

H. R. 12292. An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 18383. An act to provide better sanitary conditions in composing rooms within the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 21239. An act to increase the limit of cost of the site of a Federal building at Oakland, Cal., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry-Farming Congress to be held at Denver, Colo., September 27 to October 8, inclusive, 1915, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m., Tuesday, February 16, 1915) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 16, 1915.

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

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

Bring us, O God, our heavenly Father, as a fitting preparation for the duties of the hour, into oneness with Thee, that we may think right, act right toward Thee and our fellow men, which is salvation. The kingdom of heaven now, with all its uplifting power, removes all doubt, all uncertainties, and makes life sublime.

"Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light."

Hear our prayer and help us to answer it. In the spirit of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 17869) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate has canceled his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 7555) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Suwanee River, in the State of Florida.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday. I think we need the day on appropriation bills. I understand the purpose of the Committee on Rules is to present a rule this morning and dispose of the shipping bill before adjournment to-night, but I think it is necessary to move along with the appropriation bills, and I therefore desire to ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow, and that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow be dispensed with. Is there objection;

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I believe the bill making appropriations to pay pensions is the unfinished business, and would naturally come up to-day unless displaced by order of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. I understand it will be displaced to-day; that is, if a majority is in favor of doing so, which I think is the case.

Mr. MANN. Well, if there is such a rush about appropriation bills, why not take up the pension appropriation bill and pass it to-day? That is a very important bill to the pensioners of the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an important piece of legislation, but the majority has determined to pass another bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the majority is determined to set aside the most important appropriation bill there is, we will have to wait until we see what is done before we dispense with Calendar Wednesday. For the present I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. Does the gentleman from Alabama want his other request put or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. If Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, I do not desire to make the other request.

### PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table three Senate pension bills—S. 6980, S. 7213, and S. 7402—the Senate having disagreed to the House amendments, and asked for a conference. I move that the conferees be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House three Senate pension bills, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to agree to the conference requested by the Senate on these three bills. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANGLEY.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, being in charge of the pension appropriation bill, which would naturally come up this morning as unfinished business, I do not desire to interfere with the purposes of the majority, although it is an important bill and I should like to go on with it in conformity with the general purpose of getting rid of the appropriation bills. But it having been determined in a Democratic caucus last night to consider other business, however much I may agree or disagree with the action on that matter, I do not feel that it would be my duty now to present a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union upon that bill. I want to make this statement in order that it may be known why I do not, being in charge of that bill, now make the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BARTLETT. In one moment; that is, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is ready to present a rule for the consideration of another bill.

Mr. HENRY. I am ready now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the special rule should be offered by the Committee on Rules and the House should not agree to that rule, would the gentleman then move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would. That would be my duty, as the gentleman understands, and I would undertake to carry it out.

Mr. MANN. I understood it, but I would like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows I would, and I would.

### PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 736 (H. Rept. 1410).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on Naval Affairs shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 5259 and the House shall proceed immediately to the consideration of same. There shall be not exceeding six hours' general debate on the bill, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE]. That it shall be in order to offer the following amendments only, which may be offered during the general debate and considered as pending, to wit: Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "with the approval of the President"; in line 5, page 2, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to"; at the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm



or individual, citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual party to such charter or lease shall violate the provisions of the same.

"The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901.

"The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders, shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

"The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

"Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

"Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

"Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

"The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

"The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

"Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

"At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

"Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

"Sec. 6. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed \$10,000,000, neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

"Sec. 7. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from the proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board: *And provided further*, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.

"Sec. 8. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall not issue any bonds in excess of \$40,000,000, or incur any liabilities other than stock issues in excess of \$10,000,000. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board; and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities

governing merchant vessels in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

"All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States heretofore made or published by authority of law shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall, as provided hereby, take the place of those now in existence.

"The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States, in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character, as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect, in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

"Sec. 9. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutula: *Provided*, That the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States, except as herein provided.

"Sec. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be \$6,000 per annum.

"Sec. 11. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

"Sec. 12. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use, and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace; and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace; and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided, upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

"Sec. 13. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily for use as naval auxiliaries of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

"Sec. 14. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

"Sec. 15. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of \$10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 7, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

"Sec. 16. That two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels.

"That the Secretary of the Navy shall in such leases provide for their cancellation whenever such vessels may be required for naval or military purposes.

"That all leases made under this section of the act shall be subject to all of the provisions of section 5 of this act relating to maximum rates and charges and terms and conditions of forfeiture.

"That when the vessels, land, piers, leases for land or piers, and other property held by the corporation are disposed of as herein provided the corporation herein provided for shall be dissolved and said shipping board abolished.

"Sec. 17. That sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not take effect until two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President."

At the conclusion of the general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the amendment and the bill and vote shall be had upon the final passage of the bill without other intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.



Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker—  
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I am entitled to an hour.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Before the debate begins, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice the last paragraph of the rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the "amendment," while the first paragraph of the rule provides for offering certain "amendments."

Mr. HENRY. It should be "amendments" in the last paragraph. I will ask that the letter "s" be added to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to amend by adding the letter "s."

Mr. HENRY. It is a typographical error.

Mr. MANN. In line 6, page 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to inquire whether the Speaker in construing this rule will hold that the bill is to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it so states somewhere in the rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. HENRY. I suggest that the construction of the rule will come up after it is adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course I do not want—

The SPEAKER. It is perfectly proper for the gentleman to make the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENRY. The rule reads that—

The House shall proceed to consider.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am perfectly willing to pretermitt the question.

The SPEAKER. Where is that provision?

Mr. HENRY. In line 3 of the first section.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion from the verbiage of this rule that it would be considered in the ordinary way.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I was going to suggest.

The SPEAKER. That is, that the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the reason I ask the question, because unless otherwise specifically provided for the rules of the House require that all bills making appropriations shall be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and it is to be presumed that if the committee intended that the bill should be considered in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union they would have so stated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is entirely correct about that.

Mr. HENRY. Of course I have no objection to it being modified to that extent.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman wishes to ask for that modification, he can do so; and if he does not want to do so, he does not have to.

Mr. HENRY. It makes no difference. I suppose gentlemen on the other side do not desire more than 20 minutes on this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Texas is mistaken. We would like to have a little more time than that.

Mr. HENRY. How much time would you like?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I really have requests for much more time than I have the face to ask for.

Mr. HENRY. I think the rule is so liberal that you should not ask much.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think we can get on with an hour on this side.

Mr. HENRY. I think 30 minutes on a side ought to be an abundance of time, and I suggest, if the gentleman is willing to take 30 minutes, that I will yield him 30 minutes of my hour; and I suggest that we agree that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman move the previous question at the end of the hour?

Mr. HENRY. I hardly think it is necessary to do that. I think the gentleman might agree that we should order the previous question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It will be impossible to secure unanimous consent to have the previous question ordered.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman to have an abundance of time; but it seems to me that 30 minutes on a side are sufficient. This matter has been thoroughly discussed.

Mr. MADDEN. Where?

Mr. HENRY. In various quarters.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The 30 minutes will be satisfactory, but I shall ask that the gentleman move the previous question at the close of the debate.

Mr. HENRY. I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered at the end of one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that at the end of one hour's debate on this rule the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I will object.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 126, answered "present" 4, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 65.]

YEAS—181.

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Igoe	Reilly, Conn.
Adair	Doremus	Jacoway	Reilly, Wis.
Adamson	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Rothermel
Alexander	Dupré	Johnson, S. C.	Rouse
Allen	Eagle	Keating	Ruby
Ashbrook	Estopinal	Kennedy, Conn.	Rucker
Aswell	Evans	Kirkpatrick	Russell
Bailey	Fergusson	Kitchin	Seldomridge
Baker	Ferris	Konop	Sherley
Baltz	Fields	Korbly	Sherwood
Barkley	FitzHenry	Lafferty	Sims
Beakes	Flood, Va.	Lazaro	Small
Bell, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Blackmon	Foster	Leshner	Smith, Tex.
Booher	Fowler	Lever	Stedman
Borland	Gallagher	Levy	Stephens, Miss.
Brodbeck	Garner	Lewis, Md.	Stephens, Nebr.
Brown, N. Y.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Bryan	Garrett, Tex.	Linthicum	Stone
Buchanan, Ill.	Gilmore	Lloyd	Stout
Bulkley	Glass	Lobeck	Stringer
Burke, Wis.	Goeke	Lomergan	Summers
Burnett	Goldfogle	McAndrews	Taggart
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKellar	Taylor, Ala.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goulden	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Ark.
Candler, Miss.	Graham, Ill.	Metz	Taylor, Colo.
Caraway	Gray	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Casey	Gregg	Moon	Thomas
Church	Griffin	Mulkey	Townsend
Clancy	Gudger	Murray	Tribble
Clark, Fla.	Hamlin	Neeley, Kans.	Underwood
Claypool	Hardy	Neely, W. Va.	Vaughan
Cline	Harris	Oldfield	Vinson
Coady	Harrison	Padgett	Vollmer
Collier	Hay	Page, N. C.	Walsh
Connelly, Kans.	Hayden	Palmer	Watkins
Cox	Heflin	Park	Watson
Crisp	Helm	Peterson	Weaver
Crosser	Helvering	Phelan	Webb
Cullopp	Henry	Post	Whitacre
Davenport	Holland	Pou	Williams
Decker	Houston	Quin	Wingo
Dershem	Howard	Rainey	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Raker	
Dixon	Hull	Rauch	
Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rayburn	

NAYS—126.

Anderson	Gallivan	La Follette	Porter
Anthony	Gardner	Langham	Powers
Austin	Gerry	Langley	Prouty
Barchfeld	Gillett	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Barton	Good	Lindbergh	Rogers
Bathrick	Gordon	Lindquist	Scott
Bell, Cal.	Green, Iowa	McGuire, Okla.	Sells
Borchers	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Shackleford
Britten	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Sinnot
Brockson	Guernsey	MacDonald	Sisson
Broussard	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Slemp
Browne, Wis.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Sloan
Browning	Haugen	Mapes	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hawley	Martin	Smith, Minn.
Butler	Helgesen	Miller	Smith, Saml. W.
Callaway	Hinds	Mondell	Stafford
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Moore	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Morgan, Okla.	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Morrison	Stevens, Minn.
Cranton	Hulings	Moss, Ind.	Stevens, N. H.
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.	Sutherland
Davis	Johnson, Utah	Mott	Switzer
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Murdock	Temple
Donohoe	Keister	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Norton	Towner
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Volstead
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, N. J.	Walters
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Fess	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Kinkaid	Platt	
French	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.			
Bartlett	Beall, Tex.	Dies	Logue
NOT VOTING—112.			
Aiken	Dooling	Kahn	Rupley
Ainey	Driscoll	Kettner	Sabath
Avis	Drukker	Key, Ohio	Saunders
Barnhart	Dunn	Kiess, Pa.	Scully
Bartholdt	Eagan	Kreider	Shreve
Bowdle	Edwards	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Brown, W. Va.	Elder	L'Engle	Smith, Idaho
Bruckner	Falson	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	Falconer	Loft	Sparkman
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	McClellan	Stanley
Burgess	Fitzgerald	McGillicuddy	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Francis	Mahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Calder	Gard	Maher	Tavener
Cantor	George	Manahan	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gill	Montague	Thacher
Carew	Gittins	Morgan, La.	Thompson, Okla.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Morin	Treadway
Carr	Gorman	Nolan, J. I.	Tuttle
Carter	Graham, Pa.	O'Brien	Underhill
Cary	Griest	Oglesby	Vare
Connolly, Iowa	Hamill	O'Hair	Walker
Conry	Hart	O'Shaunessy	Wallin
Copley	Hayes	Patten, N. Y.	Whaley
Dale	Hensley	Price	White
Danforth	Hill	Ragsdale	Wilson, Fla.
Deitrick	Hobson	Reed	Wilson, N. Y.
Dent	Hoxworth	Riordan	Winslow
Difenderfer	Jones	Roberts, Nev.	Woodruff

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. MCGILICUDDY with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. DALE with Mr. CONRY.

Mr. DENT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. THACHER with Mr. VARE.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. WALLIN.

On this vote:

Mr. SCULLY (for previous question) with Mr. J. I. NOLAN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for previous question) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for previous question) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for previous question) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for previous question) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. STANLEY (for previous question) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for previous question) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. UNDERHILL (for previous question) with Mr. HAYES (against).

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. FALCONER. No, sir; I was at the telephone booth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. GILL. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas. No, sir; I was in the cloak-room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I can say at the present time more than is contained in the rule. I think we all understand the rule. Its language is as plain as it can be, and we understand the object of it. There is no need of my taking up the time of the House, and therefore I shall for the present yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW].

Mr. POW. Mr. Speaker, next year is election year. It has been quite noticeable of late that the nearer we approach the coming election the greater becomes the abuse of the President. He is denounced by partisan press as only a criminal ought to be denounced. What has he done? Has he deserved all this partisan abuse? Has he deserved any of it? Let us see. He has urged the passage of several great reform measures. He urged tariff revision. He urged currency reform. He urged the measure defining more clearly our antitrust laws. He urged the trade-commission bill. All of these great measures have now become the law of the land.

There is one significant fact about the passage of these bills which should not be forgotten. While there is a large Democratic majority in this Chamber and a working majority in the other Chamber, all of the measures which the President has recommended would have passed both bodies if we had had no majority at all.

If our membership in this Chamber had been just half instead of two to one, we would nevertheless have passed all of the measures President Wilson has urged. Yet he is denounced as a dictator and political tyrant by the Republican press, and we who vote for these administration measures are called automations who sit here with no views or convictions of our own, simply carrying out the wishes of the President.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, in this day and time a man to be independent, to be credited with having convictions of his own, must vote against the President. No matter what your convictions are, if you vote with the President you are merely obeying orders. To be an independent American Representative, you must be against the President.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something more than the presidential will behind these measures. I can understand how his influence might affect a Democrat, but I can not understand why so many Republicans and Progressives support these measures unless there is real merit in them, and on every occasion we have received sufficient Republican or Progressive votes to pass every one of the measures if the two Chambers had been equally divided between two parties.

Mr. Speaker, we will hear the caucus held last night denounced. Why? We stood by the President.

The enemies of the President hoped we would break up in a row. If we had done that, our popularity among the President's enemies would have been great indeed. Oh, what splendid men we would have been if we had repudiated the President! For my part I do not want that kind of popularity. God knows if I thought the President was wrong I would not go with him. The trouble with me is I can not help thinking he is right upon these measures, and if I did not go with him under those circumstances I would not be fit to sit in this Chamber.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to what extent men will go to win a party victory.

Here is this man in the White House working, striving, for what—for some special interest? Oh, no; not that. There is not a political enemy of the President in this Chamber who will rise in his seat now and say that he believes any but the purest motives prompt Mr. Wilson in all he has done or is trying to do.

What will be the fate of this bill? Why is it Mr. Wilson wants us to pass it? Freight rates are prohibitively high and cargoes of American goods, the products of our farms and factories, await shipment. Those cargoes will not be sent abroad at all if this bill does not pass unless somebody pays a tremendous freight rate. The President says there is a very practical remedy—the passage of this bill. For my part I am proud of the chance to help, and I do not care the snap of my finger what anybody says. I believe the President is right, and when I vote with him I believe I am doing what is best for the American people.

The President has at his disposal the great army of Government patronage. Nobody has charged that he has offered to punish any man who has differed from him. He could use the patronage ax. It has been used, but that is not the Wilson way of doing things. He has influence which extends beyond his own party. He carries not only his own party but part of both the other parties, and he does it without threat of any kind.

It must be he is right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the secret of the President's success. He is trying to serve



the American people. And when the record of his administration is made up, thank God, it will not be passed upon by any partisan jury, but by free American voters.

Republicans who are willing to be unfair may talk about our secret caucus; you may denounce the President because he is not of your party; you may criticize your colleagues in this Chamber because we will not break with the President; but, after all, these measures will be passed upon by the jury of American voters, and the President and those who stand with him with perfect confidence await their verdict. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, this rule will be adopted by this House, although a majority of the membership of this House is against the rule. The bill to which the rule relates will be passed by this House before we adjourn to-night, although a majority of the membership of the House is against the bill. I make that deliberate statement, that if the majority of this House were free to record their convictions upon the merits of the bill, it would be defeated before we adjourn to-night. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] has just said that we will denounce the caucus and denounce this bill as the work of a secret caucus. You will hear no one on this side of the aisle denouncing this bill as the work of a secret caucus. You held a caucus last night, but you made only one slight amendment to the bill. This bill was not the work of a secret caucus, it was not the work of any committee of this House, it was not the work of the membership of this House. This bill, sir, is the product of the President of the United States [applause and cheers on the Democratic side], and your caucus was not held for the purpose of considering this bill, but to carry out the orders of the captain of your team. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when you will understand that whenever the captain of a team undertakes to order every move that shall be made by the members of the team, at the end of the season that team will always find itself the tail-end of the league. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

What is this proposition? A rule comes in this morning to discharge a committee that has never considered the bill and make that bill in order. The Committee on Rules undertakes further to attach as an amendment a proposition that has never been introduced in the House of Representatives. They have attached a proposition to the bill that has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, but which has never been considered by any committee in that body. Oh, you ought to be proud of your method of legislating.

The Washington Herald this morning undertakes to quote from a speech that the distinguished Speaker of this House made to the caucus last night. Mr. Speaker, you are reported as saying:

The President wants this bill—

And that is all you are considering—

The President wants this bill, and it is probably as good a bill as could be framed, even if we delayed matters. I am opposed to Government ownership, but this is an emergency measure. The House should do everything possible to expedite action and avoid an extra session. If there is an extra session the Democratic Party will be wiped off the face of the earth at the next election.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

For your judgment, sir, as to the result of an extra session, I have the profoundest respect. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the great complaint that our opponents have against this Congress and this administration has been that it has not shown the lack of efficiency that they predicted it would show, and for some reason or other they are utterly unable to get over that particular complaint. If the Democratic Party had shown the lack of efficiency and the lack of power to grasp the great public questions and emergencies of this administration, they would have denounced it with the time-honored and threadbare denunciation that they have used on the stump. But the fact that the Democratic majority in this House can work in harmony with the Democratic President and a Democratic administration to accomplish the great economic good of the American people seems to sit pretty ill upon their stomachs.

No attempt has been made to jam this bill through this House, and no attempt will be made to jam this bill through

this Congress. [Laughter on the Republican side.] This bill has been carefully considered [laughter on the Republican side]—yes; this bill has been given as careful consideration as any measure before the American Congress. It has attracted as widespread public attention, it has been debated by as many experts and as much light has been thrown on this economic measure as upon any measure that ever came before Congress, and it is simple in its characteristics. Except for the question of detail, the question is purely and simply whether the Government will establish the mercantile marine in the face of an emergency in this country. All else is a matter of machinery and detail.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Does not the bill provide that within two years after the cessation of the European war these ships shall all be disposed of, and we shall go out of the business entirely?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be explained by gentlemen who are more familiar with it than I, but I can say in the limited time that I have that the bill provides in effect that for two years the shipping board shall buy and acquire ships, charter and lease them under the shipping board, and at the end of two years after the cessation of the European war the ships shall be turned over to the permanent operating agency, which is the Navy Department itself. In brief, that is the bill. The ship board itself is a temporary matter, coming to an end altogether by proclamation of the President two years after the end of the European war. At that time these ships become auxiliaries of the Navy and are turned over to the Secretary of the Navy. The proposition is simple, and the American people are asking action on this matter. It has been debated now week after week, and practically month after month, while the business conditions in the country are waiting. Now, through the efficiency and team work and harmony of the Democratic caucus and of the Democratic administration this bill comes before this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be notified at the end of three minutes and to yield the two remaining minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] talks of efficiency of the party in power. Efficiency which depends on despotism and which takes all power from the majority of the membership of this House is not the kind of efficiency to be commended in a representative body. There is something just as important as efficiency, and that is liberty. I want to call attention to the quadruple gag in this resolution. Here are united four separate ways of gagging this House through the Committee on Rules. We may forget the caucus of last night and simply put our attention to the power of the Committee on Rules of the House. First, here is the discharge of a committee. The rules provide for the discharge of committees. Under the rules we have a system supposed to furnish a method for discharging a committee from consideration of a measure after a due time has elapsed. On the first day possible in this term, December 1, 1913, a resolution was introduced to discharge a committee under the rule. That motion and all others like it have never been considered in the Sixty-third Congress and never will be. During the entire two years of this Congress no motion to discharge a committee has been considered, yet the Rules Committee come in here and offers a rule to discharge the Committee on Naval Affairs from consideration of a bill, thus doing what a majority of this House has never been able to accomplish. Second, this rule limits debate to six hours on a proposition that the Senate has been considering for many weeks and which has never been considered by the House. Third, it forces an arbitrary rule on the House by which no amendment can be made to the measure. Fourth, it is the enactment of new legislation that has never been considered by a committee or by this House. The rule takes the four sections of the Weeks bill, but in the last provision provides that these four sections shall not go into effect until two years after the European war is over. These are the ways in which this rule proves that the majority of the membership is absolutely lacking in power and efficiency under customary methods of procedure. I want to support this measure, because I am in favor of the principle involved. I believe in the principle and policy of Government ownership of steamships, but these methods of dictating consideration are unjustifiable and can not be successfully defended any more than they have been by the chair-



man of the Committee on Rules, Mr. HENRY, and the others who have spoken here. These men are silent on the vital issues of legislative procedure in this rule, for such methods can not be defended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But if I were against it, I would have a better reason for being against it than the fact that the President of the United States is for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The opposition to the bill is largely partisan. I have seen the time in this body when if the Republican organization had proposed such a bill it would have had practically the unanimous Republican support. So much for the partisan side of this discussion. Now as to the proposed rule. As usual, whenever the House and the Senate have entangling parliamentary difficulties with a measure, the House is made the goat. Because there is no cloture rule whatever in the Senate, we must have complete cloture over here. Why should we be made to suffer for the sins of the Senate? Why should you Democrats gag us? Why should the majority here, when you have the President and are in complete control of both branches of the National Legislature—why should you apply the gag? Now, I am not shedding any crocodile tears over this procedure with the weeping Republicans. I have seen practically the same thing here before under Republican rule and in connection with shipping legislation. On January 14, 1907—if some of the Democratic chieftains care to do so they can hunt it up—a ship-subsidy bill, under the direction of the then Republican organization, was rammed through the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in one day. It had been introduced by a new member of the committee, appointed to the committee for that purpose, apparently. There had been no previous regular meeting of that committee upon that bill. There had been for weeks previous, however, private dinner parties, at which the bill was considered, under direction of the Republican leaders. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So this is no new procedure. It is an old one. But why continue it? Now, Mr. Speaker, as to this measure, if I did not believe that there was included in it a plain proposition that we shall observe complete neutrality in the taking over of vessels [laughter on the Republican side]—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I have read it over and over again.

