been made for the Emery disappearing gun carriage:

Act approved Feb. 18, 1893 (Public, 69)	$130,000.00	
Act approved June 6, 1896	10,000.00	
Act approved May 25, 1900	40,000.00	
Act approved Mar. 3, 1903	40,000.00	
Act approved May 27, 1908	30,000.00	
Total appropriations		$250,000.00
Of this amount there was paid Mr. Emery prior to 1903	135,656.98	
Of this amount there was paid Mr. Emery subsequent to 1903	100,811.51	
Total paid to Mr. Emery to date		236,468.49
Unexpended balance of appropriations		13,531.51

The act of February 18, 1893, above referred to, provides in part as follows:

To enable the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications to procure and test one 12-inch elevating carriage of A. H. Emery's design, $130,000, * * * and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to contract, without advertising, with A. H. Emery for this carriage, and test it, the same to be built, erected, and tested for a sum not exceeding $130,000, which price shall cover the cost of the carriage erected, and including all the powder and projectiles necessary for its preliminary test * * *. Of the price of this contract $110,000 shall be for the carriage and foundations erected, including all changes and repairs, and $20,000 shall be paid the contractor for the preliminary testing of the carriage * * *. Of the $110,000 to be paid for the carriage and its foundations 60 per cent shall be paid in partial payments as the work progresses * * *. Before advancing any part of this 60 per cent the contractor shall furnish bonds satisfactory to the Secretary of War for the return of this money if the carriage is not accepted.

The other portions of this act seem not sufficiently material in this connection to require their quotation.

On March 17, 1893, in accordance with the terms of the act, a contract was entered into with Mr. Emery for the delivery of the completed carriage at Sandy Hook within two years after the date of the contract. The act of June 6, 1896, amended the act of February 18, 1893, by providing that 85 per cent (instead of 60 per cent) of the $110,000 to be paid for the carriage and foundations should be paid in partial payments as the work progressed. It also expressly stipulated, in direct reversal of the earlier act, that "no bond shall be required for the return of this money if the carriage is not accepted, nor shall the said Emery be required to return the money paid * * *." It also provided for an additional $10,000 for a loading apparatus to accompany the carriage.

The Board of Ordnance and Fortification strongly disapproved of the foregoing amendments, stating in a report dated October 31, 1896:

The plans for this carriage were not completely worked out at the time the appropriation bill was passed—referring to 1893 bill—and

were never approved by the board. In its action of January 25, 1893, the board stated as follows:

"In view of the doubts in the mind of the board as to the successful working of this carriage, as expressed in its action of December 29, 1892, it is of the opinion that if Congress deem it advisable to authorize and direct the construction, the appropriation should be so worded as to make the cost of the carriage and foundations payable only after their successful test and acceptance by the War Department."

The board still adheres to the opinion thus expressed. Should the proposed amendment become a law, $93,500 might be paid to Mr. Emery for preliminary work on a carriage the plans for which have never been approved by experts on this class of work and the patents for which are not transferred to the United States, although it should prove of no value after completion.

It will be observed that in spite of this opinion Congress persisted in passing the objectionable amendments above quoted.

In accordance with the amendatory act, a supplementary contract was entered into with Mr. Emery to deliver the loading apparatus at the Sandy Hook Proving Ground March 17, 1898.

On July 27, 1896, the date of the delivery of the carriage was extended to March 17, 1898. Further extensions were granted, first to March 17, 1899, and then to March 28, 1900. Other extensions have since been requested from time to time. A report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification dated October 31, 1899, states:

The original act was passed after this board, having carefully considered the drawings and specifications submitted to it by Mr. Emery, had declined to approve its plan of construction. The amount appropriated by Congress for the same is several times as large as the cost of carriages of the same kind now in service. A large portion of that amount has already been expended in the construction of innumerable pieces of the carriage. Although the inventor and contractor gives no information whereupon any conjecture or speculation can be made as to the time when the carriage may be completed, yet he has drawn from the Treasury $95,380.16, of which he has expended $12,500 for the purchase of ammunition with which to test it after completion. It now hardly seems probable that this experimental carriage will be finished in time to be used, even if successful, in the adopted plan of our coast defenses.

