PRESIDENT URGES NEW LEGISLATION IN HOT MESSAGE

BIG CORPORATIONS SCORED BECAUSE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD GOVERNMENT.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY LAW

Chief Executive Declares Act Needs Immediate Revision—Righting of Injunction Abuses Is Urged.

To the Senate and House of Representatives: The recent decision of the supreme court in regard to the employers' liability act, the experience of the Interstate commerce commission and of the department of justice in enforcing the interstate commerce and anti-trust laws, and the grave discontent which exists toward the law and its administration among many of certain classes of our great corporations, render it desirable that there should be additional legislation as regards certain of the relations between labor and capital and between the great corporations and the public.

The supreme court has decided the employers' liability law to be unconstitutional because its terms apply to employes engaged in both interstate commerce as well as to employes engaged in interstate commerce. By a substantial majority the court has decided that congress has power to deal with the question in so far as interstate commerce is concerned.

As regards the employers' liability law, I advocate its immediate reenactment, limiting its scope so that it shall apply only to the class of cases as to which the court says it can constitutionally apply, but strengthening its provisions within that scope. Interstate employment being thus covered by an adequate employers' law, the field of intrastate employment will be left to the action of the several states. With this clear definition of responsibility the states will undoubtedly give to the performance of their duty within their field the consideration the importance of the subject demands.

Compensation for Employes Hurt in Government Service

I also very urgently advise that a comprehensive act be passed providing for compensation by the government to all employes injured in the government service. Under the present law an injured workman in the employment of the government has to carry the whole heavy burden of the accident falls on the helpless man, his wife and his little children. This is an outrage. It is a matter of humanity to the nation that there should not be on our soil a single needy widow to meet and partially to atone for cruel disfigurement or death. It is a shame a man through no fault of his own while faithfully serving the public in any proper prominent industrial country in the world could such error occur, for almost all civilized nations have enacted legislation embodying the complete recognition of the principle that the entire trade risk for industrial accidents ought to be assumed by the employer, rather than by the workman, in the employment of the government, nor should there be the requirement that in order to secure recovery negligence in some form on the part of the government should be shown. Our proposition is not that there be a right of action upon the government employe, but that secure liability shall exist against injuries received in the course of his employment. The burden of the industrial risk should be placed upon the government. Each injured workman is entitled to his wages, so he also is entitled to indemnity for the injuries sustained in the service of the public. The rates of compensation and the regulations for its payment should be specified in the law, and the machinery for determining the amount to be awarded in each case be provided in such manner that the employe may be properly represented without expense to him. In my opinion the compensation should be paid automatically, while the application of the law in the first instance should be vested in the department of commerce and labor. The law should apply to all laborers, mechanics, and other employes working for the government of the United States, including those in the service of the Panama canal commission and of the insular governments.

The same broad principle which should apply to the government should ultimately be made applicable to all private employers. Where the nation has the power it should enact laws to this effect. Where the states alone have the power they should enact the laws. It is an obscene fact that an employers' liability law does not really mean anything except to lawyers. It merely throws upon the employer the burden of every insurance against injuries which are sure to occur. It requires him either to bear or to distribute through insurance the loss which can readily be borne when distributed, but which is undoubtedly a most unjustly frightful hardship upon the unfortunate victim of accident. Unless the injured men were always freely and fairly adjusted, they would always receive an allowance as against the risk of loss. In theory, if employes were all experienced and careful men, they would employ that part of their wages which is required because of the risk of injury to secure themselves by insurance. But as a matter of fact, it is far more practical to attempt that this work be done by the great body of employers and employes. Finally, it is almost certain that it will be done in effect by the employer, and will ultimately impose no real additional burden upon him.

There is a special bill to which I call your attention. Secretary Taft has urgently recommended the immediate passage of a law providing for compensation for employes of the government injured in the work of the Isthmian canal, and that bill has my approval. I hope that purpose can be carried out. I earnestly hope that it will be done, and that a special bill be passed covering the case of Mr. Jackson, a man who was injured nearly two years ago while doing his duty, and who is now threatened to support his wife and his three little boys.

Action Urged to Right Abuses of the Injunction

I again call your attention to the need in some section in connection with the abuses of injunctions to the end that as regards the rights and wrongs of labor and capital, from which the public suffers most, the whole subject is covered in admirable fashion by the report of the Anthracite Coal Strike commission, which report should serve as a chart for the guidance of both legislative and executive officers. As regards injunctions, I can do little but repeat what I said to you in my last message to the congress. Even though it were possible to abolish the use of injunctions it would be unwise to abolish the use of the powers of injunction. It is worth very little that the courts may maintain their exact dignity and to order that they may in effective manner prevent disorder and violence. The judge who takes summary action to punish one who, when the need arises, uses it fearlessly, confers the greatest service upon our people, and his prominent usefulness as a public servant should be universally recognized. But there is no question in my mind that it has sometimes been used heedlessly and unjustly, and that some of the injunctions issued have been grave and needlessly irreparable wrongs upon those enjoined.