A MEMBER. When?

Mr. MURDOCK. And, besides my satisfaction with the plain language of the provisions, I have in my mind what the Republicans could not have if they tried—full confidence in the President of the United States in reading those words as they are. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I wish the Democrats in this House would applaud more and gag less. I shall vote for the bill. The measure merits support, but it does not warrant the gag which accompanies its presentation here to-day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas to use some time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many speeches has the gentleman?

Mr. HENRY. Just one.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, this gag rule purposes to make in order the latest scheme of the President for reviving prostrate industry in the United States.

The President's appeals for the passage of his ship-purchase bill would be more convincing if any one of the other schemes he has proposed, one after another, had made good his promise that they would revive languishing industries throughout the country. What the country needs is more buying and selling at home, more confidence, more business among our own people; but nothing is proposed that will bring this condition.

And this bill is urged when it is doubtful if anyone believes it will become a law in this Congress. It is equally certain that few believe it should become a law at all, and a less number believe it would do any good if it does. It is safe to say that less than one-third of the American people or of the Members of this Congress believe in either the principle the bill involves or in the wisdom of its enactment into law. This gag rule purposes to force through the House, with whip and spur, the White House bill, with only a secret caucus indorsement. The bill in its present form has not even had the consideration of a committee at either end of the Capitol, and has had scant, if any, consideration at the Legislative Mansion, if I may borrow from the gentleman from Wyoming.

This bill launches the Government into the business of carrying private property for the private gain of a very few people. It put all of the people, by Government action, into competition

with those of our people who are common carriers upon the sea. The President says the scheme will revive our languishing industries. The President has been just as sure that each of the five other schemes he has purposed, one after another, would do the same thing.

The purchase of foreign ships belonging to belligerents now interned in our ports, as proposed, would launch the Government upon a dangerous and most expensive experiment. Even if there were no danger that with the purchase of belligerent ships we should become involved in a foreign war, there is still no justification for the passage of this bill.

The Government must purchase ships, the President says, to afford facilities for exporting American products. There may have been a few days, after the beginning of the war in Europe, when our commerce, outward and inward, languished, but that condition has long since passed.

Since the beginning of the war our exports have increased far beyond our normal outward commerce. The official reports, up to the 1st of January, 1915, show we have exported since the war began over \$9,000,000 worth of automobiles, \$41,000,000 worth of steel products, \$8,500,000 worth of woolen goods, \$33,000,000 worth of leather products, and \$17,000,000 worth of sugar. In the month of last December alone we exported 29,000,000 bushels of wheat, five times the amount exported in December of the year before, at the average price of \$1.25 per bushel, while in December of the year 1913 the average price was 98 cents per bushel. In last December we exported \$9,500,000 worth of flour, more than twice as much as in December, 1913. In December, 1914, we exported 5,250,000 bushels of oats, as against 30,000 bushels in December, 1913. The exports of oats in the month of December, 1914, was greater than for the entire year of 1913.

We exported in December, 1914, 4,500,000 bushels of corn, valued at \$3,500,000, as against 749,000 bushels, valued at \$560,000, in December, 1913. In December, 1914, we exported 6,500,000 pounds of fresh beef, as against 524,000 pounds in December, 1913. We exported as much fresh beef in December, 1914, as in the entire year of 1913. We have exported over \$200,000,000 worth of breadstuffs since the war in Europe began. We have exported over \$8,000,000 worth of horses. Last week cotton exports were 365,733 bales, a greater number of bales, it is claimed, than in any week last year; and the total exports of cotton for the year now totals almost 4,500,000 bales.

Mr. Speaker, all this vast outward commerce has brought better prices to the American producer, except cotton, than he has received for similar products under normal conditions of export in recent years.

But the President says that the cost of over-sea transportation is abnormal. The conditions of over-sea transportation are abnormal. Search and possible seizure, mines, war zones, congested foreign ports, difficulty in unloading in foreign ports, returning with light loads—all these abnormal conditions account for the abnormal increase in ocean freight rates and for whatever temporary difficulty cargoes find in leaving American ports.

From whom and from where does the demand come for this legislation? Certainly not from the farmers and manufacturers of the United States, for they are exporting in larger quantities than in the normal years of peace, and at better prices; and it follows that they have found sufficient facilities for carrying their larger exports, while the President and two members of his Cabinet have been taxing their own energies and the patience of the American people in an endeavor to secure the passage of this bill.

Why, the President within three days has received, if press reports are to be credited, from the mayor of New York an appeal to place an embargo on wheat, one of the chief products of the American farmer, and the reason for urging the embargo is that we have so enormously increased our wheat exports within the last few months that we have endangered the food supply of our own people.

The suggestion of an embargo on wheat has been made from many points in the eastern portion of the United States, while from the West there come demands to every Member of the Congress for an embargo on munitions of war, products of manufacture. Demands from every portion of our country come for an embargo on exports, and the answer of the administration is a proposition to embark the Government as a common carrier upon the seas of additional export products.

While the President has been taking his time and the time of the Congress in urging the purchase of five or six ships of commerce our increased exports have stimulated American ship-building, and private enterprise is now employed in building American ships for use in the common paths of the sea to the ports of the world with the export products of the American



people. There is an unprecedented boom in shipbuilding in the shipyards of the United States. All along the Atlantic seaboard shipyards are busy. Newport News, the Maryland Steel Co., the New York Shipbuilding Co., the Fall River Shipbuilding Co. are all working to the limit of their capacity filling orders for ships. To-day there is under construction at Newport News two 15,000-ton steel vessels and two 10,000-ton steel freighters.

Is it the purpose of the Government to stop this one demand for American labor by the purchase of interned ships of belligerents now in American ports? There are 66 of these now in the ports of our country—55 German ships and 11 Austrian ships. Private citizens do not buy these, because of the diplomatic and international questions involved and the danger of involving our country in the deplorable war now waging in Europe. The administration should profit by the example of American citizens and refrain from an act that may involve this country in foreign complications that may at any time result in war.

In the meantime the promises of the Baltimore platform and of the President for rural-credit legislation and to reduce the cost of living are unkept. Nothing is done for conservation, and the appeals of Porto Rico for better government are unheeded. We approach the last days of this Congress, and only one of the great supply bills for the Government has become a law, and the President insists on consuming all the time on another experiment not promised by him or his platform.

Why does the President insist on this Congress, that has been so nearly repudiated, spending its last days passing on this important measure? Does he fear to submit his new proposal for Government competition with private enterprise in our overseas commerce to Representatives lately chosen by the people?

The President requires a platform pledge from his party as a basis of his support for woman suffrage and for limiting foreign immigration. He has neither a platform pledge nor a favorable expression from the people for this proposal. Indeed, he seems to fear to submit this measure to the latest Representatives chosen by the American people, and insists upon this consideration by a Congress that has been all but repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to both the rule and the bill. I would avoid war by not provoking it. I would not purchase a quarrel by purchasing ships of belligerents in violation of the principles of international law to which we have subscribed. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] said that he had noticed where a baseball team started in by following every order of the captain they usually came out at the tail end when the season closed. Evidently the gentleman is a novice in the baseball business. I have seen a few baseball games myself, and my observation has been that where a team starts in by not following the orders of the captain at the beginning of the season they begin at the tail end and end there.

Mr. Speaker, we are following the lead of our captain, and you gentlemen will find that the American people follow his lead when he is this day undertaking to rescue them from the shipping pirates of the high seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Their attention is fixed on this body, and they know what is going on. The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MURDOCK, made a very sensible speech. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The only regret I have is that he did not commence making sensible speeches at the beginning of his career. Now, Mr. Speaker, the other gentleman from Kansas, Mr. CAMPBELL—and I presume I will not be accused of saying anything offensive when I refer to him as a “standpat Republican”—speaks of this “gag rule” that we are passing to-day. Let me say to him that the people, the voters, everywhere will justify this “gag rule” rescuing them from the monopoly of the Shipping Trust and the oppression that has been going on for more than a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more than that, Mr. Speaker, when the contest comes in this country, when the session of Congress is ended, when we appeal to the American people under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, and the people hear the voice of that other tribune of their rights, the Speaker of this House, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK [applause on the Democratic side], than whom no man here is better loved, and hear the voice of that other leader who goes to the other end of this Capitol, the Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, in support of the Wilson administration, they will record a verdict justifying our action.

Gentlemen, we welcome this contest. It is a struggle between this administration and the Shipping Trust. He is grappling with the shipping monopoly before the gaze of the world. The

Shipping Trust is going to destroy Wilson's administration or Wilson will destroy the Shipping Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe when the contest is over the Shipping Trust will fall. It will not be the Democratic administration fighting in behalf of the American people. Ah, gentlemen talk about Government ownership and this Government embarking in commercial enterprises! Do you not recall that in the very beginning of this Government we embarked in Government ownership and constructed highways leading from one part of this continent to the other—among them the Cumberland Road—in order that the commerce of the people might be carried over them? Under Jefferson, Jackson, Madison, and Monroe we constructed these highways for the benefit of the people, so they might interchange their commerce. And then the war came on and this Government again embarked in Government ownership and aided in the construction of the great transcontinental railways, and the people applauded and justified that governmental enterprise. And when we came to the Panama Canal, under Roosevelt again we embarked in Government ownership, and are now making a success of that enterprise. And recently we passed the Alaskan railroad bill. And if you call that Government ownership, all well and good. It will justify itself, and if it takes Government ownership, if this Government must go into a commercial enterprise, to destroy the shipping monopoly and trust on the high seas, I am ready to follow the leader and cast my vote in favor of it. What do you gentlemen propose? You propose a subsidy, to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers and put in the pockets of this monopoly, and at the end of that time the people will have no relief.

We propose something that is sound, that is sane, that will justify itself, and that will bring the relief we have promised the American people; and let me say that when this fight has been finished, after Woodrow Wilson has presented his record to the voters and you have taken the other side of the issue, in 1916 he will triumph, because he is fighting for the people's cause, and you are on the side of the special privileged class.

We welcome the conflict. Call on the battle. Shall the shipping pirates of the high seas win or the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson go down in loss of confidence and support? For my part, I will be standing by Wilson's side in this last death struggle against the world's greatest and most conscienceless monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those who favor the resolution will, when their names are called, answer “yea”; those opposed will answer “nay.”

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 139, answered “present” 2, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 66.]

YEAS—186.

Abercrombie	Coady	Gittins	Kirkpatrick
Adair	Collier	Glass	Konop
Adamson	Connelly, Kans.	Goeke	Korbly
Alken	Connolly, Iowa	Goldfogle	Lafferty
Alexander	Cox	Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro
Allen	Crisp	Goulden	Lee, Pa.
Ashbrook	Crosser	Gray	Leshner
Aswell	Cullopp	Gregg	Lever
Bailey	Decker	Griffin	Levy
Baker	Dershem	Gudger	Lewis, Md.
Baltz	Dickinson	Hamlin	Lieb
Barkley	Dixon	Hardy	Linthicum
Beakes	Donovan	Harris	Lloyd
Bell, Ga.	Doolittle	Harrison	Lobeck
Booher	Doremus	Hay	Loneragan
Borland	Doughton	Hayden	McAndrews
Bowdle	Driscoll	Heflin	McKellar
Brodbeck	Dupré	Helm	Maguire, Nebr.
Brown, N. Y.	Eagan	Helvering	Metz
Brumbaugh	Eagle	Henry	Mitchell
Bryan	Evans	Hensley	Moon
Buchanan, Ill.	Ferguson	Hill	Neeley, Kans.
Buchanan, Tex.	Ferris	Holland	Neely, W. Va.
Bulkley	Fields	Houston	O'Hair
Burke, Wis.	FitzHenry	Howard	Oldfield
Burnett	Flood, Va.	Hoxworth	Padgett
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer
Byrns, Tenn.	Foster	Hull	Park
Candler, Miss.	Fowler	Humphreys, Miss.	Peterson
Caraway	Francis	Igoe	Post
Casey	Gallagher	Jacoway	Pou
Church	Garner	Johnson, Ky.	Quin
Clancy	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, S. C.	Rainey
Clark, Fla.	Garrett, Tex.	Keating	Raker
Claypool	Gill	Kennedy, Conn.	Rauch
Cline	Gillmore	Key, Ohio	Rayburn



Reilly, Conn.	Small	Taggart	Vollmer
Reilly, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.	Talcott, N. Y.	Walsh
Rothermel	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ark.	Watkins
Rouse	Stedman	Taylor, Colo.	Watson
Rubey	Stephens, Miss.	Ten Eyck	Weaver
Rucker	Stephens, Nebr.	Thomas	Webb
Russell	Stephens, Tex.	Townsend	Williams
Seldomridge	Stone	Tribble	Wingo
Sherley	Stout	Underwood	Young, Tex.
Sherwood	Stringer	Vaughan	
Sims	Summers	Vinson	

## NAYS—139.

Anderson	Fordney	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley
Anthony	Frear	La Follette	Porter
Austin	French	Langham	Powers
Barchfeld	Gallivan	Langley	Roberts, Mass.
Bartlett	Gardner	Lenroot	Rogers
Barton	Gerry	Lindbergh	Scott
Bathrick	Gillett	Lindquist	Sells
Bell, Cal.	Good	McKenzie	Shackleford
Borchers	Gordon	McLaughlin	Sinnott
Britten	Green, Iowa	MacDonald	Sisson
Brockson	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Slayden
Broussard	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Slemp
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Mapes	Sloan
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Haugen	Mondell	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Hawley	Montague	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Helgesen	Moore	Stafford
Chandler, N. Y.	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Steenerson
Cooper	Hinebaugh	Morrison	Stevens, Cal.
Cramton	Howell	Moss, Ind.	Stevens, Minn.
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	Moss, W. Va.	Stevens, N. H.
Davenport	Hullings	Mott	Sutherland
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Murdock	Switzer
Deltrick	Johnson, Utah	Murray	Temple
Dies	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Dillon	Jones	Norton	Towner
Donohoe	Kelster	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Paige, Mass.	Walters
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, N. J.	Whitacre
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, N. Y.	White
Falconer	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Farr	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fess	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Fitzgerald	Kinkaid	Platt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.  
Beall, Tex. Logue

## NOT VOTING—96.

Ainey	Drukker	L'Engle	Sabath
Avis	Dunn	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Barnhart	Edwards	Loft	Scully
Bartholdt	Elder	McClellan	Shreve
Blackmon	Estopinal	McGillcuddy	Smith, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Falson	McGuire, Okla.	Sparkman
Bruckner	Finley	Mahan	Stanley
Burgess	Gard	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	George	Manahan	Tavener
Calder	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Cantor	Gorman	Morin	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Mulkey	Thacher
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson, Okla.
Carlin	Griest	O'Brien	Treadway
Carr	Hamill	Oglesby	Tuttle
Carter	Hart	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cary	Hayes	Phelan	Vare
Conry	Hobson	Price	Walker
Copley	Kahn	Prouty	Wallin
Dale	Kettner	Ragsdale	Whaley
Danforth	Kiess, Pa.	Reed	Wilson, Fla.
Dent	Kitchin	Riordan	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Kreider	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Doolling	Lee, Ga.	Rupley	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. UNDERHILL (for) with Mr. HAYES (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. STANLEY (for) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois (for) with Mr. BARTHOLDT (against).

Mr. LEE of Georgia (for) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. WALLIN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. HART with Mr. MANAHAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the rule and those who may speak on the bill may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the rule and those who speak on the bill may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Chair wishes to correct a ruling. When the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] made a parliamentary inquiry this morning the Chair read only the first sentence of this rule:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on Naval Affairs shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 5259 and the House shall proceed immediately to the consideration of same.

The Chair is still of the opinion that if that was all there was to it the House would go into Committee of the Whole; but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has called the attention of the Chair to the last paragraph in the rule, which reads as follows:

At the conclusion of the general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the amendments and the bill, and vote shall be had upon the final passage of the bill without other intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Inasmuch as the previous question can not be ordered in Committee of the Whole, that settles the intention of the gentleman who drew this resolution; and the Chair will request the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to preside in the House as Speaker pro tempore. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, under the rule I desire to offer the following amendments to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments. Does the gentleman desire the entire paper read?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the amendments as read and pending. They are the identical amendments provided for in the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that the bill as presented in the House does not contain some of the amendments offered by the caucus. Where are they?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the printed copies of the bill, as agreed to in the resolution which has been adopted, will be on the Doorkeeper's desk shortly.

Mr. MADDEN. Are we going to proceed to the consideration of a bill without the bill before us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The printed bill will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. The Senate bill is printed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the reading of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] for general debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not. This is the presenting of the amendments to the House, and the reading does not come out of the time on either side.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. PADGETT:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "with the approval of the President"; in line 5, page 2, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to"; at the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm or individual citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual, party to such charter or lease, shall violate the provisions of the same.

"The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901.



"The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders, shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

"The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

"Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

"Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

"Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

"The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

"The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

"Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

"At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

"Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

"Sec. 6. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed \$10,000,000, neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

"Sec. 7. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from the proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board: *And provided further*, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.

"Sec. 8. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall not issue any bonds in excess of \$40,000,000 or incur any liabilities other than stock issues in excess of \$10,000,000. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board, and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

"All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States, heretofore made or published by authority of law, shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall as provided hereby take the place of those now in existence.

"The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

"Sec. 9. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutuila: *Provided*, That the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

"Sec. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be \$6,000 per annum.

"Sec. 11. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

"Sec. 12. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace, and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

"Sec. 13. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily, for use as naval auxiliaries of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

"Sec. 14. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

"Sec. 15. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of \$10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 7, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

"Sec. 16. That two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels.

"That the Secretary of the Navy shall in such leases provide for their cancellation whenever such vessels may be required for naval or military purposes.

"That all leases made under this section of the act shall be subject to all of the provisions of section 5 of this act relating to maximum rates and charges and terms and conditions of forfeiture.

"That when the vessels, lands, piers, leases for land or piers, and other property held by the corporation are disposed of as herein provided the corporation herein provided for shall be dissolved and said shipping board abolished.

"Sec. 17. That sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not take effect until two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold that just a moment, until the Chair ascertains the situation? Has the pending bill been read?

Mr. PADGETT. It has not. The bill (S. 5259) ought to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois withhold his point of order and allow the Chair to have the bill read?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the original Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines, by employing such vessels of the Navy as in his discretion are available, without impairment to the paramount duties of the Navy, and as are necessary and appropriate, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining regular communication between the east or west coast, or both coasts, of the United States and either or both coasts of South America



and between the United States and the countries of Europe. The vessels so employed shall carry United States mail, passengers, and freight under such regulations and at such rate or rates as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, and such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired list, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary, shall be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines, and retired officers of the Navy so employed at sea or on shore shall, in all respects, be held and considered to be in an active duty status, and shall receive the pay and allowances of officers of the active list of the same rank and length of service: *Provided*, That officers placed on the retired list on account of wounds or disability incident to the service, or on account of age, or after 30 years' service, shall not be ordered to such duty without their consent.

The enlisted strength of the Navy, as now or hereafter authorized by law, is hereby increased by the number of men required to man the vessels so employed, and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist such number of men in the Navy for such terms of enlistment, not to exceed four years, as may be desirable, and to distribute the number of men so enlisted among the various ratings of the Navy.

SEC. 2. That in addition to and as a part of the line of the Navy there is hereby established an active reserve list. Line officers placed on the active reserve list under the provisions of this act shall be held to be in an active-duty status in all respects, except that officers on the active reserve list shall not be advanced on the active reserve list except for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle, or extraordinary heroism, when their advancement thereon for these causes shall be governed by the provisions of law governing the advancement of officers on the active list for like causes. All laws now in effect with reference to the retirement of officers from the active list are hereby extended to include officers on the active reserve list.

SEC. 3. That sections 8 and 9 of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," as amended by the act approved August 22, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," are so far amended that officers who hereafter volunteer or are selected for retirement as therein provided shall be held and considered to have volunteered for transfer to the active reserve list, or shall be selected for transfer to the active reserve list, respectively; and the transfer of such officers to the active reserve list in lieu of their retirement shall be made subject to the restrictions imposed by the provisions of the said sections as amended.

SEC. 4. That in addition to such part of existing appropriations as may be available for the expenses of operating the line or lines herein provided for, the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy for the purpose of organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on the traffic provided for in this act and in defraying the operating expenses incident thereto: *Provided*, That all money received for the transportation of mail, passengers, and freight, as provided in section 1 of this act, and for such other services as may be incident to the operation of the said line or lines, is hereby made available, in addition to the aforesaid sum of \$100,000 herein appropriated, for expenses incident to the proper conduct of the business contemplated in this act: *Provided further*, That any sum of money herein appropriated which remains unexpended at the end of the third fiscal year after the passage of this act, and at the end of each fiscal year thereafter, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67.]

Alney	Dooling	Kettner	Roberts, Nev.
Anderson	Drukker	Kless, Pa.	Rupley
Anthony	Dunn	Kitchin	Sabath
Avis	Edwards	Korbly	Saunders
Baker	Elder	Kreider	Scully
Barnhart	Estopinal	Langham	Sells
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Shreve
Bowdle	Faison	L'Engle	Smith, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Farr	Leshner	Smith, Minn.
Bruckner	Ferris	Lever	Smith, N. Y.
Bulkley	Fields	Lewis, Pa.	Sparkman
Burgess	Finley	Lindquist	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Gard	Lobeck	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	George	Loft	Summers
Calder	Gerry	McClellan	Talbott, Md.
Callaway	Gittins	McGillcuddy	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantor	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Thacher
Cantrill	Gorman	Maher	Thomas
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Treadway
Carr	Greene, Vt.	Moore	Tuttle
Carter	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Underhill
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mulkey	Vare
Clancy	Hart	Nolan, J. I.	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	O'Brien	Wallin
Claypool	Hay	Oglesby	Weaver
Conry	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Whaley
Copley	Helgesen	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Dale	Hensley	Post	White
Danforth	Hobson	Price	Wilson, Fla.
Davenport	Hull	Ragsdale	Wilson, N. Y.
Davis	Johnson, S. C.	Reed	Winslow
Deitrick	Johnson, Utah	Reilly, Conn.	Woodruff
Dent	Kahn	Riordan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in order that we may thoroughly understand the situation with reference to the two bills in one I will take a little time to explain it as I understand it. The Gore bill, which we are about to vote upon at the end of six hours' debate, is practically the same as the Alexander bill reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries last September and introduced in the Senate by Senator STONE. The bill before you now is a composite bill composed of the Weeks bill, so called, and the Gore bill, so called. The Weeks bill last August passed the Senate practically unanimously; in fact, I think it did pass unanimously. The Gore bill is now pending in the Senate.