In volume 3 of the Report of the War Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, being a report of the Chief of Ordnance, at pages 349 to 359 appears the report of hearings held April 14, 16, and 18, 1900, before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations which was considering the fortifications appropriation bill. Gen. Buffington, the principal witness, deals at length with the Emery gun carriage, stating again and again that the character of it does not commend itself.

It requires a pit of about 30 feet, which is filled up with springs and with hydraulic cylinders, the practicability of the working of which does not appear very clearly. We do not in the ordnance office approve of this carriage as a general type for mounting our seacoast guns, on account of this complication and the expense it would take to build the emplacements for them, and I could not recommend any further appropriation to be expended on it.

Gen. Buffington says that the contract had already been extended five times since 1893, and that there was an application from Mr. Emery then on file for a further extension; that the United States had received nothing in return for its money expended, then amounting to nearly $100,000; that the War Department did not know the stage of completion of the carriage nor when it would be completed; that it was purely experimental, and that experience would indicate that, even if originally workable, it would soon get out of order and become unserviceable.

There is considerable evidence that Senator Teller, who was then on the subcommittee, was greatly interested in behalf of Mr. Emery; certainly the character of his questioning of Gen. Buffington would so indicate. Gen. Buffington pointed out that as he was the deviser of a carriage then used in the service he was placed in a somewhat questionable position in criticizing the Emery carriage.

In spite of the recommendation of Gen. Buffington, there was carried in the act approved May 25, 1900, a further appropriation of $40,000, and by the act approved March 3, 1903, the further sum of $40,000 was appropriated to enable Mr. Emery "to complete and erect the 12-inch carriage." The fortifications appropriation act approved April 21, 1904, authorized the Secretary of War, "to enable A. H. Emery to proceed promptly in the work of building and erecting the 12-inch disappearing carriage and its loading apparatus," to advance Emery any part of the unexpended balance, then amounting to $84,343.02, and also to make a new contract, relieving Emery from further work in connection with the 12-inch carriage and substituting therefor a contract for an 8 or 10 inch disappearing carriage.

In accordance with the provisions of this act, all work on the 12-inch carriage was suspended, and on June 13, 1904, a contract was entered into by the Chief of Ordnance with Mr. Emery for one 10-inch disappearing carriage of his design. The sundry civil appropriation act approved May 27, 1908, carried a further appropriation of $30,000 to enable Emery to complete the gun carriage, "$20,000 to be paid on the approval of this act, $5,000 when Emery is ready to put in the foundations for this carriage, and the other $5,000 when he is ready to erect the carriage for its preliminary test." The report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the year 1908 states, page 11:

The board was not consulted regarding, nor has it any knowledge of the purpose of this additional appropriation other than as shown by the act.

The report of the same board for the year 1910 states:

In the latter part of 1908 Mr. Emery constructed a railroad track connecting the site selected for his carriage at Fort Hancock with the Sandy Hook Proving Ground Railroad. This track was used for the transportation of material for the construction of the concrete foundations for the carriage. Under the provisions of the act of May 27, 1908, Mr. Emery was paid $5,000 for the completion of this work, since which time no further deliveries have been made.

Of the $114,343.02 available for the execution of the present contract with Mr. Emery for his carriage $100,811.51 has been paid him.

There may be added to the $114,000 mentioned above the sum of $135,656.98 paid under a former contract which was canceled by congressional authority, so that the total amount authorized has been a quarter of a million dollars. Of this sum there remains to be paid Mr. Emery $13,531.51. Another year has passed, the seventeenth since this work was authorized, and the Government has nothing to show for the expenditure except the foundations for the carriage, completed about two years ago.

