

# BATTLE ROYAL ON SHIP SUBSIDY

## DEMOCRATS FINALLY KILL THE BILL

The house passed the ship subsidy bill Friday, March 1, by a vote of 155 to 144, eleven republicans voting with the democrats against the bill on the final ballot. Referring to what it calls "the battle royal on ship subsidy," the Associated Press says:

"It has been years since the house was the scene of so royal a battle between the two great parties as it witnessed there today over the ship subsidy bill. The bill was passed, but not until after it had been once defeated, and this fact in itself shows how close the alignment was. When the first vote disclosed a majority against the measure the democrats and their republican allies made the house ring with their cheers. There were several roll calls before the final favorable result was secured. The vote on the Littauer substitute was defeated on the first vote—ayes 154, nays 161.

"The democrats could not retain their lead, however, for on a vote to lay on the table a motion to reconsider the opponents of the ship subsidy were defeated—156 to 159—and the vote to reconsider the first vote was adopted—164 to 154.

"Immediately after the first ballot desertions began and on the final vote to pass the bill as amended the work done by the republican leaders during the battle was made manifest. The bill was passed—155 to 144.

"The following republicans voted with the democrats in opposition: Burton of Ohio, Campbell of Kansas, Chapman of Illinois, Cooper of Wisconsin, Darragh of Michigan, Davidson of Wisconsin, Davis of Minnesota, Fordney of Michigan, Foster of Vermont, Fulkerson of Missouri, Gillham of Indiana, Graff of Illinois, Gronna of North Dakota, Hamilton of Michigan, Hinshaw of Nebraska, Holliday of Indiana, Jenkins of Wisconsin, Kinkaid of Nebraska, Knopf of Illinois, C. B. Landis of Indiana, Fred Landis of Indiana, Lawrence of Massachusetts, Lowen of Illinois, McCarthy of Nebraska, McGavin of Illinois, McKinney of Illinois, Mann of Illinois, Marshall of North Dakota, Miller of Kansas, Mouser of Ohio, Murdock of Kansas, Nelson of Wisconsin, Perkins of New York, Stafford of Wisconsin, Steenerson of Minnesota, Stevens of Minnesota, Volstead of Minnesota, Webber of Ohio, Weems of Ohio, Wilson of Illinois, Woodyard of West Virginia.

"Fifty-two republicans voted with the democrats on the first roll call. On the motion of Mr. Williams to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, fifty republicans voted with the democrats. On the vote to adopt the substitute there were forty-three republican 'insurgents,' and on its final passage there were forty-one.

"Only four steamship lines are to be subsidized under the measure in the form finally agreed upon, and all of these are to sail for South American ports. One of the lines will be from the Atlantic coast to Brazil, a second from the Atlantic coast to Argentina, the third between the Gulf of Mexico and Brazil. The fourth line will be from the Pacific coast to Panama, Peru and Chile. The annual subsidy for each of these lines is to be \$300,000 for a monthly mail service, or \$600,000 for a fortnightly service, excepting the Argentine line, which is to have \$400,000 for a monthly service, or \$800,000 for a fortnightly service.

"No American cities are named as ports from which any of the lines are to start, and the bill is so worded that the line in the Pacific to South America can touch at any number of ports in the United States. The same is true of the Atlantic lines. The bill provides that vessels profiting by the subvention must have a speed of not less than sixteen knots. It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the house that no ships now engaged in the South American trade can make any such speed.

"An amendment by Mr. Sulzer requiring ships to stop at Mexican Pacific ports, which developed the fact that several members of the house do not know the names of Mexican ports, was next offered. By this time the interest in the bill was intense. The galleries were crowded and the leaders on both sides of the chamber were rallying their forces for the final battle.

"It was near 3 o'clock and there was still pending Mr. Fordney's amendment substituting a tonnage tax measure. The advocates of the Littauer bill did not desire to vote on that proposition, and they began to filibuster by forcing a vote on the Sulzer amendment, which was overwhelmingly defeated.

"Tellers were demanded by Mr. Littauer to

kill time, notwithstanding the chorus of 'noes' that went up from the democrats. When the count was finally taken there was found to be only one vote for the provision. The vote was slow in the extreme. The democrats became highly indignant. Mr. Sulzer rose to have the vote by tellers abandoned, but Mr. Currier of New Hampshire, in the chair, held that the vote could not be interrupted and the farce was continued until 3 o'clock arrived, when the regular order was demanded.

"The bill was then reported from the committee of the whole to the house and much to the chagrin of the supporters of the Littauer bill, Speaker Cannon held that there must still be a vote on the Fordney substitute.

### THOUGHT BILL WAS KILLED

"The result was unfavorable to that measure, and a ballot on the Littauer substitute was immediately announced. The ayes and nays were ordered and the vote as announced showed the bill defeated—ayes 154, nays 161.

"Mr. Littauer moved to reconsider. Mr. Williams of Mississippi, the minority leader, moved to lay the motion on the table. Then the republican leaders determined to undo the former action and pass the bill if possible. The motion to lay on the table was defeated 156 to 159. The republicans had won victory in the very jaws of defeat.

"Again the ayes and nays were called this time on the motion of Mr. Littauer to reconsider the first vote and the house decided to reconsider by a vote of 164 to 154.

"Mr. Littauer then moved that the substitute to the senate bill be agreed to and the substitute was adopted—ayes 162, nays 150. The third reading of the bill was authorized—ayes 161, nays 151, and then on its final passage there was ayes 155, nays 144.

"Mr. Williams realized that it would be useless to continue the contest, and the motion to reconsider and the motion to lay on the table were perfunctorily agreed to."