We have had assurances from the other end of the Capitol frequently that if the Gore bill could be made a temporary measure much support would be gained for it, and, in fact, some have been led to believe that the Gore bill, under those circumstances, could pass.

Now, what is done in the bill under consideration to-day is to make the Gore bill a temporary measure and abolish the shipping corporation two years after hostilities in Europe are concluded, and at the end of that time put in effect the Weeks bill, which passed the Senate unanimously. In other words, we have given gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol what they say they want in the Gore bill and what they voted for in the Weeks bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. MANN. How are the minority stockholders to be protected when the vessels are turned over under this bill?

Mr. WEBB. That is a matter of detail, but I will answer it. You will have no minority stockholders. I do not think any private party will invest in the stock of the corporation.

Mr. MANN. That is the gentleman's answer—that there will be no minority stockholders?

Mr. WEBB. I think not; it will be a corporation like the Panama Railroad or the Panama Steamship Co., and if there should be any minority stockholders the stock will be paid for when it is turned over to the Navy Department.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. For a brief question.

Mr. TOWNER. If that be the case, and I agree with the gentleman, if this property is to be turned over without compensation, there are no minority stockholders who would subscribe. If this is the case, where would there be any reason for the organization of a corporation at all?

Mr. WEBB. None whatever, except that it is a mere fiction. We did it in the case of the Panama Railroad Co. and in the case of the Panama Steamship Co. It is a mere fiction, which the American people love to follow because of the habit. There is not much real difference between authorizing the outright purchase by the Government of these vessels and the owning and operating of them by a corporation, all of whose stock is owned by the United States.

The Weeks bill, which, as I say, passed the Senate practically unanimously, provides that the Secretary of the Navy may take such vessels as are not absolutely necessary in the Navy Department and use them in the establishment of mail steamship lines, which lines shall also carry not only mail but passengers and freight also.

Now, you would have thought that our friends in the Senate who inveigh against socialism in the Gore bill would have raised a mighty howl against that proposition in the Weeks bill, and yet the principle in the Gore bill is the same as is involved in the Weeks bill, with one exception, and that is that the vessels operating under the Weeks bill shall be operated by naval officers, while those operated under the Gore bill are operated by civilians. I confess that, in view of troubled conditions across the sea, I think it is better at present to have Government vessels operated by civilians rather than have them operated by naval officers in United States uniforms.

Therefore we have provided that the Weeks bill shall be suspended until two years after hostilities cease, and in the meantime the Gore bill shall take effect, so when the Gore bill dies the vessels which the shipping corporation own may be operated under the Weeks bill or may be leased or chartered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.



Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the Gore bill provide that these ships shall go into Alaskan ports and operate to and from Alaska?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir. That was an amendment adopted in caucus last night—providing that Alaskan ports should be included in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is to be treated as a foreign port and not as a coastwise port?

Mr. WEBB. It is to be treated like Hawaii. Hawaii is a Territory, and so is Alaska, and we thought it would be unfair to make a discrimination between different ports, both being coastwise countries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that is a very important matter to be considered?

Mr. WEBB. This is an emergency measure, and it is proposed that the vessels shall go where they are most needed, as I shall show the gentleman later on.

Now, we all, Republicans and Democrats alike, for 25 years have agitated the question of a larger merchant marine.

In 1821 American-owned vessels carried 89 per cent of the commerce of the United States, but from that time to the present hour our American vessels have been carrying less and less of our commerce, until they have almost vanished from the seas. To-day they carry 7½ per cent of our foreign commerce. That commerce amounts to two billions and a half dollars of exports and \$2,000,000,000 of imports, and yet we carry in American bottoms only a little pitiful 7½ per cent of that tremendous commerce. Sir Walter Raleigh, after whom my own State capital was named, at one time said that the Nation that controls the seas controls the commerce of the world, and the nation that controls the commerce of the world controls the wealth of the world, and the nation that controls the wealth of the world controls the world.

England learned this many, many years ago, and although she is little larger than my native State in area, still she has 20,000,000 tons engaged in deep-sea commerce, while our country with a hundred million people has a little pitiful 1,000,000 tons. Everyone agrees that we ought to have a merchant marine, that our expanding commerce demands it, and yet American statesmanship up to this good hour has failed to devise a plan by which that great merchant marine may be built up. Our Republican friends, many of them, have supported the idea that we should go into the Public Treasury and take out the people's money and put it into the private pockets of corporations to build up the merchant marine; but that has not been satisfactory. That has not succeeded. In fact, we subsidize vessels now to the extent of a million dollars a year. That has done no good. England's entire subsidy is only \$3,000,000 a year, and England has twenty times as many tons on the seas as the United States, which has \$1,000,000 of subsidies a year. I say again that something ought to be done, and, if possible, quickly. How shall it be done? The Republican Party has been in power for half a century, and during all that time our great merchant marine has been gradually fading from the seas. It has been a great problem. Of course, land business has been more profitable than sea business. Our Republican friends have tried to revive the merchant marine with subsidies, but with a great Republican majority they have not been able to pass a bill subsidizing merchant ships, for there are always enough Republicans opposed to it who, together with the Democrats, kill it, and the Democratic Party has never stood for that, and we therefore agree that subsidies can not be granted.

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

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Has not the Democratic Party always uniformly opposed every Republican effort to build up a merchant marine by subsidies?

Mr. WEBB. All the Democrats and some Republicans have opposed private subsidies, and we expect to do that as long as we are a party. We believe that it is better to take all of the people's money and spend it for all of the people rather than to take all of the people's money and put it into the private pockets of a few great corporations for their private benefit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the fundamental difference between the Democratic Party and those Republicans who feel like my friend from Pennsylvania does.

Mr. MOORE. What is the difference between taking \$30,000,000 direct from the pockets of the people and buying ships and having the Government enter into an enterprise that involves risks?

Mr. WEBB. If my friend can not see the difference between them, I do not want to spend the time telling him. I ask him to come over and vote for this bill if he sees no difference, because this bill takes \$30,000,000 direct for the use and benefit of all

the people, and not for a few private shipowners. My friend knows the difference, and everyone in the House knows it.

I am willing to answer any question if the question is direct, because I think sometimes we can bring out matters more clearly by questions than we can in general debate if the question is asked in good faith. But I do not want to explain any more the difference between the proposition in this bill and a private subsidy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What effect does the gentleman think the passage of this bill will have on shipbuilding now going on in shipyards of the United States for private shipowners?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I confess to my friend that I can not answer that and nobody else can. I see that all the shipyards are being opened now and are "booming." I suppose if we construct some more ships under this act in the American shipyards it will help the "boom," and if we can not build them in that way we can buy them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has the gentleman from North Carolina observed in the press that some proposed builders who had contemplated giving orders for four ships have cancelled these orders, pending the legislation now under contemplation?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, that is like some of the great factories I have heard of, that close down just before an election and tell the workmen that if they do not vote the Republican ticket they will stay closed down forever. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] That is a bluff, pure and simple, and will fool nobody.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from North Carolina ask the gentleman from Kansas to give the names of those people to whom he refers and to be more explicit?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas to do that a little later. Let us see now if there is any necessity for such a bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say that he was willing to explain certain features of the bill as he went along?

Mr. WEBB. I would not want to go into the details of the bill. I will leave that to Judge ALEXANDER. I can not do it in 20 minutes, but any general question I am quite willing to answer.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is what I want to ask. First, I want to know if the Democratic caucus last evening made any change in the so-called Weeks bill on page 1, lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11?

Mr. WEBB. I have not the bill before me, and I can not answer the question. What is provided in those lines?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman is familiar with the so-called Weeks bill—

Mr. WEBB. I am.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It provides that the Secretary of the Navy might operate naval vessels on certain lines of trade.

Mr. WEBB. I can answer the question. The only amendment made to the Weeks bill was, after the words "Secretary of the Navy" insert the words "with the approval of the President."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is the only change made in the Weeks bill?

Mr. WEBB. That is the only amendment to the Weeks bill, except to postpone its effect until two years after hostilities cease.

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

Mr. WEBB. I hope the gentleman will not insist; I would be glad to yield if I had the time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I wanted information only; I have no idea of delaying the gentleman.

Mr. WEBB. I have only about 10 minutes remaining and I have just begun. I hope the gentleman will understand that I do not intend to be discourteous. I always answer questions, because I think that is a good way to debate matters.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed with my statement, I will yield later, if I have the time. Now, gentlemen, we all agree we ought to have a merchant marine. We all agree, so far, no plan has been presented that will produce that great merchant marine. I doubt if there are 50 men in the Hall who will agree on one particular method by which an American merchant marine may be built up. You may say, Repeal the shipping laws; but you can not do it. The Republicans, I think, would not vote to ever repeal all the shipping laws, and neither will many Democrats, so that can not now be done. The question is, Shall we do something now in the nature of Government control and ownership to save the situation or do nothing? We produce 25 per cent of all the wheat in the world. We pro-



duce 45 per cent of all the pig iron in the world. We produce 40 per cent of all the coal in the world. We produce 60 per cent of all the corn and 65 per cent of the world's cotton. We export 30,000,000 barrels of petroleum oil every year. We have not the vessels in which to transport even a decent fraction of our products. Eight per cent is all we carry in American bottoms, and our exports must be carried in our foreign competitors' bottoms, and will be carried in our competitors' bottoms unless this Congress does something in the present emergency to relieve the situation not only temporarily, but I would like to see it be relieved permanently and forever, and you gentlemen who oppose this proposition ought not to criticize the sponsors of this bill, unless you can present something better in its stead.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not get a chance to present anything, not even an amendment.

Mr. WEBB. Yes; you do. At the end of this debate you have an opportunity to offer your own bill to be voted on.

Mr. MADDEN. You will not even let us offer an amendment.

Mr. WEBB. We provide how it can be done on a motion to recommit, and then you gentlemen will have a chance to show how you would build up a merchant marine.

Mr. GLASS. They had the opportunity for 40 years and did not do it.

Mr. WEBB. They have had the opportunity for half a century to build it up, and during all that period the merchant marine has been growing sadly less. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any necessity for an emergency merchant marine as provided in this bill? Is there any man who denies that the exports of the United States are being hampered by the checked and clogged conditions in every port in the United States? Only on the 6th day of this month the collectors of practically every port in the United States telegraphed to the Secretary of the Treasury the conditions with regard to commerce in each particular port, and without an exception the collectors wired that all the ports were jammed, clogged, and crowded with wheat, cotton, corn, lumber, tobacco, and many other products ready for export, with no ships to take them. Can we as American Representatives afford to go to the country and say we have no way by which we can relieve that situation, but must let our commerce be clogged, choked, and left to rot and die because you do not want to embark the Government on an idea of ownership and control of vessels in order to relieve that situation and keep the commerce and business of this country from dying?

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. I would prefer not just now. My time is limited. I do not desire to be discourteous to the gentleman, and if possible I will yield later.

Mr. STEENERSON. Only for a question.

Mr. WEBB. When I get through I will be glad to do so. In some of the ports the collectors wire that the railroads had placed embargoes on any further delivery of cargoes into those ports. What are we going to do, gentlemen? What are we going to do? Are we going back to our people and tell them that we can do nothing? Are we going back to them and tell them we tried to do nothing?

If you gentlemen on that side have any better scheme than this one, pray present it. You ought to have presented one long ago. We have tried to get together on some bill to relieve this terrible situation, but in some parts of this Capitol they seem to be fiddling while Rome is burning. It is an emergency situation. The life, health, and blood of our entire commerce depends upon something being done for it and on its being done quickly. It will not do to wait, even six months or two years. The patient may die, stagnation may set in, and worse business conditions may spring up than even those already created by this terrible war in Europe. That is not the worst of it. We not only have not the vessels—because practically all the German merchant vessels have gone out of business and numbers of other vessels have been taken over by the warring nations as naval auxiliaries—consequently we have a great scarcity of merchant vessels at a time when we need them most. We now have an opportunity that few nations in their history ever had, in reference to foreign commerce, and the thing that is needed to make it blossom like the rose and return prosperity in great waves is sufficient ships, with reasonable freight rates, to carry our commerce abroad to the people who want it.

Not only, my friends, is there a scarcity of vessels, but the men who own and control the great Shipping Trust, both foreign and domestic, know they have the American people by the throat, and instead of charging normal or twice normal prices they have run rates, in some instances, up a thousand per cent,

and just last December they took out of the shippers, out of the pockets of the American people, \$18,000,000 more than normal freight rates. In 12 short months if we can save to the people of the United States an average of \$18,000,000 per month, we would have saved them \$208,000,000, and with this result attained at the end of that time you could afford to burn all the vessels that we could buy under this bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WEBB. I would rather not. Cotton, the great staple that has always kept the balance of trade in the United States—its exportation has been hampered because, instead of charging the normal price of \$1.25 a bale, these high-sea pirates are charging \$17 a bale to carry it across the ocean, and other freight rates are being raised in proportion. I ask you what you are going to do? Are you going to let foreign and domestic trusts rob us and not try to break loose from that strangle hold?

This may not be a perfect measure, but it is a patriotic measure, and men ought to join in in order to relieve this situation as best we may. You say it is Government ownership. That has no terrors to me. Long ago this country went into Government ownership—from the days of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln down to the time of William H. Taft and Woodrow Wilson. We have been in the Government control and ownership of interstate highways and business for a hundred years, and if there was ever a time when we should engage in it that time is now. Thomas Jefferson ordered a great highway surveyed from Baltimore to New Orleans. Has the Government a right to build highways? Yes. A little later on the Cumberland Road was ordered to be built, a great interstate-commerce road from Cumberland, Md., to Jefferson City, Mo., and they spent \$710,000 to build it. And in Abraham Lincoln's administration great transcontinental railroads needed to be built, and the Government got behind them and built them, and in many cases practically controlled them. And not only that, they built the same kind of road from Chicago and Cairo to New Orleans. In 1904 the Government of the United States authorized the building of the Philippine railroads and guaranteed 4 per cent interest on their bonds. That is on the statute books now, and a Republican Congress passed it, and they let the building materials go into the Philippine Islands duty free, even though they were such strong protectionists in those days. And then there was the parcel post. For years and years we heard the cry that "you are going to put the Government in the carrying business in competition with private enterprise, the express companies. Do not dare to put the Government in the business of carrying small packages." But the Government went into it, and is in it, and where is the man who now would vote to repeal it—the parcel-post law?

The Government is carrying freight on land. Why not carry it on the sea? We authorized the Alaskan Railroad. We make powder and armor plate and many other things that private individuals not only make, but want to make. Here in our foreign commerce is the situation that private individuals can not meet even if they wanted to. But human hands fail and are unable and the Government steps in; there is no paternalism in the proposition. We print envelopes and sell them to the people of the United States. We are in the stationery business, and private individuals want to do the work. We destroy the cattle tick and the boll weevil and do thousands of other things. And not only that, I suppose that many of you on that side of the House voted to put the Government into the insurance business.

Mr. MANN. We voted against it very decidedly, and it has proven a failure.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman will have to wait and give us more time before he can say that—

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is not a failure. The Government is writing war-risk insurance at one-eighth of 1 per cent.

Mr. WEBB. The war-risk insurance bill passed the Senate, and the Republican Senators who are now holding their hands up in holy horror against this shipping bill voted to allow the Government to insure the cargoes that are carried abroad in monopolistic ships. I can not see the difference in owning the ships that carry the cargoes and the Government insuring the cargoes which the ships carry. I have no metaphysical scissors with which I can make a distinction in principle.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not think we voted for that on this side of the House?

Mr. WEBB. I think a number of you did.

Mr. MANN. A very small number.

Mr. WEBB. Well, I am sure that quite a number of Republicans in the Senate did, and also a goodly number of Republicans in the House.



There are others who say this bill is unconstitutional, because there is no warrant in the Constitution that gives the Government the right to do this. That is worn-out doctrine. That has been declared otherwise by the Supreme Court for many, many years, and I refer gentlemen who care to read on this point to the case of *Wilson versus Shaw*, reported in the Two hundred and fourth United States Reports, where a man by the name of Wilson undertook to restrain the building of the Panama Canal, and the Supreme Court, Justice Gray speaking for that court, said it has too long been settled under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States that Congress not only has the power to construct railroads but create corporations for the purpose of building railroads and constructing canals and operating them. There is your highest authority in this country construing the Constitution with reference to the building of railroads and canals. If we have the power under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution to build railroads, maintain them, and operate them, why have we not the right under the same clause of the Constitution, which is granted in the same identical language, to maintain and build a line of ships to foreign countries?

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. Just for a question.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman make a distinction between the authority to regulate commerce and authority to engage in commerce?

Mr. WEBB. That point has been made many times, but the Supreme Court says the point is not well taken.

Mr. MILLER. And that is the distinction the Supreme Court has made every time it has been before it.

Mr. WEBB. The Supreme Court says the contention is not sound. If it were the court would have restrained the building and operation of the Panama Canal. They say we have the right to build the Panama Canal under the interstate-commerce laws of the Constitution. Under that commerce clause we can establish, regulate, and operate a ship line or lines to foreign countries.

Now, if we can establish railroads and build canals, we can also establish a ship line on the sea, because we have the same power on the sea with reference to foreign commerce as we have on the land with reference to interstate commerce. I shall not take the time of the House to read what Mr. Justice Gray said, but if any of you are in doubt about it, I ask you to read it. I will, without reading it, put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. You will not put it in the RECORD unless you read it. I am going to object to all extensions.

Mr. WEBB. I hope the gentleman will not filibuster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have served as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries ever since I have been a Member of this House. Since the Democratic Party came into power in 1911 I have never filed a minority report against a bill brought out by the majority of the committee, of which my friend from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, is chairman, until I prepared a minority report upon this bill.

The hearings on the bill (H. R. 18666) which was reported to this House were only of one day's duration, and the only person who appeared before us as representing the Government was the Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the United States Treasury. The members of the committee tried to ascertain from him what was intended by the bill; whether it was intended to go into the overseas foreign trade or whether it was intended to go into the South American trade. We obtained but very little information from him, and most of the information furnished was that it was intended to go into the South American trade, but that it was, as we well knew, in the power of Congress to do whatsoever it pleased. And when some of the members of the committee raised the question as to the advisability of the bill providing for Government ownership, his answer was: "Leave the matter to the President. You all have confidence in the President. Leave the whole subject to him."

I replied that I thought the Congress of the United States should take the responsibility rather than have the President of the United States take all the responsibility for the pending legislation. The report of the majority of the committee was filed on the 5th day of September, 1914. I obtained permission from the House of Representatives on the 8th day of September to file within five legislative days the minority report, and the minority report was filed on the 13th day of September. And nothing has been heard from the other side of the House,

with their great majority, in regard to this bill until we are confronted to-day with a bill which no one has had a chance to understand or consider. We are met with a bill to-day without any hearings having been held upon it, without any definite explanation of what it is to be; but we learn from the newspapers that it was agreed to in a Democratic caucus held last night. It is not even printed for the information of the House, and yet we have this bill brought before us for final action and debate limited to three hours.

At the time the original hearing was held before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries it was represented that a great emergency then existed; that we could not wait for anything to be done except to act upon the bill that was then presented. It was suggested there by one of the members of the committee that we should admit the vessels mentioned in the bill to the coastwise trade, and when that proposition was brought to the attention of the committee I made the suggestion that if that subject were introduced it would mean a delay in any final action on the bill, whether that delay occurred in this House or in the other body at the northerly end of the Capitol, and that such a proposition would lead to interminable debate. Consequently that project was thrown aside, although the Secretary of the Treasury kindly informed us that he himself had no objection to that proposition, and that he would like to see it carried into effect.

Mr. Speaker, allusion has been made to the fact that the party now in power has its first opportunity to bring in a bill for the building up of the American merchant marine in the presentation of this Government-ownership bill. If I recollect rightly, when the Panama Canal bill was passed an amendment was placed upon that bill that brought out the exact Democratic theory, and that was the right to buy ships in the markets of the world. That has always been the Democratic argument in opposition to every proposition that we put up to build up the merchant marine—that if they only had the right to go into the markets of the world to buy ships they could build up a merchant marine.

The Panama Canal act provided that vessels could be bought in the markets of the world, but that vessels thus purchased should not be over five years of age. That provision of the bill was tested. Not a single vessel was bought under that proposition. Then that limitation was stricken from the bill, in order that all who desired might buy with perfect freedom—buy vessels of any age, in any way that they could get them. That finally resulted in no purchase of vessels, and at last a ship-registry bill was provided. Unfortunately, I did not happen to be present in the House when the bill was brought up and hastily rushed through the House, but a ship-registry bill was provided, and it was put in the discretion of the President of the United States to provide that foreign watch officers might be engaged to act in charge of these vessels thus purchased if it was found necessary. That bill finally passed both branches of Congress, and the next day thereafter the signature of the President was attached to that bill. He also granted the right to put foreign watch officers on every one of these vessels granted an American registry, and then an attempt was made to put these vessels into the coastwise trade of the United States, but this attempt failed of consummation by the action of the Senate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I decline to yield.

Now, the coastwise trade of the United States was established in 1787, and when that trade was established it was provided that it should be confined to American-owned, American-built, and American-officered vessels; and this proposed extreme change in policy was one that I am sure would not be made with the approval of the American people. Some of the most prominent Democrats I know called my attention to the fact that the admission of such vessels, with such officers to take charge of the same, to the coastwise trade would be an unwise act that would take away our means of defense, which had been practically provided for by the men who had manned these vessels year after year since the coastwise trade was established in 1787.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is it not true that the United Fruit Co. of Massachusetts and the Standard Oil Co. and the United States Steel Corporation were the ship companies that asked to have the law extended as to the captains and watch officers?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not know who asked for it. I am not familiar with the action, except as I read of it in the newspapers. But I do know the President granted that



privilege, whoever asked for it, without stopping to consider the importance of the question, after the Congress had given him the discretion to act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not an interesting fact that the administration yielded so readily to the request of the United Fruit Co., the Standard Oil Co., and the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes. It is peculiar, because the Democrats have been abusing the Standard Oil Co. and the United States Steel Corporation and the United Fruit Co. for, lo, these many years. That has been their stock argument ever since they have been in existence.