The report of the next year—1911—pages 5 and 6, states:

There have been no development, so far as the board is informed, in connection with the Emery gun carriage, and the board can only repeat what has been said heretofore in regard to the history of this carriage. All the work on the Emery design has been done under direct legislative enactment, and the only part to be taken by the board in the matter is that when completed, if ever, the carriage is to be tested under its supervision. * * * The Government still has nothing to show for the expenditure of 95 per cent of the appropriations except the foundations for the carriage which were put in three years ago in order to enable Mr. Emery to obtain an additional $5,000 as provided by the act of 1908, practically the first which required him to do anything in return for money paid him.

The report for 1912, page 6, says:

The second decade is drawing to a close since Mr. Emery first undertook the work of developing a suitable gun carriage. In this 20 years other designs have been developed, served their time in the coast defenses, and been superseded by more perfect appliances, while Mr. Emery's work is still uncompleted.

In the letter of transmission of this report from the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives under date of December 3, 1912, appears the following:

Attention is invited to the statement of the board regarding the Emery disappearing carriage, * * * and in this connection Maj. Gen. Wood, president of the board, in submitting the report, remarks as follows: "The possibility of any useful result being obtained from Mr. Emery's 20 years' experimentation does not warrant continuation of his contract and possible payment to him of a further $13,500." The matter is therefore submitted to Congress with a view to action looking to the cancellation of the outstanding contract and the saving to the Government of at least a portion of the money heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

The report of the board for 1913, page 5, states:

Nothing has occurred in the last year that would indicate the eventual completion and delivery of this carriage. * * * Of the quarter million dollars appropriated there remain unexpended $13,531.51, but as some affirmative action on Mr. Emery's part is required to enable him to draw this money from the Treasury, it is likely to remain undisturbed unless Congress authorizes cancellation of the contract and allows the money to revert to the general funds of the Government.

In the endeavor to learn for myself something of the human side of this long story I was referred by various officials of the War Department to Grahame H. Powell, secretary to the Board of Ordnance and Fortification. He states that Mr. Emery made a great reputation about 25 years ago with a wonderful testing machine which he made for the Watertown Arsenal; later he made a duplicate for the Bureau of Standards. He was very friendly, indeed, with certain Members of Congress. Through this friendship he was able to get the various appropriations through Congress against the approval and advice of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification. Mr. Emery is still living, and just prior to my call had visited Mr. Powell. He now seeks an appropriation of $20,000, in addition to the unexpended balance.

Mr. Powell states that originally the alleged invention of Mr. Emery would have been highly useful and desirable for Army use, but that since 1893 many new devices have become perfected and are perfectly adequate for their purpose. Hence, even if Mr. Emery should now miraculously succeed in his endeavor, the result would be obsolete in type and of no especial value to the Army. The machines constructed for the purpose nowadays cost about $20,000. Mr. Emery's, as above shown, has cost nearly $250,000.

In view of this state of affairs, there seems every reason for the passage of an act covering back into the general fund of the Treasury the pittance which is still unexpended of the various appropriations made in behalf of Mr. Emery.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts called my attention to this proposed amendment. I did know of the history of the Emery gun carriage, and I quite agree with the gentleman's position. It is a splendid illustration of how Congress can lose its head and spend money unwisely. I did not know that there was any balance of the sums appropriated that had not been expended. Personally I see no reason why the amount should not be covered into the Treasury. It is a matter that I had not thought about until presented by the gentleman to me a while ago. This committee is in possession of as much information about it as I am. I assume that the gentleman from Massachusetts knows about the balances and knows whether they are obligated in any way. If they are, the amendment ought not to be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. They are not obligated.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then I see no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the way of appropriations made during a series of years for the Emery gun carriage were lobbied through Congress. I do not use the term in an offensive way at all. The War Department never was in favor of the proposition, but Congress decided to spend one-quarter of a million dollars to see whether a man had a device which, if it proved successful, he would have been willing to have sold to us or let us use it at a high royalty. We spent the money, and if it had proved successful he would have had the advantage. It has not proved successful, and for a series of years the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications—if that is the correct title—has annually recommended that this money be covered back into the Treasury and the contract canceled. I do not know whether it would be safe for Congress to cancel the contract. Nothing is being done about it, although I was told some time ago that Mr. Emery was again coming before Congress to ask for another appropriation, hoping that he might develop some new idea in connection with the plan, the old ones having all failed.