The ship subsidy bill after leaving the house met with a filibuster on the part of the senate democrats. They adopted a plan of talking the bill to death. The speakers on the bill were interrupted frequently to permit the passage of minor bills, the adoption of conference reports and the transaction of other business incidental to the closing hours of the session. Senators Carmack, Dubois, Overman, Newlands, and Tillman made speeches for the purpose of killing the bill. Both houses remained in session during Sunday and about midnight took a recess until 9:30 o'clock Monday morning. The following is taken from the report of the Associated Press:

Never before has the senate appeared to relish so much an attempt to kill legislation by filibustering methods. Mr. Carmack, director of the minority movement against the bill, at no time tried to hide the fact that his effort was a filibuster pure and simple. He came into the open by addressing himself principally to the term "filibusters" which Mr. Gallinger only yesterday applied to the democratic senators who have undertaken to defeat the measure.

First Mr. Carmack devoted himself to an endorsement of Webster's dictionary as an authority on orthography and definition and said if the senate had any doubt that this work was an authority, he would bring it in and ask that passages from it be read from the desk.

After reading Webster's definition of "filibusterer" with its varying uses and synonyms, Mr. Carmack said that the remark of Mr. Gallinger had branded him as a "marauder, a pillager, a buccannier, a sea robber, a freebooter and a pirate upon the seas," in fact, he said, "I have been accused of almost everything except appendicitis. So branded I am to be retired from this body and sent to my home for I cannot defend myself by attacking the character or the credibility of the senator from New Hampshire. I cannot discredit him truthfully and therefore cannot discredit him at all." When he had spoken for about forty-five minutes with the obvious purpose of killing time, Mr. Carmack looked at his watch, and remarked: "Well, I see I must be hurrying along."

At this the senators on the floor shouted their amusement.

To give Mr. Carmack a rest, Mr. Dubois asked to be permitted to read from a very interesting document on the subject of ship subsidy and Mr. Spooner protested that as Mr. Carmack was in so great a hurry to conclude it would not be fair to interrupt him. The Tennessee senator, however, said he was sure that any contribution from Mr. Dubois would be valuable and he should be

glad to permit it to be read and incorporated in the body of his remarks. Mr. Dubois then read at length and when he had concluded a very technical paragraph to which few senators paid any attention, Mr. Carmack asked that the last paragraph be repeated, as he regarded it of great importance. Laughter followed and as Mr. Dubois sat down Mr. Gallinger interrupted to reply, as said, to what he thought had been an unwarranted attack upon him.

At this juncture, a colloquy occurred between Mr. Gallinger and Mr. Carmack over the definition of the word "filibuster" as given by different dictionaries and the latter charged that Mr. Gallinger had simply been trying to "filibuster according to his own definition of the word."

Charging that the pending measure was for the purpose of "looting the treasury," Mr. Carmack referred to the bill as voting a "subvention" and Mr. McLaurin asked the difference between "subsidy" and "subvention." Mr. Carmack answered: "Subsidy by any other name smells as bad."

Mr. Carter added to the spirit of levity by interrupting the reading of letters from shipbuilders by Mr. Overman, who was giving Mr. Carmack a reprieve.

"I want to know," said Mr. Carter, "what, if any, dictionary is used in Tennessee, and what, if any standard of spelling exists and if it is uniformly applied?"

This gave Mr. Carmack an opening which he took advantage of to taunt Senators Carter and Gallinger with being parties to a filibuster. "Observing that my question embarrasses the senator," interjected Mr. Carter, "inasmuch as he probably is not willing to admit that the dictionary is unknown in that state, I will withdraw the question."

"If the senator wants a direct answer," said Mr. Carmack, "Tennessee stands by the constitution and Webster's dictionary."

After Senator Tillman has asked "How much steal?" there is in ship subsidy, Senator Frye rebuked the whole proceeding as unseemly and undignified. For the senate to hold a session on the Sabbath day, for the sole purpose of frivolous debate for the amusement of the galleries was about the most unseemly proceeding he had ever witnessed. While he spoke, Mr. Frye turned so as to face Senator Carmack who was seated. He at once arose and replied:

"If the senator refers to me, I will say that I am not responsible to him for my conduct and I shall conduct myself according to my own notions of propriety. If the senator from Maine does not like my manner he has my permission to leave the chamber and go where he can attend church, if he would prefer."

"I would much rather be in church," retorted Mr. Frye.

"If the senator wishes to take a recess until tomorrow morning I shall not interfere with it," suggested Mr. Carmack.

"The senator knows I cannot," was the reply. "Well," continued Mr. Carmack, "the senator is evidently much more concerned about the defeat of this bill than anything else."

Mr. Carmack then declined to yield further to Mr. Frye although the latter attempted to interrupt.

Shortly after this the incident was closed by the restoration of amity.

Senator Carmack expressed regret that the incident had occurred. He had spoken he said, on the impulse of the moment and withdrew what had been said. Senator Frye too expressed the same sentiment and explained that he had not meant to address the senator from Tennessee personally in his criticism.

At 5:30 p. m. the senate took a recess until 8:30 o'clock.

The filibuster against the ship subsidy bill was continued when the senate resumed its session at 8:30 p. m. Sunday. Senators Dubois and Carmack made an appeal to Senator Gallinger to withdraw the bill but he did not comply. The debate was interrupted by the passage of a resolution for the printing of a document on horses which brought out from Senator Carter the remark: "That's a horse on the democratic side."

This sally aroused the venerable Senator Pettus of Alabama, who remarked: "We accept the rebuke from the senator from Montana, because of his wisdom and long experience and we do not fail to recollect that he has the record for speaking for more than twenty hours to kill a river and harbor bill."

When on Monday morning it was plain that the democratic filibuster would succeed Mr. Gallinger (republican) withdrew the measure and the ship subsidy bill died so far as this session is concerned.