But, gentlemen, I find that my time is so limited, and I have promised so much of the time granted to me to others, that I have very little time that I am privileged to occupy myself.

One great argument made by those on this side of the House and those upon the other side who have opposed subsidies to vessels in the foreign trade was that if we subsidized vessels and put them into the over-seas trade, it would cause an increase in freight rates, and that if an increase in freight rates resulted the farmer would be injured, because he would have to pay larger freight rates. Now, the fact is that since the breaking out of the war—and that terrible war is the cause of everything troublesome now with our friends on the other side of the aisle—it is true freight rates have been very largely increased, but the price of farm products does not seem to have been reduced, and as far as I have been able to ascertain the farmer delivers his freight at the dock in this country and the man who buys the farm product across the broad ocean pays the freight.

Mr. GORDON. The consumer pays the freight.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes; the consumer on the other side of the water pays the freight. Therefore the argument that has been presented heretofore on this side and on the other side of the aisle has been dispelled, and if no other proposition has been settled by the discussions arising from the great European war that one proposition has been shown to have no foundation in fact.

Now, gentlemen, I shall not take any more time myself, although I would be glad to do so if time would admit. I desire to yield to gentlemen who undoubtedly will be able to present this case much better than I am able to present it myself. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, upon this bill the fundamental propositions in controversy are few. In the short time allotted to me I wish to discuss two propositions which have not had the attention which I think their importance deserves. They may be stated as follows:

First. What will be the international status of the ships procured under this bill?

Second. Can these ships carry contraband without violating our neutrality and possibly involving us in war?

The second proposition is dependent upon the answer to the first.

As to the status of these ships the supporters of the bill take the position that inasmuch as a corporation is provided for to acquire the ships, and the United States is only a majority stockholder, and inasmuch as it is expressly provided that the ships shall be regarded in all respects as private ships are regarded, that therefore no foreign power can claim that they are public ships or subject to any different rules or treatment than private ships would be. While this is the contention of the supporters of the bill their position has not been sustained, and it can not be. On the contrary, in our international relations these ships are Government ships, and they may be so treated by any foreign power. The only effect of the creation of the corporation proposed in the bill will be to give to any foreign power the option of treating them as either Government or private ships.

Upon this proposition I would observe, first, that any laws that we may make can not bind any foreign power. We can not make a law regarding our own affairs and then declare to Germany or Great Britain that they are bound by what we have done to limit any rights that they might otherwise have. The form of the ownership amounts to nothing internationally. If we, the Government of the United States, own them to the extent of exercising control over them as a proprietor, and we will do so under this bill, we can not escape responsibility to a foreign Government by declaring we have created a corporation in which we are the principal stockholder and the title is in the name of the corporation. The question will be, "Does the

Government of the United States control them to the same extent as if operated directly by it?" The answer must be "Yes," otherwise the only reason given for the passage of this bill would disappear. If, then, the Government controls them, then the Government is responsible for whatever they may do.

International law is well settled as to this proposition. I shall give only two short quotations from Moore's Digest of International Law, page 878:

The measure of a neutral's obligations is to be found in the rules of international law, and it can not shelter itself by the allegation that its own legislation imposes a laxer standard on its subjects.

The duties of neutrality by the law of nations can not be either expanded or contracted by national legislation.

This last quotation is from a great Democratic Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard.

I have searched diligently all the arguments that have been made in behalf of the bill to find some authority for the claim that the United States has the right to shield itself behind a corporation, so far as our international relations are concerned, but have found not one. The eminent advocates of this legislation either can not understand or willfully misunderstand the point involved. They cite a number of bank cases where the sovereign power was a stockholder, and the question at issue was whether the corporation bank was subject to suit in the Federal courts. It has been uniformly held that in such a case the sovereign power could not interpose as a defense its sovereign capacity. But that question is not in issue at all here. Everyone must admit that the United States may waive its sovereign rights by the creation of a corporation in the manner proposed in this bill. If a foreign power chooses so to do, it may treat its ships as private ships and subject them to the international law relating to private ships. That is not in issue. The issue is whether a foreign power is bound to do so. Will a foreign power have the right to treat them as public ships and hold the United States responsible for them, if they choose so to do? The answer must be "Yes." We may waive our sovereign rights over these ships, but we can not waive our sovereign responsibilities.

The tremendous importance of this will be seen in the discussion of the second proposition, "Can these ships carry contraband without violating our neutrality and possibly involving us in war?"

Granted that these are public ships, for which we are in our sovereign capacity responsible to foreign powers, then it is well settled in international law that they can not carry contraband at all without violating our neutrality. A citizen may carry contraband in his private ship and his doing so will not violate the neutrality of his Government. He takes the risk of capture and confiscation of his cargo, but that is all. The Government can not carry contraband at all without violating its neutrality.

Again quoting from Moore's Digest of International Law, page 865:

It is no offense, either against the law of nations or against our neutrality statutes, for a citizen of the United States to sell munitions of war to a belligerent; yet it could scarcely be contended that the Government would be justified in employing its agents to promote such transactions.

Do I need to argue that if these ships carry contraband these ships would be an agency of the Government to promote the transaction?

The reason for the exemption of the Government from violation of its neutrality by the act of one of its citizens in carrying contraband is stated in Woolsey, International Law, sections 193 and 194. I quote:

If the neutral (Government) should send powder or balls, cannon or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from the neutral position. \* \* \* Now, the same wrong is committed when a private trader, without the privity of his Government, furnishes the means of war to either of the warring parties. It may be made a question whether such conduct on the part of the private citizen ought not to be prevented by his Government, even as enlistments for foreign armies on neutral soil are made penal. But it is claimed to be difficult for a Government to watch narrowly the operation of trade, and it is annoying for the innocent trader. Moreover, the neutral ought not to be subjected by the quarrels of others to additional care and expense. Hence, by the practice of nations, he is passive in regard to violations of the rules concerning contraband, blockade, and the like, and leaves the policy of the sea and the punishing or reprisal power in the hands of those who are most interested, the limits being fixed for the punishment by common usage or law. \* \* \* It is admitted that the act of carrying to the enemy articles directly useful in war is a wrong, for which the injured party may punish the neutral taken in the act.

Here the reason for the distinction between a private trader and a Government ship, so far as neutrality is concerned, is made plain, and it is the law.

It must, then, be admitted that if these are public ships they can not carry contraband at all without violation of our neutrality, while private ships may do so. This brings us to a consideration of what constitutes contraband of war. Our own



Supreme Court has defined contraband of war to be articles manufactured and primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war. Articles which may be and are used for purposes of war or peace are contraband only when actually destined to the military or naval use of a belligerent. The United States has had a fairly consistent policy in the treatment and definition of contraband of war, but the practice of other nations is involved in hopeless confusion and inconsistencies. A careful study compels one to the conclusion that there is practically nothing produced that at some time or other has not been declared contraband by the great powers of the world. In our war with Spain we find in the list of absolute contraband, horses; in the list of conditional contraband, coal. England once declared contraband all grain, flour, or meal bound to any port in France. In 1885 France declared rice destined to certain portions of China as contraband. In 1905, in its war with Japan, Russia placed cotton upon the contraband list. Without giving further instances, we all know what is happening in the present war. The list of contraband articles is being enlarged every month, and it is impossible to say from day to day what has been declared to be contraband by one or the other of the belligerent powers. In the case of a private trader these are the chances that he takes, but let a Government ship have a cargo that England or Germany declares to be contraband, and we may be immediately met with the charge of having violated our neutrality, the result of which might be war. Because of the inexcusable limitations of time, this question can not be given such discussion as its importance deserves, and I must content myself with this very imperfect presentation.

To sum up, the ships provided for in this bill will be public ships, so far as foreign powers are concerned, if they choose to so regard them, and we in our sovereign capacity will be responsible for their operation. These ships can not carry contraband at all without violating our neutrality. As to what is contraband is so uncertain that we could not, without the risk of grave complications, engage in trade at all with any of the belligerent countries. If we can not engage in trade with them, then the reason for the bill fails.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I am afraid I can not. If I have time, I will yield later.

There is another phase of the matter which I would like to discuss, but I have not the time. I can only state the proposition. It is: These ships, being public ships, must not discriminate against any of the belligerents in the trade carried on by them. If they do, we violate our neutrality. If this bill passes many in this country will insist that these ships engage in the German trade, on the ground that English ships are constantly carrying cargoes from the United States to England; and, therefore, if we would be strictly neutral, that we should devote the ships to the German trade to equalize our exports. To this England would strenuously object. Aside from the international complications involved, there would be complications at home, public opinion would become inflamed, and consequences might follow which would be most unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, serious and delicate questions are daily arising, and I will not vote for this bill and add uncounted new ones. A vote against the bill can work no serious injury. Every Member who votes for it, if it should become a law, may regret his vote to his dying day.

Some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle treat this matter lightly. The day may come—God knows we all hope it will not—when you may realize that instead of blindly following any man, however great and patriotic he may be, you owed it to your country in this hour to vote your own convictions and not those of some one else's. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] 10 minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I can not begin without thanking the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LENROOT] for his careful presentation of the dangers of this bill. But there is danger also in the way that this bill comes forward. It is not merely that it was reported six months ago and now comes before this House as a caucus measure at the end of the session, but that we have heard it stated that gentlemen have been assured that unless it is passed in the few remaining days of this session there will be an extra session. That means that every Member of this House is threatened with a sentence of six months' confinement at hard labor in a tropical climate, away from home, and likewise that he will be sentenced to pay expenses, and so be fined at least \$1,000; and he is also told, if the statement in the morning papers be true, that such an extra session would be the political suicide of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. How can a great measure be considered under

those circumstances, with no power of amendment and only the power to say "No"?

I am going to give only two thoughts as to this bill, full as it is of features which are subject to criticism.

The first four sections are known as the Weeks bill. They provide that the ships of the United States Navy shall be fully manned with retired officers, civilians, and new enlistments, and that the Navy shall be got ready for use; and that meanwhile, as we have an exigency in our foreign trade, especially with South America, those ships which can be spared shall be used in that foreign trade. When that bill was passed in the Senate it was insisted and admitted that it was a temporary measure to meet a temporary exigency and to be passed now for that exigency. This present bill passes the Weeks Act not for this exigency but for kingdom come; not for the needs of the present trade, not for the needs that may come upon us because of the danger of war and the need for enlarging our Navy, but to be without effect until two years after the European war shall have ended and shall have been so declared by the President. It reminds me in its value of a will that was probated, in which a man reserved to himself the use of his real and personal property at the resurrection. And if it is a comfort to the majority party who have introduced this proposition to know that that will was sustained as not made by an absolutely insane man, I will give them that consolation; but the good of the Weeks bill is gone when it is postponed until the need for it will not exist.

How many minutes have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am anxious to yield back some of my time. The rest of this bill is a novelty. It was reported six months ago. It proposes that the United States of America shall own or control a corporation which shall buy, build, equip, or charter merchant ships. There are none to be had anywhere except those in harbor belonging to one of the belligerents. Any other ships must be built. This corporation has leave to charter its ships to whom it pleases, and to do business under a shipping board composed of political officials who know nothing about it. The only ships that it can get are useless as freighters, and that is the only kind of ships for which there is a demand. These fast ships are ocean liners meant for passengers, and very few people are going to Europe to spend their money there now. These provisions bring us at least into a doubtful realm with reference to our relations with foreign countries, for while they provide that we shall not do anything with those ships that is not neutral, the very purchase is doubtful as to neutrality. Such provisions imperil this country, and for no good. They drive Americans out of the shipping trade instead of encouraging them to go into it. We want Americans at sea.

I will say only one word more. I am ready to stand for postal or freight subsidies, as other countries have done, or for a tonnage subsidy, but I have always proposed something that I thought better, and that was to pay the difference in cost between the running of an American ship and a foreign ship, which is caused by the cost of American labor. I was always ready to vote for a bill which would say that the United States would pay to any shipowner the difference in cost of the labor of the captain and crew that was aboard the American ship, compared with a foreign ship, or, if necessary, more than the difference, but based on the men being there and their being enlisted in a naval reserve. [Applause.]

That is a single and separate proposition, and would go directly to the evil that prevents Americans being at sea. I have no time to debate it now. If this bill were before the House, I would offer that bill as a substitute, because I believe that the country and the House are determined to have something that will induce Americans to go back on the seas. Unfortunately this is an act to prevent their going back on the seas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to have a better audience, and I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-two Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.



The Clerk called the roll, and the following-named Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68.]

Ainey	Gallivan	L'Engle	Scully
Anthony	Gard	Lewis, Pa.	Seldomridge
Avis	George	Lindquist	Sherwood
Barchfeld	Gerry	Loft	Shreve
Barnhart	Gillett	McClellan	Smith, Md.
Bartholdt	Gillmore	McGillcuddy	Smith, N. Y.
Bartlett	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Sparkman
Broussard	Gorman	Maher	Stanley
Brown, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Bruckner	Guernsey	Mondell	Sutherland
Brumbaugh	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Burgess	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Hardy	Murdock	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hart	Neeley, Kans.	Thacher
Carew	Hay	Nolan, J. I.	Townsend
Carr	Hayes	O'Brien	Treadway
Carter	Hill	Oglesby	Tuttle
Cary	Hinds	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Clancy	Hinebaugh	Peterson	Vare
Conry	Hobson	Plumley	Walker
Copley	Hoxworth	Porter	Wallin
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	Post	Walsh
Dale	Jones	Price	Walters
Danforth	Kahn	Prouty	Watkins
Deltrick	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale	Weaver
Dixon	Kettner	Ralney	Whaley
Dooling	Kless, Pa.	Rauch	Whitacre
Dunn	Kitchin	Reed	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Korbly	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Faison	Kreider	Rouse	Woodruff
Falconer	Langham	Rupley	Woods
Fitzgerald	Langley	Sabath	
French	Lee, Ga.	Saunders	

The SPEAKER. On this call 289 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me a moment?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of this side of the House for a moment. We have consumed a little over one hour in debate this morning and an hour in roll calls. It will be impossible to get through with this bill by midnight unless Members remain in the Chamber and maintain a quorum at all times. There are two or three more appropriation bills still pending, and those who have a lingering hope of getting away from here on the 4th of March will simply destroy that hope by not remaining here, and thus wasting the time.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY. I will state that some Members did not catch the terms of the rule this morning and think that the bill will be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. I think the gentleman should explain that at the end of the six hours' debate the vote will be on the bill and the pending amendments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; the rule provides that at the close of the debate the previous question will be ordered and the vote will come on the bill and amendments to final passage. Members must realize that we lose half an hour or more on every roll call.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I hope the admonition of my friend from Missouri will be given due attention, because there is not a quorum of the House here now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes that Democrats will all stay here.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker knows the Republicans will.

The SPEAKER. And he also invites the Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, we will stay.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder the Democrats do not want to remain in the House during the discussion of this bill; a great many of them have consciences and they do not want to break records for personal independence that up to this time have been creditable. The bill they are asked to support, partly at the dictation of the White House and partly because of the party caucus, is a bill which does not propose to build up American industries; it is a wreckage bill pure and simple. Gentlemen on the other side have suggested that opposition to this bill comes from the so-called Shipping Trust. None are better posted in regard to the Shipping Trust than

the gentlemen who make that allegation; there is absolutely no information on this side, so far as I know, concerning any such institution. The Democratic Party will again reverse its professions about the trusts if it passes this bill. It will do this even at the risk of forsaking the plain people, for whom it has professed such undying love. The Democrats used to inveigh against the Guggenheims in Alaska, and it was charged that certain privileges were being granted to extend railroads in that country. Then Democrats were on the alert; they had a great deal of information about the Guggenheims and the great railroad trusts and private monopolies, but it did not take long after the present administration came into power to pass an Alaskan government-ownership bill for the very purpose of buying out the so-called Railroad Trust in Alaska, and if our information be true, that is what is actually occurring under the direction of this administration.

When the railroads of the country were complaining because the freight rates were insufficient and because they were losing money, notwithstanding the Democrats for 16 long years had denounced the railroads and had made all sorts of charges against railroad trusts, 62 very distinguished railroad men and representatives of the "big interests," most of them coming direct from Wall Street, called upon the President of the United States, and shortly thereafter a statement was issued from that quarter indicating that the railroads of the country ought to have a fair show, and that perhaps there had been too much hue and cry against the so-called railroad trusts. That the railroads themselves are not now so unfavorably regarded by this administration has been demonstrated during the last few days, when the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its freight-rate ruling, has indicated that the railroads ought to be preferred even as against the Panama Canal. These things should not be forgotten when we are discussing trusts.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen who raise the cry of "the Shipping Trust" against the men who oppose this bill desire to get from under. They seek to find a refuge from the wrath of the people whom they intend, in this instance, to rob to the extent of \$30,000,000, direct taxation, for the purpose of buying foreign ships and putting American shipyards and American workmen out of business. Some of the gentlemen who have spoken, and, in particular, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], have called this bill a bill to build up the American merchant marine. That is a grave mistake. This is a bill to buy foreign ships built in foreign shipyards, not for the purpose of building up an American merchant marine, but for the purpose of transferring the business of building ships from American shipyards, where American wages are paid, to foreign shipyards, where cheap foreign labor prevails.

Gentlemen have intimated that there is a reason for the passage of this bill, because it is said that freight charges have become excessive on the high seas. When a man owns a vessel and there is a great demand for that vessel to carry freight, it is no more unnatural or illogical that he should ask a higher rate of freight for that service which is so greatly in demand than that the cotton planters of the South should combine not to sell their cotton until they obtain a certain price. But gentlemen have contended, and particularly the President of the United States and his very active Secretary of the Treasury have urged, that it is because of excessive freight rates in ocean carrying business; that there is a necessity for buying these foreign ships and taking this American money and transferring it to foreign shipyards, thus displacing American labor. In this regard they are in error. I have said in one or two previous addresses here that there is no abnormal congestion of freight on ordinary business at the various ports in this country. The congestion is due to speculation because of war conditions. I have read into the RECORD statements from men who know, not collectors of the ports nor men who have been solicited for their opinion by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, nor men who are brokers for the purchase of ships, but men actually in the business of shipping and men who to-day will find all of the ships that are necessary to carry the normal business of the country. They say ships are still to be had and that legitimate business is being relieved. Who, then, is it that wants to purchase these foreign ships, and what is the purpose in making the purchase?

There is heavy pressure on the part of those who desire to send cotton out of the country. Cotton is going out in greater quantities than ever before. The Bureau of the Census proves that in its January report.

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

Mr. MOORE. I can not. There is heavy pressure on the part of those who want to send oil out of the country. Oil is going



out in tremendous quantities. There is heavy pressure on the part of those who want to send steel and war munitions out of the country. That means trouble for the country. But if you have any doubt about who wants this ship-purchase bill passed, about who wants the people to pay \$30,000,000 for these foreign ships, I recur, for historical reasons, to that interesting conference at the White House in August last, just prior to the passage of the war-risk bill. The gentlemen on the other side of the House, it will be remembered, rushed the war-risk bill through in great haste about that time.

Some of you have said that the Republicans voted for that bill. I question whether a dozen on this side voted for it—Republicans and Progressives put together. It was a Democratic bill, and you are entitled to all the credit, if you consider it creditable to spend \$5,000,000 of the people's money in that way. But since this shipping bill is up, I want you to recall the circumstances under which the war-risk bill was passed. Do you remember who it was representing the "big interests" who went to the White House to discuss this and other matters? Let me read to you the names of a few of the 62 who went there with the eminently respectable Seth Low, of New York, as chairman: Mr. Samuel Rea, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., was one, an excellent Democrat and a great railroad engineer. Remember, the discussion was about freight rates and the necessity of taking \$5,000,000 of the people's money and putting it into the business of insuring risks for those who wanted to send contraband to sea. There was too much risk in this, even for the marine insurance companies. They were willing the Government, which means the people, should take it. Mr. Alfred H. Smith, president of the New York Central Railroad Co., was another of these gentlemen; Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., who deny they are interested in the purchase of foreign ships or have any direct connection with the Hamburg-American Line or any other line, was another one of them; Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan—it is not necessary for me to state who he is—was another of these gentlemen; and so was Mr. Frank H. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank; and that other distinguished representative of "big interests," to whose great organization reference was made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], Mr. James H. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation. There were 62 of them in all, and pretty heavy financial timber. Oh, but what a reversal of opinion there was either before or after that visit! Oh, how those who had been proclaiming "the rights of the downtrodden people" began to see a new light! Oh, how those who had been denouncing "the trusts" of the country changed their views after this memorable visit of the illustrious 62! And, by the way, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] whether it was not the United States Steel Trust that had asked to register its ships under the American flag, and the answer was "Yes." Why was that question asked unless your war-risk bill was framed, not for the benefit of the poor people of this country, not for the benefit of the ordinary shippers, but for the benefit of the United States Steel Trust or the great corporations whom you have seen fit heretofore to denounce?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. No; I can not—

Mr. ALEXANDER. I simply desired—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE. I have but 12 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri has ample time. Oh, there is a congestion of freight, is there? That is the reason you want to pass this bill. Look over the report which Secretary McAdoo and Secretary Redfield sent to the Senate of the United States, and see how this thing was built up; see what splendid press agency work was done; see how the collectors of the ports were made use of; see how the Cabinet relied upon the men who knew how to buy ships at a high price and sell at a low price. When you have done this you will begin to get some light upon the subject. Congestion in business at the ports! No ships to carry freight! I want to submit that in the month of January, 1915, there were enough ships to carry more cotton and grain than was carried through half the year in 1914. In the single month of January, 1915, we exported on ships, which were obtainable, from all ports save that of New York—and the New York figures are not yet compiled by the Department of Commerce—we transported a total in value of foodstuffs from the United States into foreign countries, with a plentitude of ships to carry it, \$41,579,756, as against \$11,042,318 in January, 1914. Nearly four times as much was sent out on ships in January, 1915, as we sent out in January, 1914. In bushels for the month of January, 1915, from all ports except that of New York—and New York exports were also exceptional, as will be seen when the figures come in—we sent out in bushels of wheat,

January, 1915, 18,906,545 or nearly 19,000,000 bushels, as against 4,985,148 bushels in 1914; about four times as much in January, 1915, as we sent out in the month of January, 1914. As to cotton and oil—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ].