It seems to me it is quite advisable to end this thing by covering the money back into the Treasury. It ought to have taken an hour of discussion in the House to do it, in order to fasten in the minds of Members of the House the undesirability of going off halfcocked merely because some man pleads for a chance to make a pipe dream come true at the expense of the Government and for the benefit of the man, but to think coolly before we do it. That is not the only pipe-dream scheme that is floating around here now, somewhat similar in character.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating the past history of the Emery gun carriage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rose a moment ago on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts not for the purpose of saying what I did say, although I think it was proper, but for the purpose of commending the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] for taking these reports of the board, examining them, examining this whole subject matter in the War Department, and then bringing a concrete proposition before the House. Such work as that deserves the thanks of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, report the bill with the amendment to the House, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOUSTON, 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. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with certain instructions, which I send to the desk, and on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to recommit the bill with instructions, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARDNER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report an appropriation of $1,000,000 for purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, in lieu of $200,000.

The SPEAKER. On that motion the gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit with instructions.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 38, nays 219, answered "present" 2, not voting 164, as follows:

[Roll No. 86.]

YEAS—38.

Britten	Guernsey	Miller	Porter
Bryan	Helgesen	Mott	Powers
Danforth	Hinds	Murdock	Rogers
Deitrick	Hobson	Nolan, J. I.	Shreve
Donohoe	Johnson, Utah	Paige, Mass.	Sinnott
Falconer	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Sutherland
Farr	Kiess, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Ten Eyck
Gardner	Knowland, J. R.	Peters	Thomson, Ill.
Greene, Mass.	Kreider	Platt	
Greene, Vt.	La Follette	Plumley	

NAYS—219.

Abercrombie	Davis	Hull	Rubey
Adair	Dershem	Humphreys, Miss.	Russell
Adamson	Dickinson	Igoe	Saunders
Aiken	Difenderfer	Jacoway	Scott
Alexander	Dillon	Johnson, Ky.	Seldomridge
Allen	Dixon	Johnson, S. C.	Shackleford
Anderson	Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Sherley
Anthony	Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Drukker	Kettner	Sims
Austin	Dupré	Kinkaid	Slayden
Bailey	Eagle	Kirkpatrick	Slemp
Baker	Esch	Kitchin	Sloan
Baltz	Evans	Konop	Small
Barkley	Fergusson	Langley	Smith, Idaho
Bartlett	Fess	Lazaro	Smith, J. M. C.
Barton	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Smith, Md.
Beakes	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Smith, Minn.
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Lenroot	Smith, N. Y.
Bell, Cal.	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Smith, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Fordney	Lieb	Stafford
Blackmon	Foster	Lindbergh	Stanley
Booher	Francis	Linthicum	Stedman
Borchers	Frear	Lloyd	Stephens, Cal.
Borland	French	Lonergan	Stephens, Miss.
Brockson	Gard	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Nebr.
Browne, Wis.	Garner	McKellar	Stone
Browning	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Stout
Buchanan, Ill.	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin	Taggart
Buchanan, Tex.	Gill	Madden	Talcott, N. Y.
Bulkley	Godwin, N. C.	Maguire, Nebr.	Tavenner
Burke, S. Dak.	Goeke	Manahan	Taylor, Ark.
Burke, Wis.	Goldfogle	Mapes	Taylor, Colo.
Butler	Good	Mitchell	Temple
Byrnes, S. C.	Gordon	Moon	Thacher
Byrns, Tenn.	Goulden	Morgan, Okla.	Thomas
Calder	Gray	Morrison	Thompson, Okla.
Callaway	Green, Iowa	Moss, Ind.	Tribble
Campbell	Griest	Murray	Underhill
Candler, Miss.	Gudger	Neeley, Kans.	Vaughan
Caraway	Hamilton, Mich.	Neely, W. Va.	Vinson
Carlin	Hamlin	Norton	Vollmer
Carter	Hardy	Oldfield	Volstead
Casey	Haugen	Page, N. C.	Walters
Church	Hawley	Palmer	Watkins
Clancy	Hayden	Park	Watson
Claypool	Hayes	Parker, N. Y.	Weaver
Cline	Heflin	Phelan	Webb
Coady	Helm	Post	White
Connelly, Kans.	Henry	Quin	Williams
Cox	Hill	Ragsdale	Wingo
Cramton	Hinebaugh	Rainey	Witherspoon
Crisp	Holland	Raker	Woods
Cullop	Houston	Rauch	Young, N. Dak.
Curry	Howell	Reilly, Wis.	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Hughes, Ga.	Rouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Mann Talbott, Md.