It is a wise thing to use the injunction to prevent the entirely proper and legitimate action of labor organizations in their struggles for industrial betterment, but under the guise of protecting property rights unwarrantable invasion is made of fundamental rights of the individual. Trial by jury should be granted in all cases of indirect contempt, and the necessity of organized effort on the part of laboring men and yet for an injunctive process to forbid peaceably actions, to a large extent by the very men which they are organized and upon which their success depends, and then to punish disobedience of the injunction by imprisonment for the violation of an injunction must, to make the order effective, be instantaneous and drastic without the intervention of a jury makes its issuance in these cases entirely too powerful a weapon, and in itself furnishes a reason why the power should be carefully hedged with safeguards to protect individuals against being punished from the arbitrary exercise of rights. Reasonable notice should be given the adverse party.

This matter is of such importance and I can not too urgently recommend to the congress legislative consideration to the end that some way of remedying the present indignation against them among large numbers of our citizens will lend to make it less existent because of a revolt against the wise use of the process of injunction. The difficulty is to secure legislation which will do away with the present abuses while preserving the power to punish for disobedience of such orders as are necessary and proper. I am sure that congress can devise a way to deal with it if the effort should be made in the right spirit. I submit some further recommendations in regard to the same and kindred matters and conditions within the sphere of federal authority in a very recent decision of the supreme court of the United States rendered since this message was written, in the case of Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. et al. against the United States, the court, seemingly of far-reaching import and effect, has declared unconstitutional and has modified the previously entertained view of the scope of the act of congress in the premises to such a degree as to render the statute incapable of consideration of the opinions therein filed before it is possible definitely to decide in what way to suggest amendments to your attention.

Asks Federal Supervision of Interstate Carriers.

Not only should there be action in certain lines of improper conduct, but there should also be such action on laws designed to secure reasonable methods of business operation engaged in interstate commerce, although the need for such action is often carefully disguised in specious arguments against interference with evils which all honest men condemn. Mr. Henry White recently illustrated the methods of the Le Chatelier of the Santa Fe and shows the latter falsity of the position taken by the attorney and plea of the Standard Oil being equally applicable to railroads.

Department of Justice, Office of the United States Attorney, District of Oregon.

Portland, January 11, 1908.

"The President, Washington, D. C.

"Dear Mr. President: I understand that Mr. Roland Boyden, attorney for the Santa Fe Railway system, has commented with some severity upon the attitude toward the payment of rebates by certain interstate railroads and that he has declared that he does not believe I knew anything about any rebates being granted by the Santa Fe Railway system, and that I have declared that no rebates were ever granted. These and other cases may in any given case justify an advance in the rates if such advance is found to be permitted and approved. But there may be, and probably are, cases where the rate is not true, and our law should be so framed that the government, as the representative of the whole people, can protect the individual against unlawful exaction for the use of the highways. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been given the power to make a physical valuation of railroads, and I trust that this power will be given necessary. In some form the federal government should have supervision over the financial operations of our interstate railroads. In no other way can we put a stop to the secret control by owners of those properties and the public discrimination which is inseparable from an inflated capitalization based upon fictitious values and has become, in effect, its existence must be recognized in any proper system, but it is then often absolutely necessary to take action for the thousands of innocent stockholders as well as the general public. The railroads are the most conspicuous offenders in this matter, but many other corporations are also offenders. Such wrongs should be undone, but they can be prevented only by wise legislation. When combinations of interstate railways have been effected by the federal government, then the people's representatives in congress should have the power to forbid the issuance of stock and bonds save in the manner approved by the federal government, and then the government makes such action that the railroads shall issue no stock and bond issue go into the improvement of the property, or the acquisition thereof of some individual or syndicate, when, however it becomes necessary to take account in the regulative action of the government of the physical value of one of those properties, the amount of stock and bonds which will be eliminated from consideration in fixing the basis upon which dividends may be computed will undoubtedly certainly which legal to them this specific amount of stock and bonds will count very much to the financial stress of the railroad in question.