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I want to be understood as being opposed on principle to governmental ownership and fads of that kind. I call them fads, but we are up against the proposition to-day, and while we hear about the doctrines of Jefferson and others, it is to be remembered that they are all dead and we are right here. I think changing our navigation laws would solve the problem, but we have not the nerve to do it. The Republicans for 20 years did not have the nerve to do it; so we must find some other remedy. I am a shipper, and I represent shippers. Cotton and wheat are not the only things in this world. Other products are handled, and to-day I am obliged, in bringing cargoes from Europe, to pay 75 shillings a ton as against 20 shillings before the war, and I am asked to sign a contract for a year at that rate and to bind myself not to ship a pound by any other line. That is no new condition; we have always had that, especially to New York. Now, who pays it? Some one made the remark that in normal times the shipper pays the freight, as in the case of the wheat grower the price is fixed in Liverpool. I will concede that to this extent, that the export price of wheat and cotton, for instance, is fixed in Liverpool. I will take wheat, and not cotton, as an illustration. That price includes the freight to Liverpool, which is added to the price of the wheat. Now, when the Shipping Trust, the trust you are all speaking about, or the shipping monopoly, has got hold of you, it fixes the freight rate, which, plus the cost of the wheat, makes the price in Liverpool; but suppose that some firm in Liverpool brings goods on from South America on other lines, or a competing line, at a much lower freight rate. The grower in South America gets a much higher price than the farmer in the United States, and to that extent the freight is paid by the shipper. In all other cases not analogous the ultimate consumer pays it.

Now, then, there is some talk about buying interned ships. I would buy every one of them except the big passenger ships, and take chances on the complications. I do not think we ought to buy any ship of over 10,000 tons. It is a freight traffic we want and not a passenger traffic. I hope sometime the law will be amended so that bought ships can go into the coastwise trade, so that a ship carrying cotton from Galveston to Europe ought to be permitted to bring a return cargo to New York, and there take on a coastwise cargo, instead of being compelled to go back to Galveston in ballast for more cargo.

I do not want this arrangement permanent, but I am opposed to a time limitation in the bill. If you put in this law now the clause to stop it in two years after the war, the steamship people will know in two years that we will be out of business, and lie back and keep up the rates, and buy your ships for junk at that time. If, however, after two years, competition has brought down rates so low that the ships do not pay, no Congress will go on very long appropriating funds and run at a deficit. On the present basis I do not care what you pay for a ship, it will pay for itself in a year's time, even if freight can only be had for one way, and the return is made in ballast. Figure it yourselves. I have had occasion to do so. You can afford to scrap all your ships in two or three years, and still save money for the people on to-day's rates, if they were maintained.

Mr. MANN. Why would a man sell it then?

Mr. METZ. All right; if he will not sell, then you will not get any. What are you kicking about if nobody will sell them? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. You may get them at a very high price.

Mr. METZ. If you are going to put crooks in office who will do that kind of thing, that is up to us. I do not propose to have that kind of men if I can help it, and I do not believe our President does. We want goods that are under embargo, such as rubber and wool. You may send them in English bottoms. You go to South America for a load of rubber, and what will they tell you? It is British property, and it must be transported in a British ship. I guarantee if it was down there and was your property you could bring it in American bottoms; but you can not do it to-day. You have not the bottoms to send. Those are the things that are going to count.

I claim the credit of sending the first ship abroad with an American flag when this war broke out. The marine insurance on some of the cargo she brought went to 17 per cent. Our boats are not built for trans-Atlantic traffic, but for coastwise traffic. The Holland-American Line ran 70 boats out of Rot-



terdam in October and November, all loaded with freight for American ports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. METZ. They chartered Danish, Norwegian, Swedish—any kind of a boat except American. They could not afford to take those. Among them was the steamer *Laura*—an old tub that took 44 days to cross the Atlantic with freight for this country. Now, when we send goods abroad, unless they go in American boats, they are held up by the English Government. You can not afford to charter a boat of any kind and have it held up in England three or four weeks on a time charter. American boats will not be held up long; and they will not be held up if we show backbone in this administration, and I am willing to say that we have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman be willing to take a chance on war?

Mr. METZ. If my rights are attacked, I would be willing to take a chance on any kind of war. When anybody tells me I can not do anything I have a right to do, I am going to fight for that right. When I am told I can not send foodstuffs here or there, I for one would fight for my right to do so. We do not have to be dictated to. If we do buy interned ships, we can use them—can release vessels now going to South America for other ports.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has any consideration been given in committee or Democratic caucus to this question of return cargoes—at length?

Mr. METZ. I can assure you it was discussed in Democratic caucus with all the knowledge at our command. You can not get return cargoes from all ports at the present time. Of course, it depends on where you go—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has not that something to do with it?

Mr. METZ. The trust ships have return cargoes. The ships that have not return cargoes are the ships we are sending with cotton to German ports. I can get cheaper ocean freight rates on my goods from Germany to New York by sending them by railroad to Bremen, and get as low a rate of insurance out of Bremen as any other port, as I can on the Holland-American Line from Rotterdam, with its cheaper water rate down the Rhine to Rotterdam. The shipowners have got us. That is all there is to it. If this is only a club with which to break in, I am willing to spend \$30,000,000 to show that we can do it. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, you gentleman on the other side of the House have 145 majority, and, of course, you can pass any bill that you propose. Only part of the bill we are proposing to pass is before the House. Certain amendments were made last night by the Democratic caucus that are not yet in print, and yet the Representatives of the American people on the floor of this House are called upon to enact a law that is not before them.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield to anybody now. You are bound by caucus action. You have no right to think for yourselves. You are trying to jam something through this House that the American people do not want. Legislation is no longer enacted by the House as a deliberative body. It is brought in here after deliberation all night in a Democratic caucus. This bill was prepared on the outside. Nobody in here had anything to do with its preparation. You propose to spend \$50,000,000 of the people's money to enter upon a doubtful enterprise at a time when everybody is taxed beyond his power to bear it, and when more than 4,000,000 American workmen are out of employment. And this will not give employment to any American workmen—not one. You are opening employment bureaus everywhere now. It would be much better for the American people if you would open the workshops and the factories and give them a chance to make a livelihood. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You keep on taxing the idle people of America on their necessities, adding to their daily burdens by your extravagance and wasteful expenditures of the public money. You continue to empty the Public Treasury at the expense of the necessities of the people. You authorize the organization of a ship company in this bill. You give that company \$10,000,000 out of the Public Treasury. You authorize the issue of \$30,000,000 of bonds, and perhaps \$40,000,000, as the case may be. You add the opportunity for this corporation to increase by \$10,000,000 more the capital that they may employ. You authorize the shipping board to repeal all the navigation laws and to make any kind

of laws they please, but you give them no power whatever, when this bill ends, to restore the navigation laws under which America works.

You are engaging in competition with private enterprise. You are endangering the peace of America. You are going to carry contraband to the belligerent nations. You are going to violate the neutrality of America and involve the people of America in trouble with Europe. Can you afford to do it simply for the purpose of enacting a law, under whip and spur, because the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States demand it? You have made it a party measure by dictation from the President of the United States. This ought not to be a party measure. This is a business proposition, in which every citizen of the United States is interested. You will buy ships at an extravagant price and you will sell them for a song when you get through with this thing, after it proves to be a failure.

You give away the power of Congress to legislate and place it in this shipping board when you authorize the shipping board to make navigation laws. You throw the people of the United States into a condition of uncertainty and fear. You destroy their activity by the uncertainty which you create, to say nothing about the burdens which you will lay upon them in the matter of increased taxation to meet the whims of those who want to enter upon the purchase of these ships in order that they may satisfy their ideas of Government ownership.

The country is opposed to this legislation. There have been protests from every section of the country against the enactment of this bill. The people of the country are impatiently waiting for the time to come when they can express their opinions in opposition to this character of legislation at the ballot box, and in November, 1916, the Democratic Party will no longer have an opportunity to foist upon the American people such iniquitous and nefarious legislation as is proposed in this bill. Pass it if you will, but remember that you will be held accountable by a long-suffering people for your action. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used six minutes, and has yielded back four minutes.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we upon this side admire the performance of our Democratic friends to-day. We admire the facility and volubility with which they praise the President on the floor and curse him in the cloakrooms. [Laughter.] We hope that some day you will have the courage of your convictions, and I prophesy now that this is the last bill the President will ever force through Congress against the judgment and the conviction of the majority of his party. [Applause on the Republican side.] I think this is the beginning of the end of his dictatorship.

Now, our Democratic friends come to-day and they desert free ships, discriminating duties downward, a free Panama Canal, and every other remedy that they have ever advocated for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. And yet the father of all these failures with simple faith comes before the country to-day and insists that this last misshapen and sickly child, born of socialism and cupidity, is the only thing that will give us a merchant marine, and in order to demonstrate that they are right, with true Democratic logic, they point with pride to the fact that heretofore they have always been wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, what is the exact question before us to-day? The exact question is, Shall we purchase the interned German ships? That is the question. If you were to do away with that proposition, the enthusiasm for this bill would disappear in 24 hours. If that is not the purpose of this bill, then the whole proposition is childishly absurd. There are no other vessels to be purchased.

There is a distinct conviction throughout the country to-day that there is some understanding between those who control the Hamburg-American vessels and certain distinguished gentlemen who are insistently urging this legislation. Whether it is true or not there is an aroma surrounding this bill to-day that has already condemned it in public opinion.

What is the position of foreign countries in regard to the purchase of these interned ships? Let me read it to you:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which the enemy vessel as such is exposed.



That is the position of the allies. What is the position of Germany? Let me read that, as declared on the 4th day of last August:

Ships that after the outbreak of hostilities have been transferred from the enemy to a neutral flag are also to be considered as enemy ships.

Those declarations are plain. Anyone can understand them. It does not take a lawyer to construe them. And the very moment that we buy one of these vessels and start to run it upon the high seas, that moment it is subject to seizure, and that moment we must be prepared to defend ourselves against Germany or against Russia, Japan, France, and Great Britain.

Now, suppose that one of these vessels is seized. It is taken into a foreign port. We protest. And suppose that protest is refused. They will do the construing of the law in their court in their country. Then what? Then we are placed in the cowardly and pusillanimous position where we must either say that we are right but have not the courage to enforce that right or else we must go to war.

Now, are we prepared to take that position? That is the question to-day that, above all others, we are to consider in the passage of this bill. It is not our duty to see how nearly we can come to war and escape it. It is our duty to keep as far away from war as possible.

It is our duty to-day above all things else, not only for our own country but for the sake of humanity, to maintain neutrality, and to maintain that neutrality with honor. Now the question is, Shall we to-day, for the small benefit that might come, embark upon this new and untried socialistic path condemned by experience and by the common sense of mankind? Are we going to take chances of being involved in the greatest conflict that has ever devastated this planet for the little advantage that might come to us, even if we concede that this bill would do all its friends claim for it?

The greatest question in regard to the passage of this bill is this: Shall we, on account of an anxiety on the part of some for the dollar; shall we, because of a desire to purchase a few secondhand ships, and run them in the foreign trade, so long as we run them at a loss; shall we, for the sake of being able to get a few bales of cotton or a few bushels of wheat to Europe for a few cents less; shall we weigh these things in the balance against our country's peace and perhaps our country's existence?

May we be saved from the madness of such leadership, intoxicated with a little brief authority, and may we remain in the paths of peace and national honor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Missouri now occupy some time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitude of the Republican Party as illustrated in the remarks upon this bill to-day by members of that party in the House, a declaration made some time ago is peculiarly interesting and significant. I will read it:

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying trade is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

That is a quotation from the Republican national platform of 1900, in which the Republican Party, deploring the condition of our foreign trade and our merchant marine, prophesied the condition which we are experiencing to-day. They are certainly entitled to the distinction of being a true prophet of evil, because that which they prophesied has arrived, and in tragic form.

There can be no doubt of the fact that an emergency confronts us. We have to-day of American vessels registered for foreign shipping of all sizes only a little more than 1,000,000 tons, about 2 per cent of the world's gross tonnage. There is a dearth of foreign ships to be added to the insignificant number of American ships with which to carry our commerce. Evidence can be multiplied, so that the most skeptical must be convinced that at the ports of our country American farm products and manufactured products of various kinds, noncontraband products if you please, are demanding carriage across the sea in order to be delivered to those who are willing to purchase them and able to pay for them. What is the attitude of the Republican Party in view of its professions in 1900, which have been repeated in scarcely less emphatic language in every national platform since that time? Although in power in the executive

and legislative branches for almost 20 years, that party has done absolutely nothing to revive the American merchant marine in our foreign trade.

It is true that in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and in several Congresses succeeding, the Republican Party endeavored to report and pass a subsidy bill. But that bill was so full of favoritism, and it was so plainly recognized to be the covert of selfish interests, that even the Republican Party in the House, in a large majority at that time, would not support it. The public sentiment of the country in both parties is opposed to subsidies.

What other remedy has been proposed? That of discriminating duties, which also had the approval of the national Republican Party in its platform. And yet it remained for a Democratic Congress, in framing the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill, to place in it a discriminating duty of 5 per cent. That was not sufficient. In my opinion, it ought to be larger. And yet that is the only legislation upon our statute books in 50 years by either political party of this country intended to enlarge our merchant marine in the foreign trade.

Others have suggested that our navigation laws be amended. Yet every Republican and Democrat who is entirely candid will admit that even if it were a practicable remedy and would give the needed relief promptly we could not pass through Congress any repeal of the navigation laws as applicable to our foreign shipping.

So, Mr. Speaker, this condition of our foreign trade has been brought about under Republican control of the Government, and the fact remains that the only legislative effort made for its amelioration has been by the Democratic Party.

Now, in this emergency, which I have briefly described, what is the attitude of the two parties here? What does the Republican Party propose? Absolutely nothing. It has not offered, in either branch of Congress, any constructive piece of legislation intended to give relief to this dearth of shipping, this paralysis of our foreign commerce, to the detriment of our industry and our prosperity. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress have proposed the pending bill. Certainly in this emergency the Democratic Party confronts the country as the only constructive party, while the Republican Party, with all its boasts of past heritage and achievement, has absolutely nothing to propose in the dire conditions that confront us.

What are the arguments they bring against this measure? They allege that our neutrality will be violated and that we will be in danger of war. Gentlemen know that these professions are insincere, in the face of the attitude of this administration for peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to my friends for this ovation, and I shall requite it by yielding five minutes to the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] and reserving the remainder of the 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] five minutes.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, manifestly it is not possible within the brief time at my disposal to-day fully or satisfactorily to discuss the important measure under consideration; and yet I desire as fully as possible to present certain reasons which seem to me conclusive, from its economic aspect, why I should support this measure.

Logically a complete discussion of the subject and of the bill under consideration would involve (1) a statement of relevant facts, and a just conclusion to be drawn as to the necessity or the wisdom of embarking upon the proposed course; (2) the merits of the bill itself, as a whole and in detail; and (3) certain international legal questions which have been urged against the expediency of the policy proposed and of the bill itself.

As to the last-indicated question: Because of the limit of time imposed upon me, I must content myself in passing to say that, having carefully collated, briefed, and considered the prize-court law of each and all of the great powers of the world—the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Austria, Spain, Japan, Italy, Holland, Russia, and France—only France has ever declared any position in that matter denying the citizens of any neutral country the right to purchase, in good faith and for a valuable consideration, from the citizens of any belligerent country merchant ships even after a declaration of war, and even France has never resolutely adhered to that position, having abandoned it at least once upon the insistent representations of the United States and later in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870; and therefore that it would lead the United States into no embarrassing international complications if her citizens, or if the shipping board created by this act,



should purchase, during the present European war, ships interned in our ports and belonging to citizens of any of such European belligerents.

As to the details and merits of the bill under consideration: As no serious question has been raised in this debate upon its provisions, I must content myself to state that, in its scope and in its details, it is sensibly constructed to accomplish the purpose intended, namely, to enable the United States to acquire, either by purchase or construction, or both, and to operate, a merchant marine in the interest of the entire American people to accommodate their foreign commerce at a reasonable charge for a regular service under fair conditions.

And therefore my remarks will be limited to a consideration of the economic phase of the subject under discussion.

There is presented here to-day exactly the same party spectacle I have observed during the two years I have served in this body, upon every occasion involving an important issue—the Republican Party is hiding behind some specious pretext to protect special interests, while the Democratic Party is championing the just rights of the masses in their struggle for economic independence and industrial freedom. At the end of two years of extreme trial the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Wilson, is still a forward-looking party, and continues to take its stand against special privilege in every form and in favor of the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Sir Walter Raleigh said:

Whosoever commands the sea commands trade. Whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and, consequently, the world itself.

But the United States, as the richest nation in the world, having more than \$140,000,000,000 of wealth, occupies admittedly the most insignificant position, in the matter of its merchant marine, of any great nation on earth. For a half century the country has heard much concerning an American merchant marine; but the fact remains that during that period of time the American merchant marine has faded from the high seas, until it is now practically a negligible factor in the world's commerce.

Our country contains only one-fifteenth of the population of the earth, but it produces about 70 per cent of the world's corn, 65 per cent of its petroleum, 63 per cent of its copper, 60 per cent of its cotton, 42 per cent of its iron ore, 40 per cent of its coal, 35 per cent of its tobacco, 30 per cent of its live stock, lead, and silver, 25 per cent of its wheat, and 20 per cent of its timber.

With its 60,000,000 head of cattle, its annual production of 240,000,000 barrels of petroleum, 763,000,000 bushels of wheat, 2,500,000,000 bushels of corn, 60,000,000 tons of iron ore, 550,000,000 tons of coal, and 15,000,000 bales of cotton—its total annual farm products amounting to some \$10,000,000,000 and its total manufactures amounting to some \$21,000,000,000—after supplying our own people with food, clothing, and manufactures of every sort, out of these enormous resources, the people of this Nation are able annually to ship to foreign countries for sale a total of about \$2,500,000,000 of American products, and to buy back from foreign lands for the use and convenience of our own people something like \$2,000,000,000 of their products.

I mention these stupendous figures only to illustrate the imperative necessity that, either by private capital or by some form of public ownership, adequate shipping facilities be provided to accommodate this enormous commerce and traffic.

We have realized, since last August when the European war began, how entirely dependent our American commerce is and has been upon foreign bottoms, and how helpless the American people now are in the face of this awful calamity. They have known for many years, in a general way, that this Nation had no adequate merchant marine, and our manufacturers, merchants, and shippers have in many different ways brought to the attention of the Congress the fact that the greater part of American import and export trade was carried in foreign bottoms; and yet the people have deluded themselves with the thought that they had at least a respectable merchant marine. Indeed Lloyd's Register points out that the American merchant marine comprises some 3,100 vessels of more than 5,300,000 tons gross register. But those figures when analyzed are a delusion; for when the number of vessels which are used upon our canals, lakes, bays, and rivers are taken from such total of 3,100 vessels, it leaves only 361 American vessels of 1,375,000 gross tons capacity used or capable of use in our deep-sea shipping. It is the tragedy of this awful European war which has emphasized American marine helplessness.

It was not always true that America had no considerable merchant marine. As late as 1821, 90 per cent of our import and export shipping was done in American bottoms; but the

proportion has constantly declined, so that it was 86 per cent in 1831, 83 per cent in 1841, 72 per cent in 1851, and 65 per cent in 1861. Then, during the period of our Civil War, because the Confederate cruisers were able to destroy the American merchantmen at sea, American owners sold their ships to foreigners rather than let them lie idle and go to pieces. For instance, during the period of 1860-1867, the American merchant marine was sold to foreigners in rapidly increasing volume, as is illustrated by the following table:

American ships sold to aliens, 1860-1867.		Tons.
1860	-----	17,518
1861	-----	26,649
1862	-----	117,756
1863	-----	222,199
1864	-----	300,865
1865	-----	133,832
1866	-----	22,117
1867	-----	9,088

And in passing it may be remarked that the same nations which are now belligerents in Europe were those which thus bought the American merchant marine when the United States were engaged in war; and yet in this debate gentlemen insist that the citizens of the United States have no right to acquire any of the merchant marine of any of the European belligerents at the present time. It would be interesting to know by what process of reasoning gentlemen justify those countries now belligerent in Europe in purchasing the American merchant marine when we were at war and at the same time deny to the United States the right to purchase in good faith and for a fair price merchant vessels belonging to the citizens of those belligerent European nations now that they are at war.

But even at the end of the Civil War the decline did not cease in the amount of American deep-sea shipping carried in American bottoms, because only 32 per cent was carried in American bottoms in the year 1871, 16 per cent in 1881, 12 per cent in 1891, and only 8 per cent in 1901, while immediately before the outbreak of the European war in August, 1914, it is doubtful if 5 per cent of our foreign shipping was carried in American bottoms. In practical effect our merchant marine has disappeared from the high seas. An American traveler in foreign ports will almost look in vain for a mast carrying the Stars and Stripes. This is not only a humiliation to our national pride but it is an annual drain of some \$250,000,000 on our American enterprise paid to foreign shipowners; and, in addition, the existing condition places our American farmers, merchants, bankers, manufacturers, and other shippers at the mercy of their foreign business rivals by having to charter their ships under such terms and conditions and at such times and places as their foreign rivals may dictate.

It is an alarming and lamentable condition to contemplate that, with our population of nearly 100,000,000 people—the most progressive, capable, industrious, and ambitious on the earth—producing annually some \$10,000,000,000 in value of agricultural products and some \$21,000,000,000 in value of manufactured products, with our population increasing rapidly and our lands being rapidly settled and developed, and, consequently, with our necessity constantly becoming more urgent speedily and economically to reach all the countries and population of the globe in the sale and exchange of our enormous surplus annual output, while they are now providing one-eighth of the total foreign commerce of the world, yet they carry only one-tenth of that one-eighth—that is, 1½ per cent of the world's commerce—in American ships; and the amount of cash paid to foreign shipowners for carrying our foreign commerce exceeds \$250,000,000 per year in normal times.

Evidently and certainly something, either in law or in economic conditions, is fundamentally and radically wrong, because this condition should not obtain. The major portion of the difference between American exports and American imports each year is paid by the American people to owners of foreign ships to carry on that import and export trade in normal times; and thus, instead of our people saving that \$250,000,000 per year, they are paying it for the labor, capital, and ships of foreigners when the American people might better thus employ their own capital and labor, build up their own merchant marine, and save that enormous average annual drain of \$250,000,000.

Solidly upon the Republican side of this House, and in considerable numbers upon the Democratic side, the contention is made with zeal and earnest insistence that American private capital can and will supply an adequate American merchant marine.