NOT VOTING—164.

Ainey	Edwards	Kennedy, Conn.	Price
Aswell	Elder	Kennedy, Iowa	Prouty
Avis	Estopinal	Kent	Rayburn
Barchfeld	Fairchild	Key, Ohio	Reed
Barnhart	Faison	Kindel	Reilly, Conn.
Bartholdt	Ferris	Korbly	Riordan
Bathrick	Fitzgerald	Lafferty	Roberts, Mass.
Bowdle	FitzHenry	Langham	Roberts, Nev.
Brodbeck	Fowler	L'Engle	Rothermel
Broussard	Gallagher	Lesher	Rucker
Brown, N. Y.	Gallivan	Lever	Rupley
Brown, W. Va.	George	Lewis, Md.	Sabath
Bruckner	Gerry	Lewis, Pa.	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gillett	Lindquist	Sells
Burgess	Gilmore	Lobeck	Sisson
Burke, Pa.	Gittins	Loft	Smith, Saml. W.
Burnett	Glass	Logue	Sparkman
Cantor	Goodwin, Ark.	McAndrews	Steenerson
Cantrill	Gorman	McClellan	Stephens, Tex.
Carew	Graham, Ill.	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Carr	Graham, Pa.	MacDonald	Stevens, N. H.
Cary	Gregg	Mahan	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Griffin	Maher	Sumners
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Martin	Switzer
Collier	Hamilton, N. Y.	Metz	Taylor, Ala.
Connolly, Iowa	Harris	Mondell	Taylor, N. Y.
Conry	Harrison	Montague	Towner
Cooper	Hart	Moore	Townsend
Copley	Hay	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Crosser	Helvering	Morin	Tuttle
Dale	Hensley	Moss, W. Va.	Underwood
Decker	Howard	Mulkey	Vare
Dent	Hoxworth	Nelson	Walker
Dies	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Wallin
Donovan	Hulings	Oglesby	Walsh
Dooling	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Hair	Whaley
Doremus	Jones	O'Shaunessy	Whitacre
Driscoll	Kahn	Padgett	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keating	Patten, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagan	Keister	Peterson	Winslow
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. CARY.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. DENT with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.

Mr. DIES with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. Moss of West Virginia.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. HARRISON with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

For the session:

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, because I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded present.

The name of Mr. MANN was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 9509, granting a pension to Daniel Kelaher, Sixty-third Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Also, the papers in the case of H. R. 3287, granting a pension to Mary Dowling, Sixty-third Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by Gov. Spry, of Utah, before the conference of western governors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by Gov. Spry, of Utah. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE BILL 3863.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to file an additional report (No. 818, pt. 2) from the Committee on Public Lands on Senate bill 3863.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), to disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are several items which I think there ought to be a chance to consider in the House, or at least to have them voted upon separately, and manifestly it can not be done to-night. There are three in reference to mileage; one in reference to the legislative reference bureau—I do not know that is so important; one in reference to the expense of opening the Panama Canal; one for an emergency clerical service in the Department of State, about which as yet we have no information; one in reference to gauging liquors in the Internal-Revenue Department, which amendments some Members want to have a chance to consider.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman if that is the increase of $292,000 for appointments in the Internal-Revenue Department——

Mr. MANN. No; it is the one in reference to the opium law.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the one.