Would Permit Pooling of Railroad Interests

In this connection I desire to repeat my recommendation that railways be prohibited by law from entering into any contract the purpose of conferring about and agreeing upon rates, or from pooling their earnings affecting interstate business in which they are competitors. The act to regulate commerce defend all the abuses committed by railroads in the very earliest days of railroad legislation, and should be amended so as to make existing laws adequate to protect individuals against being punished from the arbitrary exercise of rights. Reasonable notice should be given the adverse party.

This matter is of such importance and I can not too urgently recommend to the congress legislative consideration to the subject. If some way of remedying the present indignation against them among large numbers of our citizens will lend to make it less existent because of a revolt against the wise use of the process of injunction. The difficulty is to secure legislation which will do away with the present abuses while preserving the power to punish for disobedience of such orders as are necessary and proper. I am sure that congress can devise a way to deal with it if the effort should be made in the right spirit. I submit some further recommendations in regard to the same and kindred matters and conditions within the sphere of federal authority in a very recent decision of the supreme court of the United States rendered since this message was written, in the case of Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. et al. against the United States, the court, seemingly of far-reaching import and effect, has declared unconstitutional and has modified the previously entertained view of the scope of the act of congress in the premises to such a degree as to render the statute incapable of consideration of the opinions therein filed before it is possible definitely to decide in what way to suggest amendments to your attention.

Asks Federal Supervision of Interstate Carriers.

Not only should there be action in certain lines of improper conduct, but there should also be such action on laws designed to secure reasonable methods of business operation engaged in interstate commerce, although the need for such action is often carefully disguised in specious arguments against interference with evils which all honest men condemn. Mr. Henry White recently illustrated the methods of the Le Chatelier of the Santa Fe and shows the utter falsity of the position taken by the attorney and plea of the Standard Oil being equally applicable to railroads.

Department of Justice, Office of the United States Attorney, District of Oregon.

Portland, January 11, 1908.

"The President, Washington, D. C.

"Dear Mr. President: I understand that Mr. Roland Boyden, attorney for the Santa Fe Railway system, has commented with some severity upon the attitude toward the payment of rebates by certain interstate railroads and that he has declared that he does not believe I knew anything about any rebates being granted by the Santa Fe Railway system, and that I have declared that no rebates were ever granted. These and other cases may in any given case justify an advance in the rates if such advance is found to be permitted and approved. But there may be, and probably are, cases where the rate is not true, and our law should be so framed that the government, as the representative of the whole people, can protect the individual against unlawful exaction for the use of the highways. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been given the power to make a physical valuation of railroads, and I trust that this power will be given necessary. In some form the federal government should have supervision over the financial operations of our interstate railroads. In no other way can we put a stop to the secret control by owners of those properties and the public discrimination which is inseparable from an inflated capitalization based upon fictitious values and has become, in effect, its existence must be recognized in any proper system, but it is then often absolutely necessary to take action for the thousands of innocent stockholders as well as the general public. The railroads are the most conspicuous offenders in this matter, but many other corporations are also offenders. Such wrongs should be undone, but they can be prevented only by wise legislation. When combinations of interstate railways have been effected by the federal government, then the people's representatives in congress should have the power to forbid the issuance of stock and bonds save in the manner approved by the federal government, and then the government makes such action that the railroads shall issue no stock and bond issue go into the improvement of the property, or the acquisition thereof of some individual or syndicate, when, however it becomes necessary to take account in the regulative action of the government of the physical value of one of those properties, the amount of stock and bonds which will be eliminated from consideration in fixing the basis upon which dividends may be computed will undoubtedly certainly which legal to them this specific amount of stock and bonds will count very much to the financial stress of the railroad in question.

Would Permit Pooling of Railroad Interests

In this connection I desire to repeat my recommendation that railways be prohibited by law from entering into any contract the purpose of conferring about and agreeing upon rates, or from pooling their earnings affecting interstate business in which they are competitors. The act to regulate commerce defend all the abuses committed by railroads in the very earliest days of railroad legislation, and should be amended so as to make existing laws adequate to protect individuals against being punished from the arbitrary exercise of rights. Reasonable notice should be given the adverse party.

This matter is of such importance and I can not too urgently recommend to the congress legislative consideration to the subject. If some way of remedying the present indignation against them among large numbers of our citizens will lend to make it less existent because of a revolt against the wise use of the process of injunction. The difficulty is to secure legislation which will do away with the present abuses while preserving the power to punish for disobedience of such orders as are necessary and proper. I am sure that congress can devise a way to deal with it if the effort should be made in the right spirit. I submit some further recommendations in regard to the same and kindred matters and conditions within the sphere of federal authority in a very recent decision of the supreme court of the United States rendered since this message was written, in the case of Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. et al. against the United States, the court, seemingly of far-reaching import and effect,