It is always a difficult matter to determine what activities the Federal Government should undertake. Personally I do not believe the Government should go into those quasi public enterprises in which private persons and capital can and will engage to a sufficient extent to provide adequate facilities. I



magnify the individual rather than the Government. That conviction is intensified by my observations and experiences in public life, where I have noted the vast political power and insistent demands of the multitudes of Government employees now in service in many different departments. Besides, in a Republic it is of first importance to recognize and to encourage individual initiative and enterprise. But it is surely a sound rule to observe, in the preservation and development of this mighty and growing Republic, that where the safety, health, development, prosperity, and happiness of the masses imperatively demand that any public or quasi public facility be provided, if private persons with private capital either can not or will not provide it on terms that are fair and just to the public and on a scale commensurate with the legitimate public needs, the Federal Government itself should provide such facilities. This same principle applies with American cities involving their water, their lighting, their power, and other systems as with the Nation which has sanely applied it to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars spent upon its rivers and lakes for domestic commerce, its many harbors, the Panama Canal—which has cost the Government \$400,000,000—and its many other fields of public endeavor.

I say with entire conviction that if private capital would and could build and operate an adequate American merchant marine there would be neither necessity nor desire that the United States embark upon that enterprise at all. But it is clearly evident that American capital either can not or will not provide a merchant marine adequate to the requirements of our foreign commerce. While some \$600,000,000 is invested by American private capital in American ships, representing some 3,100 ships in all, still of the number only 361 ships, valued at \$69,000,000, owned by American persons, firms, and corporations, are engaged in deep-sea shipping, and they carry only from 5 per cent to 8 per cent of our foreign commerce. That is proof conclusive that if the American people are to have an adequate merchant marine they can not depend upon private capital to supply it; certainly not under existing laws. And yet, both as auxiliaries for the American Navy as transports, supply and hospital ships, colliers, and scout cruisers in times of war, and as carriers for American commerce in times of peace, it is indispensable that an American merchant marine be provided if our naval defense is ever to be made secure, if American industry is ever again to be free from the toll of \$250,000,000 annually to foreign shipowners in normal times and double or treble that sum in war times, as now obtain, and if ever again the American flag is to fly in foreign ports upon the mastsheads of American merchantmen as a symbol of untrammelled American commerce.

Many different devices have been suggested, and many have been proposed from time to time in the Congress, to extend or revive our merchant marine. It is undisputed that it costs from 50 per cent to 60 per cent more to build merchant ships in the United States than in foreign shipyards. This is in part because of our duties under our tariff laws laid on the many different articles entering into ship construction, in part because of the high scale of American wages, in part because of the more elaborate finish of American boats, in part because no American shipyard has yet adopted, as has long since been done in British and other foreign shipyards, a uniformity of model or design, and probably in part because we have developed a less efficient working system because of less work and training in constant shipbuilding as in certain foreign countries, where the pursuits of the sea are a national necessity, habit, and passion. And it is undisputed that it costs from 25 per cent to 35 per cent more to operate an American-owned ship than it does a foreign-owned ship on account of our laws and our labor conditions.

But all of the discussions and all of the proposals have come to naught during the past 50 years. Effort has been made to remove the tariff duty on the different materials out of which merchant ships are built. Admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry has been advocated. The Congress has many times in the past considered changing in various ways our navigation laws, and as continuously failed to accomplish that end. Effort has been made to subsidize American shipping, and thus to put a burden on the American people of an amount sufficient to equalize the difference between the cost of manufacture and operation of American ships as against those made and sailed under foreign flags; but all such efforts have likewise failed. It is perfectly certain that the Democratic Party will remain true to its ancient principles to oppose subsidy in any form; and when the Republican Party was in power for 16 years, from 1896 to 1912, it was never able to change the national laws so as to grant either direct or indirect subsidy to American shipping and thus to attempt to equalize the

difference between the cost of construction and operation of American and foreign ships.

It ought to be evident to all of us that at present, as in the past, the navigation laws can not be changed, because the labor unions of the country resist that change upon the ground that any such change would involve the lowering of the standard of American wages, and Congress will continue to heed, as in the past it has heeded, that insistent view.

This is not a time—this awful national and international crisis through which we are passing—for anything but plain words, spoken with candor although with fraternal kindness; and therefore I assert unequivocally that American private capital is not to be condemned in its initiative and in its courageous aspirations when it declines to go extensively into the business of constructing American ships which cost from 50 to 60 per cent more than similar ships constructed in foreign shipyards, nor for not extensively operating in the foreign trade American ships which cost from 25 to 35 per cent more to operate than it costs to operate similar ships on the same passage under a foreign flag. But, while thus exonerating American private capital from the blame for having failed to provide an adequate merchant marine, it is idle longer to continue to act upon the theory that private capital can or will under existing laws and under existing cost items provide that indispensable facility to American commerce.

I have stated that normal American commerce pays foreign bottoms \$250,000,000 per annum for its service, but that is not the only disquieting factor involved in our situation. At the present time, and for the past six months when the great nations of Europe have been in war, in part because they have taken out of the avenue of foreign commerce vast numbers of merchantmen to use as transports for troops, in part to place exclusively in their own service to supply their own people in these times of stress, and in part because interned in American and other ports, vast numbers of foreign ships commonly employed in our carrying trade are denied to us, causing great congestion of shipping at our ports, with the result of poor prices for our products of the farms, mines, ranches, and manufacturing. This illustrates the utter folly and weakness of our reliance upon foreign bottoms. And one of the evidences of human frailty—to take advantage of misfortune in others in order to reap profit—is shown in the fact that foreign and American shipowners alike have availed of American necessities to extort enormous additional tolls from American commerce. It has been conclusively demonstrated that we can not depend either upon foreign bottoms as a sure source of our supply, or upon either foreign or American bottoms to give at all times an adequate service for a fair compensation. The following facts, indicated by the report of the actuary of the Treasury Department, are highly illuminating: Taking July, 1914, when the world was at peace, and using the month of January, 1915, as a comparison, when the world was in the midst of international war conditions, it will be found that from the port of New York the cost of shipping grain to Liverpool has increased 300 per cent and to Rotterdam 900 per cent; flour, 300 to 500 per cent; meat products, from 50 to 150 per cent; and cotton, from 400 to 700 per cent. From Philadelphia and Baltimore the cost of transporting all of these products has risen in about the same proportion. From Galveston the cost of shipping grain to Liverpool has increased during January, 1915, over July, 1914, 174 per cent, while the cost of shipping cotton from the port of Galveston to Liverpool has increased 361 per cent; to Genoa, 420 per cent; and to Bremen, from \$1.40 to \$17.50 per bale of 500 pounds weight, or 1,150 per cent.

These rates are so enormous that for the year 1915, in addition to the ordinary \$250,000,000 to be paid to foreign bottoms by American commerce, an additional amount of \$311,000,000 will be extorted from the American people. If present conditions continue during the year, as to the volume of our exports and as to the rate of charges obtaining for their transportation, it will mean something like \$560,000,000 of American money to be paid to transport American products—nearly all of it going to foreign shipowners. It is a condition that is appalling to any man who is a patriot and as such has the industrial freedom and the economic independence, as well as the political welfare, of the American people at heart. While no one would contend that all of that added burden of extortionate freight tolls will fall upon the American producer, still it is entirely certain that the American producer must of necessity receive very much less for his products than he otherwise would receive but for these excessive tolls.

Since, then, it is certain that American private capital has not gone into the business of constructing and operating an adequate American merchant marine, and since it is so inadequate



that it accommodates only 5 to 8 per cent of American deep-sea shipping, and since it is evident that it is not possible presently or in the early future either so to change our American registry or navigation or other shipping laws as to make possible the building by private capital and their operation of an adequate merchant marine, and since the exigencies of this European war have clearly demonstrated that even our American-owned ships are quite as greedy and extortionate and quite as anxious to take advantage of the helpless condition of our foreign commerce as even their foreign rivals, it appears to me to be a plain duty of the statesmanship of this hour to devise a means to free our people from foreign shipping domination and their industry from the great toll annually paid to foreign bottoms in normal times and the exactions of unbridled greed in these present times.

We have devised and now tender to the Congress the bill now under consideration which we are confident will accomplish that legitimate purpose. The \$40,000,000 it provides for the establishment, either by construction or purchase or both, of an American merchant marine to be used as auxiliary of our Navy in time of war and as transport of our foreign merchandise in time of peace, while a large amount is yet insignificant measured by the results which it would achieve of benefit to the American people. Indeed, it would be returned to the American people seven or eight times over this present year 1915 in the item alone of the excess charges they will pay to the shipping monopoly over the amount they would have paid for the same service this present year but for the war emergency that has arisen.

Gentlemen here have urged that it is futile to pass this bill at the present session of Congress, because a large part of American agricultural products and manufactures have already moved abroad, and that possibly the European war may end before ships could be purchased or constructed under this bill to accommodate American commerce. But I call their attention to the fact that if the war in Europe should end this day it would take at least another year for international shipping conditions again to become normal, and that during that time our people will have raised another \$10,000,000,000 crop, a large part of which must be exported, and will have manufactured probably \$20,000,000,000 worth of products, a large portion of which must also be exported, and therefore that congestion in shipping, rather than a proper accommodation of shipping, even in the event the European war should soon end, will probably result. It is of equal or greater importance that the surplus wheat and corn of the Northwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle of the mighty farming regions of our country, the enormous bulk of other American products, and the vast volume of American manufactures to be produced during this year, and most of which will actually be ready for export within the next six to nine months, may be exported when produced and ready than the export of the balance of the existing crop of products and store of merchandise.

The financial chaos and the crash of our entire industrial system which would inevitably follow from the breakdown of even the existing system of employing foreign bottoms to carry American exports and imports, unless some adequate system be provided in its stead, are incalculable and incomprehensible. In practical effect it is no less than the demoralization, if not the destruction, of our proud national position and our civilization itself. In the face of such a recognized possible national calamity petty views of opinion, or even serious differences as to principles of government, should not have determining weight with us who are charged with authority and duty in this national and international crisis.

I am not one who believes that this shipping enterprise should be made a mere temporary or emergency measure; for, independently of the existence of the European war, which has emphasized our practically total dependence on foreign bottoms for the transport of American exports and imports, the fact would still obtain that there is no considerable American merchant marine, although private capital has been invited to occupy that avenue of investment and enterprise ever since this Government was established and notwithstanding the Government itself has never undertaken that work. But this war has emphasized the fact that in such a crisis our people are powerless in their dependence even upon foreign bottoms for a sure supply, although both foreign and American bottoms have extorted from threefold to eightfold the tolls they have charged American commerce in normal times. I am not willing, as a Representative, that the American people shall thus continue wholly dependent in this important matter of their foreign shipping, which involves their national prosperity to so great an extent, upon the merchant ships of their commercial rivals or upon the greed and caprice of either private-owned American or foreign ships. In

effect their present condition robs our farmers of the fruits of their toil, hampers the legitimate growth of American agriculture, stock raising, mining, manufacturing and other industries, cripples the pride of all of our people, hinders the normal expansion of their commercial activities, extorts undue tolls from their industry, renders them dependent upon the grace of their foreign rivals, places them subject to the greed and caprice of the shipping monopoly, strips American labor, capital, and industry of an enormous proportion of their annual earnings, and fetters the free and daring spirit of American initiative, enterprise, and industrial ambition; and such condition will continue to exist until the people themselves, through their Government, establish their own merchant marine.

I am confident that the American people will never consent, once the Government shall establish a merchant marine, that it discontinue that function and thus again make them subject to the interests and the greed of the American and foreign shipping monopoly. Besides, if it is now enacted that this measure must be temporary, its life expiring with any stated interval or emergency, both American and foreign shipping will understand definitely the extent of this Government's rivalry and can shape their selfish conduct at the expense of our people accordingly. Furthermore, it is not certain whether the shipping board provided by this act may find it best to construct or to purchase merchant ships under the provisions of this bill. This measure should not be a temporary palliative, but a permanent and heavy bludgeon in the hands of the American people with which to strike monopoly on the head. It should also be recognized that sailors are not made in a day and shipbuilders are not made in a day. Both require time and experience in order to acquire skill and efficiency. American shipyards can not hope to maintain efficiency to compete with foreign shipyards merely by the construction of an occasional battleship, and therefore our Nation must remain without skilled shipbuilding artisans unless some permanent policy be pursued making an avenue for the training of American skilled artisans and sailors. This fact looms very large in view of the enormous Navy we have built, on which some \$1,600,000,000 have been expended since the year 1901, but which is even now, in the face of national peril, wholly without an adequate accompanying supply of auxiliaries such as this bill would provide in time of war. To my mind it is conclusive that a permanent policy which this bill should inaugurate will produce shipyards and docks and piers and artisans and sailors requisite to our naval and merchant marine uses, whereas a temporary policy in the nature of an emergency measure can not accomplish these desired results.

But, above these conditions perhaps, arises in my mind the still higher conception of the duty of statesmanship to the American people—that of providing for them in their collective capacity an indispensably necessary permanent means of enabling them to exchange their surplus products with the nations and peoples of the whole world upon ocean-freight terms that are fair and are not, as at present, largely confiscatory.

I would see our people free and unfettered in the conduct of their vast foreign commerce, as I would see them free and unfettered in all other respects involving their freedom, prosperity, and happiness.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to wake up the sleeping Democrats, and 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. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59.]

Ainey	Claypool	Flood, Va.	Hobson
Anthony	Copley	French	Hoxworth
Avis	Cullop	Gard	Hughes, W. Va.
Barnhart	Dale	Gardner	Jones
Booher	Danforth	George	Kahn
Broussard	Davenport	Godwin, N. C.	Kelster
Brown, N. Y.	Dent	Goldfogle	Kelley, Mich.
Brown, W. Va.	Dooling	Gorman	Kennedy, Conn.
Bruckner	Driscoll	Graham, Ill.	Kettner
Burgess	Dunn	Graham, Pa.	Kitchin
Burke, Pa.	Edwards	Gudger	Knowland, J. R.
Burnett	Elder	Hamill	Kreider
Carew	Estopinal	Hamilton, N. Y.	Langham
Carr	Fairchild	Hart	Langley
Carter	Faison	Hayes	Lee, Ga.
Cary	Fitzgerald	Hensley	L'Engle



Lewis, Md.	O'Brien	Slayden	Walker
Lewis, Pa.	Oglesby	Smith, Md.	Wallin
Lindquist	O'Hair	Smith, N. Y.	Walsh
Lloyd	O'Shaunessy	Sparkman	Walters
Loft	Patten, N. Y.	Stevens, Minn.	Watkins
McClellan	Prouty	Taggart	Whaley
McGillcuddy	Rauch	Talbott, Md.	Whitacre
McGuire, Okla.	Reed	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Fla.
McKenzie	Riordan	Taylor, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Maher	Roberts, Nev.	Thacher	Winslow
Mondell	Rucker	Townsend	Woodruff
Morgan, La.	Rapley	Treadway	Young, N. Dak.
Neely, W. Va.	Sabath	Tuttle	
Nelson	Scully	Underhill	
Nolan, J. I.	Shreve	Vare	

The SPEAKER. On this call 302 Members—a quorum—answered to their names.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill because I have studied it and believe it is a thoroughly constitutional and a thoroughly Democratic measure. I am going to support it because my district, almost unanimously, is for this bill. Every newspaper, daily and weekly, published in my district is for the bill, and every public organization in the city in which I live—the Cotton Exchange, the Merchants' Exchange, the Business Men's Club, the Lumber Exchange, and every other business organization, I believe—is committed to it. Two great staples from my part of the country are vitally interested in it—cotton and lumber. It is an emergency measure for those two products especially, and various other products, and we are suffering greatly because of a lack of shipping facilities and because of extortionate rates, and I believe we ought to pass this bill to remedy the trouble.

There is another reason why I am in favor of it—and I want to say to my Democratic colleagues and my Republican colleagues that I am not ashamed to say it, but am proud to say it—and it is because a great Democratic President, the leader of his party and the leader of his country, is in favor of this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I intended to say something which I have already prepared about other features of this bill and of this debate, but my attention is going to be diverted for the short time I have to some of the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The gentleman from Washington has never been able to see anything good in President Wilson. He is the most prejudiced man on this subject I ever saw. Nine or ten months ago no man ever so bitterly attacked another as the gentleman from Washington attacked the President of the United States on the floor of this House because he would not go to war with Mexico. Daily, almost, he abused him along this line and exhausted the vocabulary in his harsh and unjust and prejudiced criticism, and yet to-day we hear the gentleman from Washington coming before us as a disciple of peace, afraid to give this power to the President, afraid to give this power to the administration, because, says the gentleman from Washington, he is afraid that the President will involve our country in war. Ah, Mr. Speaker, that is not what is the matter with the gentleman from Washington. Last spring, when he was decrying against the President about not warring on Mexico, we found the Oil Trust and the Fruit Trust and the Steel Trust and the Sugar Trust desiring this Government to intervene in Mexico, and we found the gentleman from Washington and those who believe with him lining up with those trusts and against the President of the United States. What do we find here to-day? We find the gentleman from Washington lined up again with one of the greatest trusts that this country has ever known—the Shipping Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In abusing the President of the United States it is the same old argument for the trusts. He was for the trusts last spring; he is for them again this winter. Now, it never seems to occur to the gentleman that his position about the matter is inconsistent. Consistency is waved aside when the gentleman attacks the President. Why, the gentleman from Washington is so prejudiced against Woodrow Wilson that I do not believe he would vote to indorse the Lord's Prayer if the President of the United States had indorsed it first. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from Washington has got a bad case of the shingles.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman has got a bad case of the shingles, as my friend from Georgia here says. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington says something else. He says that there are no Democrats over here who are heartily in favor of this bill. Why, the gentleman is wholly in error and, as usual, does not know what he is talking about. He says the Democrats praise President Wilson on the floor and curse him in the cloakrooms. I deny it, and say it is untrue. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not do anything of the kind. I do not know how the gentleman got into a Democratic cloakroom and found out what he claims to have found out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I walked in.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the gentleman walked in, he did not hear what he claims to have heard. Now, I want to say this: Here is a bill—

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman walked into the wrong cloakroom.

Mr. McKELLAR. As my friend suggests, the gentleman perhaps walked into the wrong cloakroom, and if he heard somebody abuse the President, it was in the Republican cloakroom.

Now, I want to say this about this matter: It is claimed that this bill has not been considered by this House. This is not true. This measure has been reported out by a committee of this House and has been considered by a committee of this House. It is in line with what the great majority of Democrats believe, is a mandate of the Democratic platform at Baltimore. It has been the policy of the Democratic Party at all times to build up and foster a merchant marine. The President of the United States is not trying to jam anything down our throats. We are working with him. He is doing just exactly what we want in urging us to pass this bill and in helping us pass it. We want a ship bill, and we want to build up the American merchant marine which you gentlemen have allowed to be destroyed by your policies during the last 50 years. We want to build it up, and the President of the United States is simply standing solidly and earnestly and vigorously with the Democratic Party in endeavoring to carry out our platform on that subject, and we respect him and admire him for his position. He is not afraid. He is not to be deterred by the obstacles which you may try to throw in the way. He is standing squarely for the Democratic Party and for the urgent needs of the country, and this House will stand with him.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman said this bill has been reported by a committee. It does not so show on its face. It says it was referred to a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, the gentleman knows perfectly well, if he knows anything about what has happened in this House, that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have reported out exactly this kind of a bill. Indeed, this very bill in substance.

Mr. PLATT. But not this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; this bill. On September 8. Of course, this is an amendment to a bill; it is different only in a parliamentary sense or a technical sense, but the very bill, substantially word for word, almost letter for letter, has been considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this House and reported to this House some time ago. The Senate committee has also substantially reported it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. This rule says the committee is discharged from the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT.]

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] has challenged those of us who disagree with the proposed measure to suggest amendments. I shall suggest two, which I believe to be fundamentally necessary if we are not to blunder into war.

These under the rule will, of course, die unconsidered, and so I shall be constrained to vote against the bill.

First. The purchase of belligerent ships should be precluded; and

Second. Federal merchant ships should not carry cargoes to belligerent nations, but should confine their services to neutral commerce and to our home and coastwise ports.

Under different conditions I should most heartily support this bill. I not only believe that it is proper and advisable for



the Federal Government to go into the shipping business, but I believe that it is especially necessary in view of the needs of the Navy. Even if we, the whole people, shall operate such ships at a loss, it is better to subsidize all of us than pay a few beneficiaries under a system of private subsidies.

We all know that we are short of auxiliary vessels for the Navy, and short of men of the right sort to man our Navy in time of war. But the world has been stricken with madness, and those who circulate in the neighborhood of the rabid can not be too careful lest they be inoculated.

When we consider the argument urged by every one of the nations at war, that each is struggling for national existence, and then total up the sum of the strife, we find that they are all valiantly struggling for national destruction and damnation—in which we desire no part.

As a Nation seeking peace, as a Nation sympathizing with the trials and struggles and the sufferings of all, it is our business to keep ourselves from even the appearance of evil.

I, for one, do not distrust the President or his Cabinet. I believe that they are acting from the highest motives and from the best light they have. But that can not in any way relieve us of the Congress from our personal responsibility. [Applause on the Republican side.] It rests with Congress to determine whether or not we shall be embroiled. It is no less incumbent upon us to prevent the first step than it is to prevent the last step into war. Each and every Member of this House has a personal duty to keep the country at peace, and each should voice that responsibility free from partisanship, conscientiously.

We are told that the bill before us is drawn along lines of international law. I have read with the greatest care the masterly utterances of authorities who differ entirely as to what constitutes international law in connection with shipping.

It is admitted that the international law as construed by different nations is at variance.

We know that international law is nothing but convention established from time to time between the nations or made to order by those most powerful on land or sea as suits their convenience. It is absurd that international law should, for instance, countenance the sale of munitions of war by the individuals of a neutral country and at the same time should consider it a violation of international law for a nation to sell such munitions of war from its own stores. The first proposition condones a crime against humanity, the latter is a feeble minimizing of an evil privilege. If only all munitions of war were manufactured by governments, international law would save all of us from the iniquity of promoting murder among friendly nations.

We are familiar with Lowell's poem, Jonathan to John, wherein John Bull is berated for selling arms to the Confederacy:

You wonder why we're hot, John?  
Your mark wuz on the guns,  
The neutral guns, that shot, John,  
Our brothers an' our sons.

I prefer to consider questions like the one before us from the standpoint of private judgment, unbiased by all these diametrically opposed and conflicting definitions. For as long as the dictionaries of international law can be published in constantly changing editions, by all nations, and when doctors of international law so violently disagree, each citizen must make his own determination, based on his judgment of what ought to be law—ought to be law, because law is supposed to be common sense.