Mr. MANN. Where they provide for an appropriation of two or three hundred thousand dollars——

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the one.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Regardless of the civil-service law.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the one I wanted to know whether the gentleman was inquiring about.

Mr. MANN. One is an amendment that increases by several hundred thousand dollars the cost of collecting the internal revenue and the other amendment is the decrease of several hundred thousand dollars of the cost of gauging spirits with a provision in reference to the rectifying of spirits, concerning which I think no one in the House knows anything about.

Mr. BARTLETT. The reason I asked about that one in reference to enforcing the antinarcotic law——

Mr. MANN. The Harrison law.

Mr. BARTLETT (continuing). The Harrison law—is that we had some hearings before the subcommittee on the deficiency bill and we were informed to-day that has been incorporated in the legislative bill. That is the reason I asked about it, because we had some investigation and hearings and we had some information. I do not know whether the Senate had or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] that the conferees will not be disposed to settle any of those large items without giving the House an opportunity to discuss them and vote on them. If we bring in any report it will be a report where the Senate has yielded or a partial report that will leave those questions open for the House to determine.

Mr. MANN. That item that the gentleman from Georgia refers to, which is Senate amendment No. 65, apparently makes no provision for anything except for the next fiscal year. It says:

Being for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, $292,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senate amendment was a deficiency appropriation. They applied to us for it, and we had some hearings upon it, but they ceased after they got it on the bill.

Mr. MANN. There is no deficiency in this item.

Mr. COX. May I ask if the Panama Canal item is the one for $160,000?

Mr. MANN. It is.

Mr. COX. That is the item that authorizes it to be turned over to the President?

Mr. MANN. It is.

Mr. COX. You asked in regard to 1, 2, and 18?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Of course, they all go together.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say he would not yield on it until the House had a chance to vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. All of these important amendments will be brought back to the House for the House to consider and vote on unless the Senate yields.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take the amendment the gentleman refers to—amendment No. 20—providing for a reference bureau. There are many Members of the House who would prefer to have that stand rather than to have it go out. The matter in controversy is whether it should be retained in the bill rather than eliminated.

Mr. MANN. We desire a separate vote on that proposition. It was stricken out in the House, but put in in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. It is in operation under an appropriation in the existing law, and it was a Senate amendment which was put in by the House by a vote on the floor of the House. The conferees on the part of the House did not agree to it, and brought in a partial report.

Mr. MANN. That was last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Thereupon a Member of the House made a motion that the House recede and concur.

Mr. MANN. That was last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And it is now in the law by vote of the House.

Mr. MANN. I understand. Now, as to that amendment, a number of the Members of the House would not want the Senate to recede from this amendment without a chance to vote for the amendment in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I am perfectly willing to bring it back.

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

The SPEAKER named the following conferees: Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, and Mr. GOOD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article that appeared in the New York Times on February 21, entitled "An analysis of the election returns of 1914."

The SPEAKER. What was it published in?

Mr. GOOD. In the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article from the New York Times analyzing the vote of 1914. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a poem sent by a person in my district on the subject of "The Flag."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a poem written by one of his constituents on the subject of "The Flag." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 24, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5433) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Glacier National Park in the Rocky Mountains south of the international boundary line in the State of Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1910, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1432), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11749) to create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1433), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14996) to purchase a post-office site and to build a post-office building in the city of Marion, N. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1435), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENRY, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) providing that the Congress of the United States shall participate in the celebration of the opening of The Dalles-Celilo Canal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1436), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16850) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles A. Lester, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1437), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 21539) covering back into the Treasury the unexpended balances of certain appropriations heretofore made for the development and manufacture of the Emery disappearing gun carriage; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 21540) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by the act of March 2, 1901, and as further amended by the act of April 12, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE: Resolution (H. Res. 743) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to forward to the House of Representatives information with respect to the steamship *Evelyn* and insurance upon her cargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 744) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives full information as to the operations of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution (H. Res. 745) authorizing additional clerical assistance for the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the extension of Federal aid to the reclamation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of Oregon State Legislature, favoring the removal of limitations on the amount of money which may be deposited in postal savings banks, and to use said money as basis for rural credits; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring placing veterans of the United States Army who fought in the Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 21541) for the relief of the estate of Lorence Banniza; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 21542) granting a pension to Elizabeth White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 21543) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21544) granting an increase of pension to David L. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 21545) for the relief of the Provident Mutual Building Loan Association, of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against shipment abroad of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Communications protesting against any legislation to prohibit the Government printing return requests on stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Klamath Falls, Oreg., against any change in the boundary of Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of chamber of commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., advocating the formation of a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of chamber of commerce, Santa Ana, Cal., favoring establishment by the Reclamation Service of an irrigation project to reclaim 100,000 acres of land near Victorville, Cal.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Bay Cities School Board Association, Berkeley, Cal., favoring national aid to States for vocational training; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of E. G. Buerkle, Whittier, Cal., also San Francisco Scheutzen Verein, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROCKSON: Petition of citizens of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the bill for the segregation of the colored people in separate cars in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of W. D. Wright, John Jamison, and others, of Warsaw, and J. Boyd Stephenson, M. G. Smith, and others, of Weyauwega, Wis., protesting against House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Llewellyn, C. F. Kickhoefer, and others, of Marion, Wis., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of Nicholas Meyer and 115 other citizens of New York City and American citizens of Paterson, N. J., protesting against export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against circulating the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Mrs. E. G. Strassburger, Mrs. William F. Hilgen, and 135 other lady citizens of the city of Cedarburg, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of H. J. Res. 377, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of Woman's Missionary Society (Tenn.) Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring amendment to abolish polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Empire State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of H. F. Shive and others of Palm Beach County, Fla., against S. 6865, providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Holy Name Society of the Church of St. Mary of the Immaculate Conception, protesting against the publication of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against abridgment of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of National Order of Antipolygamy Crusaders, of Columbia, Pa., favoring prohibition of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry residents of Pennsylvania, against legislation abridging freedom of the press, from Albion, Allentown, Athens, Catasauqua, Cementon, Conshohocken, Egypt, Fullerton, Harrisburg, Jamestown, Lottsville, Marietta, Northumberland, Oil City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Pottsville, Sayre, Scranton, Shamokin, Somerfield, Sunbury, Weatherly, and Wormleysburg; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of citizens of California, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of Commercial Club, of Grant, Nebr., favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of International Association of Mechanics, favoring changes in House bill 17894; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of William Ahrens, of East Granby, Conn., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of St. Benedict's Church, Shawnee, Okla., favoring protection of the clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Catholic Church of Coalgate, Okla., favoring protection for Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Urban A. Walter, Denver, Colo., against the biennial-promotion proposal in the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles,, Cal., favoring formation of a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Rev. Harry Marschner and 695 other citizens, of Erie, Pa.; St. Paul's United Evangelical Church, St. Luke's Evangelical Church, St. Benedict's Society, August Swartz, William Muellerstein, Alfred Stein, and John E. Wickles, of Erie, Pa.; O. H. Andrews, of Corry, Pa.; and Charles Oldach and others, of North East, Pa., favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of 17 citizens of Coldwater, Mich., protesting against House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Davenport (Iowa) Commercial Club, favoring legislation for flood protection and reclamation along the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of American citizens in Paterson, N. J., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 24, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are very few Senators in the Chamber, and I think we ought to have a quorum before beginning the day's duties. 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	Gronna	Nelson	Swanson
Bankhead	Hollis	Norris	Thomas
Brandegee	James	Overman	Thompson
Bryan	Jones	Page	Tillman
Burleigh	Kern	Penrose	Townsend
Burton	Lane	Perkins	Vardaman
Catron	Lodge	Robinson	Weeks
Chamberlain	McCumber	Sheppard	Works
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smoot	
Gore	Myers	Sterling	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence from the city of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. He is absent on account of illness in his family. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of sickness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. POMERENE, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. SHIELDS answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMOOT. I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], on account of sickness.

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHAFROTH, and Mr. DILLINGHAM entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.