In the bill before us we find that "no purchases shall be made in a way which shall disturb the conditions of neutrality."

If this proviso means anything, it simply means that we shall not purchase interned ships in a manner productive of discussion or trouble. This is a small meaning. If the sentence should read "no purchase shall be made or operations undertaken that shall disturb the conditions of neutrality," there would be real meaning in this proviso. To my mind, it would be far better to declare against the "purchase of any ship that is entitled to fly the flag of any nation now at war."

The ships now interned in the neutral waters of the United States would be subject to capture if they went out under their own flags. If they were to go out under our flag, there would be a close analogy to the case where a hound dog chased a rabbit into a hole and waited at the mouth of the hole, saying to himself with watering mouth, "There is my rabbit," and thereafter the rabbit emerged with an American flag wrapped around him. There might be trouble for the rabbit and the American flag might be torn. It is safer to leave belligerent ships entirely alone. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The next question is as to what the Federally owned ships shall do after they are built or purchased. The bill specifically provides that they shall engage in foreign commerce and shall

not hamper or compete with the coastwise trade. Now, whatever international law may be, we, all of us in this House, have had some experience with practical politics, and we know the vast difference that would be held by our citizens to obtain between the seizure of a privately owned ship that might be guilty of carrying contraband—and contraband varies with every nation and from day to day—at its own risk, and a Federal ship that might be seized for the same reason.

There is a vast political difference between privately owned and public-owned ships. The private shipowner may take his chances without involving the country in war, but the public ship, under Federal ownership and control, if doing what the private ship might do with nothing but the penalty of capture, would, to my mind, be extremely apt to drag us into this contest wherein the warring nations are all too willing to involve all their neighbors.

The thin disguise that a private corporation shall manage these ships and that by such fiction the Government shall secure immunity seems puerile in this day and generation. There is a continual effort born of necessity to hold those who control the management of corporations to full personal responsibility. Else why should the Rockefellers be prosecuted and persecuted for the iniquities of the war in Colorado?

Our Federal vessels should be confined to traffic with neutral countries and should engage in our own coastwise trade. They would then release coastwise vessels for foreign trade. It is absurd to contend that vessels belonging to all the people should be hampered by coastwise laws, while those belonging to privileged corporations, a few of the people and perhaps none of them our own people, shall have open to them the full privileges of our home trade. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. How much time did the gentleman use?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seven minutes. The gentleman yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that there is very little difference between Member and Member as to whether we should have a merchant marine or not.

On the other hand, I think that everybody here is agreed that the Nation ought to have a merchant marine and that instead of allowing foreign countries to carry our merchandise we ought to provide the means by which we can carry a portion of it, at least, ourselves. This bill, however, professes to be one suggestion of the manner of building up the merchant marine that I do not believe will be a success, first, because it is admitted by its sponsors to be an emergency bill, and its very character as such is that two years after the war closes the Government is to discontinue the use of the ships as a carrying or merchant agency, when they are to be taken back to the Navy Department. The Navy is permitted to sublet or to lease to merchantmen. In this way the Government builds at its own cost the ship and leases it to other corporations. I do not believe that that is a wise method. In the first place, the Government, taking all the risk in an enterprise which thus far has not proved a success financially, not only in expenditure but also in the possible contingencies that might arise with other countries through our Government owning the vessels and operating them through some sublessees, you are thus inviting complications instead of avoiding the dangers that I see in this particular plan of Government ownership. Then, again, I am not ready to change our methods and abandon private ownership for governmental ownership. I do not believe that the time is here when I am justified in taking such a long step toward national socialism as that step would be. On the other hand, I am convinced that the Government ought to encourage private enterprise and not to discourage it. I do not think the Government ought to enter into competition with private enterprise, because private enterprise certainly can not successfully compete against the Government. And instead of driving out of existence private enterprise by the strong arm of the Government, the Government ought to stimulate it. Then, again, I am opposed to the manner in which this bill has come into the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present. I think the gentleman is entitled to an audience here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five gentlemen are present—not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

## [Roll No. 70.]

Abercrombia	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Rupley
Ainey	Frear	L'Engle	Sabath
Anthony	Gard	Lever	Sells
Avis	Gardner	Levy	Shreve
Barnhart	George	Lewis, Pa.	Slayden
Bartholdt	Gerry	Lindquist	Smith, Md.
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	Loft	Smith, N. Y.
Bowdle	Goeke	McClellan	Sparkman
Broussard	Goldfogle	McGillcuddy	Stafford
Brown, N. Y.	Gorman	McGuire, Okla.	Steenerson
Brown, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Summers
Browne, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Maher	Switzer
Burgess	Hamill	Martin	Talbot, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Cantrill	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mulkey	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hamlin	Murdoch	Taylor, N. Y.
Carr	Hart	Murray	Thacher
Carter	Haugen	Neeley, Kans.	Townsend
Cary	Hawley	Nelson	Treadway
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayden	Nolan, J. I.	Tribble
Clark, Fla.	Hayes	O'Brien	Tuttle
Claypool	Hensley	Oglesby	Underhill
Coady	Hobson	O'Hair	Vare
Copley	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Vollmer
Cramton	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer	Walker
Danforth	Humphreys, Miss.	Patten, N. Y.	Wallin
Dent	Jones	Peterson	Walsh
Dershem	Kahn	Platt	Walters
Dooling	Keister	Plumley	Whaley
Driscoll	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	White
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Post	Williams
Dupré	Kettner	Price	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Kinkaid	Prouty	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Kitchin	Reed	Winslow
Estopinal	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan	Woodruff
Fairchild	Kreider	Roberts, Nev.	
Falson	Langham	Rucker	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). On this call 276 Members have responded, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized for six minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, at 11 o'clock to-day we went into session. It is now 6 o'clock. We have spent 7 hours here. During that time we have had five roll calls on the question of no quorum and two roll calls on other phases of the parliamentary status and have 3 hours and 50 minutes left out of the 6 hours of general debate originally allotted. I mention that to indicate that the majority side is not interested in this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. ADAMSON. You would not have had the last roll call if the gentleman himself had not yielded the floor for that purpose.

Mr. FESS. I had to yield the floor under parliamentary law and the rules of the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was there any compulsion on the gentleman?

Mr. FESS. Yes. I was compelled on the point of order, and I had no recourse.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. FESS. The point of no quorum takes me off the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that the Democratic side of this House is not interested in this legislation. There is not any question about it. You are not in favor of it, and you are here, when you are here, simply to ratify an order that has come in from the White House. Otherwise you would stay here and not kill time in this way.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FESS. I do.

Mr. RAINEY. Does it not indicate that the House is not interested in the gentleman's speech?

Mr. FESS. Oh, that is a cheap thing for you to say. I am not the only one who is speaking from this floor. The gentleman himself will be speaking later, perhaps, and if he should speak I will have the respect to stay and listen to him if he has anything to say. [Applause.] There have been as many speeches on the Democratic side of the House as from the Republican side. But the fact is you are taking your orders from the White House, and you know you are. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Senate on the 15th day of last month began the discussion of this issue. It is still before that body. It is now by order brought over here. You listen to the order that comes from the White House and bring in a rule to close this debate here in six hours. Then you refuse to stay in the Chamber that the hours may be consumed in debate without your presence. Less than five-sixths of one minute is permitted to each Member of this House to debate this issue. Forty-nine seconds are all that you are allotting to the individual Member of the House, and yet you are discussing an issue that involves an entire change of the governmental policy of the Nation, which is neither Democratic nor Republican, so far as an issue goes; an issue that ought to take months for its discussion before you undertake to make the change. And more than that, you are undertaking to do a thing that may involve the Nation not only in national industrial disturbance but in international trouble. Every single time that a Government-owned vessel flying the American flag crosses the sea in time of war our Nation will be taking the risk of getting into trouble by violating the laws of neutrality. Suppose such a vessel were seized by a foreign country, what would be the consequence? And yet, with but five-sixths of one minute allotted to the individual Member to discuss this great issue, involving national and international complications, you refuse to remain here to make a quorum, because it is all done, anyway, by Executive order. There is not a Member in this House, Republican or Democrat, that does not know that the order is given, and it will be carried out just as it is given.

It seems to me that this House of Representatives, with 435 Members, is in a peculiar situation, if its membership will receive orders from the White House to ratify simply what the occupant of the White House says. That is precisely the situation here. You condemn it privately, but you do not dare to do it publicly. I do not blame you for not doing it publicly. But there is not a Member on this side of the House, as there is not on that side, but knows that we ought not to push a measure like this through this House in six hours with scarcely any discussion at all, and when men on the floor are asking to be heard in the debate, you do not even have interest to stay here to listen, and the excuse is given that the men who speak have not anything to say that is worth hearing. That may be your standard of legislation, but I want to say to you that it is rather the measure of Executive influence over this House. It is also the measure of the weakness of the American Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I want to say that I have not been directed by the White House or anybody else to support this bill. I am going to support this bill without any direction from anybody.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to hear it. The gentleman has shown his independence on other occasions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe anybody on this side has had instructions from anybody to vote for this bill. I think the gentleman from Ohio makes a misstatement when he says that this side has been directed to vote for this bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman because I wanted to be courteous to him. But that does not change the situation after all. I said a moment ago that it was not the measure of the strength of the executive department, but it is the measure of the weakness of the legislative department; and I repeat that statement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The time has come when the legislative body ought to speak on matters of legislation, and not have orders sent down to put a thing through and rush it without further debate than six hours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] will permit, I would like to yield a little time which I have reserved. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the discourse to which we have just listened from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], which might be more appropriately termed a scolding than an address, is, of course, very interesting. We have heard here to-day, and we hear frequently on the part of Members of the opposition, the fact that men on this side have not sufficient



courage to vote their own convictions because they are dictated to from the White House. So far as I am individually concerned, I deny that charge, and on behalf of my Democratic friends I deny it for them. I say for myself that if this proposition were put up to the American Congress by a Republican administration, by a Republican President, believing in it as I do as a safe measure, I would have what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] does not possess—patriotism and courage enough to vote for it, regardless of where it comes from. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the progress of this debate I have heard much from gentlemen who oppose the bill about embarking this Government in Government ownership and "State socialism." If this sophistry affords them a convenient argument against coming to the relief of the people in this great emergency, I shall be the last to rob them of the effect of its soothing qualities.

However, I desire to call attention to a serious condition which confronts the people of this Nation, and which may grow more serious as this great war progresses. I am not frightened, Mr. Speaker, by the specter of "Government ownership," which has been raised to becloud the issue in this contest. I do not propose on this occasion to be beguiled into a desertion of my plain duty by following or adopting old worn-out political aphorisms, which were perhaps applicable to another generation and to other conditions, but which have no place and no value in the solution of this and many other modern questions with which we have to deal.

Let us face conditions as they are now, and not rattle around among the dead bones of ancient heroes while our people suffer and are robbed. The greatest war in history is now in progress. The avenues of trade and the means of transportation upon the high seas have been interrupted. Freight rates upon the ocean have been increased from 300 to 1,100 per cent, and upon many commodities the rates are absolutely prohibitive, even if ships could be secured. We are at the mercy of a foreign Shipping Trust. There can be no question about that. Less than 8 per cent of our foreign commerce is carried by ships flying the American flag. The balance is carried by foreign ships. This foreign shipping monopoly has increased the freight rates upon American cotton from \$1.25 per bale to \$15 and \$18 per bale. It has increased the rate for the shipment of lumber to such an extent that no man can afford to ship it at all, and many of our lumber mills have been compelled to close down and throw men out of employment because they can not secure ships to carry lumber; and if they could, the rates are so high as to make shipment at a profit out of the question.

This foreign shipping monopoly has increased the freight rate on Kentucky export tobacco from 30 cents per hundred pounds to \$3.40 and \$4 per hundred pounds, and ships are so scarce and rates so high that many foreign buyers have cabled their agents in this country to stop buying. These foreign ship-owners have canceled contracts with American shippers running for a year without notice, and have compelled them to pay outrageous increases in freight or let their products rot upon the shores. They have arbitrarily refused to carry some commodities in order to have more room for others upon which they could charge higher rates.

Mr. Speaker, this condition of affairs has been especially hurtful to the farmers of Kentucky. Our great money crop, especially in the western part of the State, is dark tobacco, 85 per cent of which is exported to Europe. The prices which have been received by the farmers for that product in the last few years have ranged around \$8 and \$10 per hundred for the best grades, with smaller prices for lower grades. It was expected that the European war would to some extent affect the price of tobacco to the farmer, and this expectation has been fearfully fulfilled. But when it is contemplated that in addition to this unfavorable market condition a foreign shipping monopoly, flying other flags than ours, has arbitrarily raised the freight upon that tobacco from 30 cents per hundred to \$3.40 per hundred, which increase must in the long run come largely from the farmer's pocket because of the decrease in the price which he may receive, some idea may be obtained of the unhappy conditions which must prevail if that condition is permitted to continue.

These same conditions prevail, with varying degrees, with respect to everything the American people have to ship. The American people have a surplus every year of both farm products and manufactured products. That surplus they have a right to sell in the markets of the world wherever it is needed to administer to the wants of humanity. In this great crisis a great emergency calls for action. The markets of the world yearn for our surplus products. Shall we sit with folded hands and complacent consciences and say this great Government has no remedy to offer to her people? [Applause.]

It is not surprising that the Republican Members of Congress are against this measure. They do not want prosperity to come to the people. They would rather see the whole country in want than for this Democratic administration or the Democratic Party to get any credit for relieving a distressing situation. They would rather see the whole country on its way to perdition in a hand basket than to see tranquillity, peace, and prosperity under a Democratic administration. For 50 years they had an opportunity to build up an American merchant marine under the Constitution. Did they do it? Did they attempt it? Only by proposing to take the money of the people collected in taxes and give it graciously to a shipping trust in the form of a subsidy. In the opinion of these Republicans it is a crime, if not treason itself, to take the people's money and buy some ships to be operated by the people's Government for their relief in a great emergency; but it is the quadrupled quintessence of Republican statesmanship to take that same money and give it to a shipping trust for its private benefit without return to the Government. [Applause.]

We have heard the great constitutional and international lawyer and world-renowned diplomat from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] discuss this question from the standpoint of constitutional and international law. [Laughter.]

We need not stop now to discuss the constitutional questions involved in this measure. Under the Constitution this Nation has spent its money to improve rivers and harbors in order that the commerce of America might move. Does that same instrument deny us the right also to spend some of our money to make those rivers and harbors available and valuable in a great emergency such as that which confronts us now? Under the Constitution we have spent our money to reclaim the arid lands of the West in order to make more homes for farmers. Does that instrument deny us the right to purchase ships in a great emergency in order that this farmer may find a market for his produce? Under the Constitution we have spent our money to make the soil more fertile in every State and to make two blades of grass grow instead of one. Does that instrument deny us the right to afford to the farmers of the Nation in a great emergency reasonable facilities for transporting that surplus produce to the markets of the world? Under the Constitution we have sent consuls and American agents to all the civilized nations of the world to build up and foster American trade in those countries. Shall that instrument be now invoked against our effort to provide at least temporary facilities for the transportation of the commerce thus secured? Under the Constitution we have established the parcel post for the cheap transportation of products upon land; we have regulated the rates that may be charged by railroads and other common carriers upon the land; and under the Constitution we have done a vast number of things that the Government could do for the benefit of all the people that could or would not have been done by private enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, if the rates for hauling freight over the railroads of the United States had been in the last six months raised in the same proportion as they have upon the high seas, the American people would rise up without exception and demand that their Government come to their relief. It so happens that we can regulate and control, and have regulated and controlled, the rates at which our products may be hauled upon the land. But we have no such power to control the rates charged upon the high seas, because most of the ships are foreign and our jurisdiction only extends three miles from shore. Consequently, the only remedy that is left to us in this emergency, which will grow greater as this great war continues, is to pass this bill and let the Government purchase and operate these vessels for the benefit of all the people, farmers, manufacturers, and merchants alike, and after the war is over and the emergency is passed we shall have more time to discuss intelligently and dispassionately the permanent policy which we shall adopt in the future in order to build up a strong and permanent American merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

For the present the town is on fire, and it does not behoove us as intelligent men to stand under a sycamore tree and discuss the question whether it would be wise at some time in the future to put in waterworks and a fire department, while all the time the town is burning. Let us grab the buckets, go to the nearest and most available source of water, and put out the fire. The settlement of future policies and programs can well await the day when the rebuilding shall begin. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, several times this afternoon I have noticed the use of a phrase like the one used by the gentle-



man from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who just took his seat, referring to the preservation of the neutrality of the United States. In section 7 of this bill we find as the concluding paragraph these words:

*Provided further, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchases shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.*

It seems to me that neither the declarations made on the floor of the House that neutrality will not be disturbed nor the provision in this bill to the same effect touch the real point of international difficulty. It is conceivable, but not very likely, that in the purchase of ships owned by belligerents the transaction might in some way compromise the neutrality of the United States. For example, the question of neutrality might be raised concerning the shipment of money to pay for those vessels. Money is contraband, just as gunpowder is contraband; but, to my mind, this is not the point upon which an international dispute is most likely to arise. No declaration that the United States Government will preserve its neutrality touches the real danger of the bill. We could buy those ships, private persons could buy them, or perhaps even the Government itself could buy them, without raising any question of having committed an unneutral act. The real point is this: If the declaration of London is in force—and it is in force in English law—we buy ships that under British law, under French law, under German law, under Russian law, and under Italian law are subject to capture. It is not a question of the neutrality of the United States; it is a matter of buying property to which we can acquire only a clouded title.

The provision that forbids any purchase which would compromise the neutrality of the United States does not cover the case. We buy the property, but there is a doubt whether the owner could convey a clear title. The German owner of a ship lying idle in a harbor of the United States will remain the owner of it so long as it does not go outside of the 3-mile limit. When it sails the ocean as a German vessel any warship of an enemy of Germany has, under international law, the unquestioned right to capture it, merely because it is enemy property.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I understand the gentleman states the proposition that a German-owned ship lying in American waters is the private property of that German, and that as long as it is in the waters of the United States, owned by him, he could sell that ship.

Mr. TEMPLE. I did not say that he had a right to sell it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Does the gentleman say that the German citizen who owned a German ship lying in American waters could not sell that ship in good faith?

Mr. TEMPLE. If the gentleman will give me my time, I will make a speech on that subject. That is the topic that I am going to talk about. The question will not hold me any closer to the point than I would hold myself.

The whole question is whether the German owner of that ship can sell us property that will not be subject to capture. He can sell us all he owns, but if he sails it on the ocean it will be captured. If we buy it from him, we have to prove, in the language of the declaration of London, that it was not sold "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy ship as such is exposed." If we can not prove this, the transfer of the vessel to the American flag is void.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman allow me to interpose a question?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. I have seen it stated in some of the speeches in the Senate that the declaration of London has never been ratified by England, either by treaty or otherwise, and that the only law in force in England is a law that is 200 years old.

Mr. TEMPLE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the declaration of London is in force in English courts. I exhibited here a week ago last Saturday an order in council and a royal proclamation, dated October 29, 1914, in which the King in council instructed all the judges of the prize courts to enforce the provisions of the declaration of London.

Mr. WEBB. Did not a commission report to—

Mr. TEMPLE. I can not yield longer nor go back further than the order in council. The point I make is that on October 29, 1914, an order in council was issued instructing the judges of the prize courts to put the London declaration into effect. The report to which you refer is of an earlier date than that, and no law earlier than that date can by any possibility supersede the later one.

Germany, Italy, France, and Russia have also put that law into effect. Now, when a case is tried, suppose a German ship

is transferred to the American flag and captured by an English cruiser; it will be tried in an English court, not in an American court. If it is captured by a French cruiser, it will be tried in a French court.

A case arose in 1912 in which article 47 of the London declaration was involved, in a dispute between Italy and France during the late war between Italy and Turkey. Italy was enforcing the declaration of London, and France protested against it. They agreed to take the case to the court of arbitration at The Hague. The ruling of the court will be found in the report on the case of the *Manouba*, in the American Journal of International Law for July, 1913. The Hague Court of Arbitration gave its award in accordance with article 47 of the declaration of London, when neither Italy nor France had ratified that document. England has announced her intention to enforce it; we may protest. Italy had announced her intention to enforce it, and France had protested; and yet, when it went to the international court of arbitration at The Hague, that court sustained article 47 of the declaration of London. The powers that signed the declaration had agreed that the rules contained in it correspond, in substance, with the generally recognized principles of international law. I think we ought to avoid a controversy that is already practically decided against us. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who may speak upon this bill may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, and several others objected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-nine Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71.]

Alney	Finley	Langham	Riordan
Allen	Fitzgerald	Langley	Roberts, Mass.
Anthony	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Roberts, Nev.
Ashbrook	Fordney	L'Engle	Rothermel
Austin	Fowler	Lever	Rupley
Avis	Francis	Levy	Sabath
Barnhart	Frear	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Bartholdt	Gard	Lindquist	Seldomridge
Bartlett	George	Loft	Sells
Bathrick	Gerry	McClellan	Sherley
Borland	Gillmore	McGillcuddy	Shreve
Bowdle	Gittins	McGuire, Okla.	Slayden
Broussard	Godwin	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Brown, W. Va.	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	Mahan	Smith, Saml. W.
Bulkeley	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Green, Iowa	Manahan	Sparkman
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	Martin	Stafford
Callaway	Hamill	Mondell	Steenerson
Campbell	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore	Switzer
Cantrill	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, La.	Talbot, Md.
Carew	Harrison	Morrison	Tavener
Carr	Hart	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ala.
Carter	Haugen	Mott	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Hawley	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Nelson	Thacher
Clark, Fla.	Helgesen	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson, Okla.
Claypool	Helvering	Norton	Towner
Cline	Henry	O'Brien	Townsend
Coady	Hensley	Oglesby	Treadway
Copley	Hobson	O'Shaunessy	Tuttle
Cramton	Hoxworth	Paige, Mass.	Underhill
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Vare
Davenport	Humphreys, Miss.	Peters	Walker
Davis	Johnson, S. C.	Peterson	Wallin
Dent	Jones	Platt	Walsh
Dershem	Kahn	Plumley	Walters
Doolling	Kelster	Pou	Wilson, Fla.
Drukker	Kelley, Mich.	Price	Wilson, N. Y.
Dunn	Kettner	Prouty	Winslow
Edwards	Kless	Rainey	Woodruff
Elder	Kitchin	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Fairchild	Knowland, J. R.	Rayburn	
Faison	Korby	Reed	
Ferris	Kreider	Reilly, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 245 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 75, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a trifle disconcerting to one who has a splendid speech to deliver to an expectant audience—or, at least, one that he hopes is expectant—to find while the roll is being called that the Members answer to their names and then immediately run as though they were trying to escape from the scene of their crimes. [Laughter.] I do not suppose, however, it is becoming in any of us to make complaint. By this time we ought to be used to any sort of treatment in the House. I think it is about all we deserve, and we may as well be satisfied, because I am sure it is all we are going to get. We have before us a bill that has never been considered by a committee of the House, that has never been passed upon by a committee of the House; one that is brought in here and one we are told to pass without the opportunity of considering it or of offering a single amendment to it. Not only that, but we have had added to it another measure, widely divergent in its subject matter and of transcendent importance to the American people. Both of these bills are of that importance, and yet we are, after a few hours of useless and almost absurd general debate, to vote upon them. You may pass this measure in this manner, if you like, but when you leave this Chamber, no matter what the hour may be, do not raise your heads in pride and say that you have this day labored in the greatest legislative body in the world. You have not labored in a legislative body at all. Do you know, my friends, that in every civilized nation in the world the legislative body of the people, the body that immediately represents the people, has been gaining in power at the expense of the other departments of the Government, save in our own?

The House of Commons has become the great ruling power of England; likewise the Chamber of Deputies in France, drawn from and immediately representing the people of France, is the great lawmaking, controlling body in that great country; likewise is this true in Italy, in Germany, aye, in Japan. But in the United States, where we claim free institutions were first given their real life, the people's body, the House of Representatives, has been rapidly declining in importance and in power until now its ancient glory is all but vanished. We have ceased to be an important factor in our scheme of government. The functions of this great branch, the lawmaking body designed to represent the will and protect the rights of the people, have been of late rapidly assumed by the Senate and the Executive. The House of Representatives as it stands to-day is an unnecessary and at times an inconvenient body—unnecessary because it has surrendered its power and performs no vital function, inconvenient because a slight obstacle that must be stepped on by the ever-growing Senate and Executive. This House is of about as much use to the Government of the United States to-day as the appendix is to the human frame, and no more. You are making history. You bring in a transcendently important matter of this kind and force its passage through this body, supposed directly to represent the people, without giving the people's representatives the slightest opportunity to shape it, frame it, or consider it. You make a farce, a complete farce, of this, the designed to be most important branch of the National Legislature.

You are making history. Yes; but history that you and your children and your children's children will be ashamed of during all the ages to come. You are reversing the processes fundamental in the evolution of free institutions and putting into action the forces that lead to absolutism.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the brethren who are so terribly and deeply interested in this bill for just a moment, I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the things in the bill.

I wish I had time to call attention to many of the things, for it seems to me that the merits of the bill have not as yet attracted the attention of the Members of the House. Probably it is because we have not time to consider its merits or demerits, and for the further reason that it does not matter what the merits or defects are, anyway, for you are going to vote it through and make a wry face when you do the job. This bill is quite in harmony in its subject matter with the method of its presentation and passage. It is an inglorious surrender as a lawmaking body, representing the people of the United States, of some of the fundamental things intrusted to this body under

our Government. This is the lawmaking part or at least a portion of the lawmaking part of our Government, and yet in two sections we propose to turn over to the Executive of the Nation the right to amend and repeal all the rules and regulations under the law that exist to-day for the control of our merchant marine, and to replace them with any other rules and regulations it may please his omnipotent power to import. No such power as that was ever given by a free people to a tyrant, except in the way you are giving this under the lash of the tyrant's whip.

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

Mr. MILLER. I have only a moment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I just want to puncture that error there.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can puncture later on in his own time, but he will find no error there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman were informed, he would not make such a statement.

Mr. MILLER. I have read the gentleman's bill, and I am giving it almost literally. The gentleman himself apparently does not know what is in the bill, and I do not wonder at it. I have not discovered anyone on that side of the House who pretends to understand what is in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. MILLER. One thing further. I notice in section 7 there is an apt and fitting expression of the attitude of this sycophantic, this cringing, this beseeching body of the people's representatives. It reads:

That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels.

What a grand and glorious moment! The United States of America, whenever a grand and glorious President, clothed with his omnipotent power, graciously condescends to permit, these United States may purchase a ship! The United States can purchase a boat when the President of the United States says that it may. How does that comport with Democratic doctrine since the days of Thomas Jefferson?

Nay, more, Mr. Speaker; I observe some more things in this bill that attract the passing attention. We have not time to give any more than passing attention to the bill, but let us give that. I see that it provides that the corporation stock and the property of the corporation which it is proposed the corporation shall acquire shall be exempt from taxation. I suppose that is upon the theory that it is the property of the United States and ought not as such to be taxed. All well and good, so far as that goes, but the bill contemplates that private individuals will become subscribers to the capital stock of this \$10,000,000 corporation up to 49 per cent, and if they do they will become the owners of almost half the property owned; and what right have you to absolve that property from paying its just share of taxes that are being paid to-day by all other property in America?

Then I notice one thing further. You say that while the United States, through its Executive and the board, is to control the corporation, because it is to have 51 per cent of the stock of the corporation, in the same breath you write into the bill a provision that a majority of the stockholders—not the stock, but a majority of the stockholders—can remove every officer of the corporation, and remove thereby the United States Government itself from the control of its own property. Then another thing. It is proposed to issue \$40,000,000 worth of Panama Canal bonds to finance this project. What a gulp of American pride you swallow when you do this. In the days of our country's prosperity—Republican days; good, old Republican days—our country carried through the stupendous achievement of constructing this great aid to commerce and national defense, engineered it, and financed it almost entirely out of the current revenues of our prosperous country. Now that you have destroyed our country's prosperity, exhausted her Treasury, burdened her people with every conceivable form of taxation, you propose to reach back, lay violent hands upon the glory of the past, and rob former success to pay for this extravagant foolishness, to enter upon a career industrially vicious and fraught with grave danger to our national peace. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand between the two sides?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has an hour and thirty-four minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 hour and 24 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has 20 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I trust gentlemen on that side will use a little time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].



Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago when the question of tolls through the Panama Canal were up for consideration some of the Members of this House were ready and eager to repeat the story of the young American eagle when it lined its nest in the lion's mane, and now it seems that they are so afraid of England or of the thought of possible controversy that they are scared into conniption fits at the very flare of the lion's tail much less his mane. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The position they take reminds me a little bit, when gentlemen proceed to talk about the prospects of war, of the little story my father used to tell about a Georgia captain, and he had the right to talk about a Georgia captain because he was a Louisiana captain. He said during the war that there was a Georgia captain who had his troops along a certain defense, and he said to his troops, "Boys, there are only a few of us and our ammunition is short. We are hungry and tired. The Yankees have four companies and they have plenty of ammunition; they are well fed, and they are coming here presently. My orders to you are to fire three or four rounds and then run. I am a little lame and I will start now." [Applause.] That is the position these gentlemen take when we take this useless Weeks bill and put into it something that will do business. They say that the London convention has prohibited us from buying vessels. The fact of the matter is that such a prohibition has never been incorporated in any international agreement or convention in the history of this world. Never before has it been claimed with any color of authority that the American Government did not have a right to buy interned ships of a belligerent in a neutral port if we desired to do so, and never before has our procedure on that line been questioned.

England has taken our ships away from us; she has taken our merchant marine from us when we were engaged in war and no question was raised; England has taken such ships repeatedly from other nations at war. They say that the London convention, composed of delegates of the various nations, prohibits us from buying these ships; but what are the facts? The facts of the matter are that the various nations gave their suggestions to the London convention called to compile the rules of international law and, in reference to this matter, said that under international law only the matter of good faith was involved in such transfers; that any neutral nation could buy interned ships of belligerents if good faith existed in the matter of the purchase. And then, after they got through with the London convention, the managers for England reported on what was done at that convention. Here is a report made to the British Government:

The provisions respecting transfers made during a war are less complicated. The general rule is that such transfers are considered void unless it be proved that they were not made with a view to evade the consequences which the retention of enemy nationality during war would entail. This is only another way of stating the principle already explained that transfers effected after the outbreak of hostilities are good if made bona fide, but that it is for the owners of the vessels transferred to prove such bona fides.

In other words, they reported a rule restating exactly what has always been stated before, and at the outbreak of hostilities England issued an order, Germany issued a lot of orders, and the United States has issued an order; and they say that the English order is going to be enforced absolutely, because England has the courts, because England will take our ships into the jurisdiction of the English courts, and that of course the English courts will do as England makes them. The English law, if it is international law, does not get its power from the London convention, because it is admitted that it has not been adopted; but it gets its power and force from the order issued by the Admiralty, by the British Government. Well, now, our Secretary of State issued an order to the contrary. He said officially that the London convention is not binding. Germany issued an order the other day telling us that they had a right to create a war zone around the British Isles, and I suppose we have got to assume as true whatever the German Government says; if the German courts can get hold of a vessel in that area such will rule according to whatever the German Kaiser says. There is no truth in these contentions. The court will have to decide according to international law—not governmental orders—subject to arbitration if the Government is dissatisfied with the court's finding.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Give me two minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. BRYAN. There has been one other argument made here in reference to contraband. It is said that the Government entering into this shipping will get into trouble over contraband or that we can not carry contraband goods. Well, of course the Government of the United States will know what goes into a ves-

sel of its own; the Government of the United States will be careful about what kind of goods it carries, and we can carry some legitimate commerce across the seas. It will no longer be the case that lumber and noncontraband articles can not be carried, because they can not afford to pay the tremendous freight rates that are charged on munitions of war and contraband articles. We will get across the ocean some legitimate commerce, some of the things that the people of this country want to continue their trade in, and some things that they ought to continue their trade in, and they will not bring protests from all sections of the country because contraband is being taken. The United States Government will know what is carried in all the ships, and that is one of the arguments in behalf of the Government going into legitimate, straightforward business, and business that amounts to something.

We have met three or four emergencies at this session of Congress, and it gives me the keenest kind of delight to see us go to Government ownership in things of this kind. It is known that I believe in Government ownership of all the means of interstate commerce in this country. I am glad enough to see you accept that remedy. It gratifies me to see you get to the real thing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rule because I was opposed to such a drastic and unnecessary restriction upon debate and the right to offer amendments. But I shall vote for the bill, because I am heartily and entirely in favor of it. This bill, Mr. Speaker, not only will do something to meet the present emergency, but it will do something to start a real American merchant marine. I think every man here admits that the people of the United States ought to have their own merchant marine. Private capital has not gone into that business in the last 60 years. There are only three possible ways in which you can build up an American merchant marine. First, you might repeal all the navigation laws and all the ship-registry laws; but that will never be done, and I do not think it ought to be done, because a large part of those laws were passed for the purpose of protecting life at sea and protecting sailors at sea, and the sentiment in this country will not stand for a repeal of those humanitarian regulations. Then you have left only two other ways in which you can build up the merchant marine. One is to grant a subsidy to private corporations. That has been against Democratic policy, and I do not believe we will ever have that law in this country. The only other method that remains is for the Government to go into the business directly itself, which is the proper, democratic, and legitimate way. The Government will then have absolute control of rates and service and everything connected with the merchant marine. If we grant a subsidy to private corporations we still would have no opportunity to control transportation rates upon the seas. If we own the ships we can fix our own rates and our own service. For these reasons I am in favor of this bill.

Now, just a word about the international aspects. The strongest speech made here to-day in opposition to this bill was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. This statement of the law was clear and convincing, but his assumption of what the facts are going to be was entirely unfounded and unreasonable. To carry contraband would violate neutrality, but every man knows that these ships will not carry contraband. While I would be glad to see an amendment put in this bill stating specifically that these ships shall not carry contraband, that amendment would not make it any surer or any clearer than it is that these ships will never carry contraband goods. No administration having full control of these ships and of the cargoes that go into them would ever for a moment consider shipping contraband goods. So there is no danger from that source.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the gentleman's position then that if England had declared all foodstuffs destined for Germany contraband, these ships would not carry any foodstuffs to Germany?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Yes, sir; it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire yields back one minute.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, this proposition is one in which I am very much interested. In the Democratic caucus I offered two amendments to this bill which I should have liked very much to have adopted. I voted against the previous question.



I wanted to offer those amendments here. I am unalterably opposed to the coastwise ship monopoly, and would be willing to make almost any sacrifice of any opinion I might have in reference to ships, in order that we might be able to break up such monopoly. [Applause.] Now, I should like—

Mr. MURDOCK. By the way, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. The terms of this bill, as I read them, absolutely exclude these ships from participation in coastwise traffic.

Mr. Sisson. Unless they are American ships. In other words, the United States Government under this bill could have an American-built ship engage in the coastwise trade just as an American citizen could. But I thought this was a great opportunity to put in this bill a provision that the ships that might be purchased or built by the United States Government might be able to get a cargo made up from several ports in the United States for the foreign trade or hauling freight from one port to another. Therefore, I offered amendments in the caucus for the purpose of accomplishing that result. In order that I might be able to offer that amendment in the House, I voted against the previous question. There are some features of the bill I do not like.

If I had the writing of the bill, I would strike some of the features out of it. There are others that I would put in the bill. But on the final passage of the bill I am going to vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My principal reason for doing so is this: If the Government shall go into the shipping business during this emergency and shall continue in the shipping business until the people can realize that the Government is excluded from doing business in her own ports from port to port in a ship which the Government has built on the Clyde, I do not believe that the masses of the American people will stand much longer for this iniquitous coastwise monopoly. And if we can by any means get the American people aroused to the extent that they are willing to demand of Congress that you shall give the people of the United States the right to buy their ships where and when they please and put them in the coastwise trade, then we will have accomplished a great deal by this legislation.

An illustration of the wickedness of the rates of this monopoly which the American people are now paying is illustrated in coal for the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy, in a statement which he made some time ago, stated that he was giving the contracts to foreign ships to haul coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coaling stations, and that in some cases when he would get a quotation of the rates from the coastwise monopoly it would be \$8 a ton around the Horn, and the foreign shipowners carried the coal for him at \$4 a ton.

Now, he is violating the law when he does that, but they dare not prosecute the Secretary of the Navy. They dare not institute against him proceedings that would bring before the American people this great iniquity. And if we could get the people to thoroughly understand the enormous prices which they are paying for the coastwise shipping, joined as it is with the railroads of the country, which own, perhaps, the majority of all the ships, they would realize the situation as it is. The Standard Oil Co., the Beef Trust, the Fruit Trust, and the Steel Trust all own coastwise shipping; and if I could break that up in any way I would make all sorts of sacrifices to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] use some of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentlemen on that side have lots of time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to conclude in one speech.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I will make the point of no quorum, so that Members may be notified of the opportunity to speak, and so be present.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] moves a call of the House. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72.]

Aiken	Fairchild	Kreider	Rupley
Alney	Falson	Lafferty	Sabath
Anthony	Falconer	Langley	Scully
Austin	Fields	Lazaro	Seldomridge
Avis	Flood	Lee, Ga.	Sells
Barnhart	Fordney	L'Engle	Sherwood
Bartholdt	Fowler	Lewis, Pa.	Shreve
Blackmon	Frear	Loft	Smith, Minn.
Borland	Gard	McClellan	Sparkman
Bowdle	Gerry	McGillicuddy	Steenerson
Britten	Gillett	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Broussard	Gittins	McLaughlin	Taggart
Brown, W. Va.	Glass	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Godwin, N. C.	Manahan	Taylor, Ala.
Bulkley	Goldfogle	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Burgess	Gorman	Morgan, La.	Taylor, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Morin	Thacher
Calder	Griest	Mott	Towner
Callaway	Guernsey	Mulkey	Treadway
Carew	Hamill	Neeley, Kans.	Tuttle
Carr	Hamilton, N. Y.	Neely, W. Va.	Underhill
Carter	Hart	Nelson	Underwood
Cary	Hawley	Nolan, J. I.	Vare
Chandler	Hayes	O'Brien	Volstead
Church	Helgesen	Oglesby	Walker
Copley	Hinds	O'Shaunessy	Wallin
Danforth	Hobson	Paige, Mass.	Walters
Davis	Howell	Palmer	Watkins
Dent	Hoxworth	Parker, N. Y.	Weaver
Dooling	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Whaley
Doolittle	Johnson, S. C.	Plumley	Whitacre
Driscoll	Jones	Price	White
Drukker	Kahn	Prouty	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keister	Reed	Wilson, N. Y.
Dupré	Kettner	Riordan	Winslow
Edwards	Kless, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.	Woodruff
Elder	Knowland, J. R.	Roberts, Nev.	Woods

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 276 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in common with other members of the Progressive Party in the House I find myself upon this measure in exactly the same situation in which we have found ourselves on many other vital measures that this Congress has considered. We discover that we are committed in favor of the name that is attached to the legislation, and in many cases to a great deal of the substance in the legislation that is offered for passage. And as most of us generally have on the progressive measures that the Democratic administration have offered found ourselves able to vote for the measure, so I expect to vote for this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I should have liked, as many Progressives on this floor would have liked, a chance to amend the bill and an opportunity as well to have debated the bill at some greater length than is permitted by this rule.

I would like the Democrats of the House to understand, if they can, something of the position in which the members of the Progressive Party have found themselves during this Congress. I would like the Democrats particularly to understand this, because they are the special beneficiaries of the existence of the Progressive Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Democrats have not shown any disposition to realize that, as far as I can see. [Laughter.] Instead of extending any helping hand to the Progressives in this Congress they have been content always to accept our help grudgingly and reluctantly, and upon the whole have played second fiddle to the stand-pat Republicans in exhibiting wholesale contempt for us as a party. [Laughter.] In the name of political consistency, I would like to know if the Democrats have not about realized by this time that their hope of continued political existence remains in the Progressive people of this country? They will not get anything by an appeal to the reactionary element in the country, because that is owned and controlled, and always will be, by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I say, our position here has been made so uncomfortable, we have been so lonely that we have felt ourselves, as far as our position here is concerned, Ishmaelites indeed; and is it any wonder that some members of our party here, under the strain and stress of this condition in which they have been placed, have become somewhat crazed, and in their delirium have actually returned to the camp of the standpatters, in the idea that they are returning to friends! [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Does not the gentleman realize that the Democrats were friendly to him personally in his contest?



Mr. MACDONALD. I do; but I am not talking personally. I am talking of a party matter.

Mr. O'HAIR. You got only what you were entitled to.

Mr. MACDONALD. In regard to this present bill, I think that is a very important alignment, along progressive lines. We find the reactionary element in the Republican Party without exception opposed to this legislation. Many of them are opposed to it because they say that it involves Government ownership. Strange to say, some others are honestly opposed to it because they believe it does not mean Government ownership. But it does to some extent mean Government ownership.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Metz] unknowingly disclosed a very peculiar frame of mind. He said, "I am opposed to Government ownership. 'Government ownership is a fad,' a temporary thing, something that is 'simply the whim of a moment'; but we are confronted by a condition that renders it necessary now to take this step, although it may seem to involve Government ownership."

That is just the point exactly. The Government, in view of the world condition with which we find ourselves confronted, is forced, for the sake of protecting itself and the people, to adopt these methods. If this were a measure presented here for the benefit of some large private interest we would have gentlemen on the Republican side, as I have heard them many times before, standing here urging us in the name of the good people to forget partisanship and hold up the hands of the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, there is no condition of which I can conceive, threatened war or anything else, that would involve a more grave situation in regard to the welfare of the American people than we are confronted with to-day. The world is at war. It is tearing loose from all its old moorings and ideas; and if we are to maintain our position in the world, if we are to give our people the things to which they are entitled, if we are to maintain the great place in the sun that the American people have made for themselves, it seems to me that now above all other times is the time to forget partisanship, the time to forget the chance that men may have for the return to the political fleshpots again, and to stand by the President in this legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Because, while the President may be the captain of the team, while he may be the leader of one of the political parties of this country, I am satisfied that he and his Cabinet advisers know that there are conditions existing that require this measure to be passed for the benefit of the whole American people, and I do not believe there is a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that that is true. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, in regard to this question of war. Under other conditions we have heard the President charged with being cowardly, supine, afraid to assert American rights, afraid to protect American citizens in Mexico through a cowardly fear of war. I do not believe the President or his advisers have changed their attitude in regard to peace since that time, and I think it is perfectly safe to leave that question to them. In any event, we as a Nation can not get off the earth. We can not sacrifice our rights and our duties as a Nation and as a people and supinely lie down in the face of world-wide conditions that we must meet. Without imputing wrong motives to gentlemen who differ with us upon this subject, it seems to me that those who advance this war scare are simply putting up a bugaboo of war for the purpose of justifying an opposition to the bill which is in reality based upon other reasons. I mean to say I do not question the motives of other gentlemen, but it seems to me that those who argue that this means a declaration of war are using that as an argument for lack of a better. They are carried away by their partisan zeal and their desire to defeat this legislation. They allow themselves to be led into a belief in an argument that is not a real argument at all. We are not likely to have war by reason of the Government being in charge of these ships. The Government is less likely to ship contraband articles than a private owner of ships would be. And I am sure that the ships that are purchased and used under this bill will be used for no other purpose than the necessary purpose of serving the commerce of the Nation that can be served without involving us in war. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, as one of the Progressives in this House, I am against this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Because I do not consider it a progressive measure and because I do not

consider it as presented to us in a progressive way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I do not know whether my good friend from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] in stating, as he did, the position of the Progressives in the House, intended to speak for all of us, but he certainly did not set forth my position on this proposition that is before us to-night.

For my part I can not see how it can be considered a progressive or proper way of legislating to come into this House, after a month or six weeks of discussion in the Senate over a bill of such importance as this, and move to discharge a committee from the consideration of another bill—the Weeks bill—and tack this ship-purchase bill on to that other bill when the ship-purchase bill has not even been introduced in the House or considered by a committee or reported to the House, and then to bring it in here under a rule limiting debate to six hours and have this new legislation provide that this vehicle—the Weeks bill—shall not go into effect for a certain length of time and that the new proposition—the ship-purchase bill—shall go into effect immediately. That seems to me to be the most reactionary way of legislating I can possibly conceive of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If you wanted to legislate decently and in order why did you Democrats not introduce the ship-purchase bill into the House, refer it to a committee, have that committee consider it and report it back to the House, and then give us a reasonable chance to debate it. A minority has a right to a reasonable opportunity to be heard on legislation, and I believe that progressive methods of legislating would give that right to the minority, and they are not given it by this rule. It seems to me that the only effect of this bill will be to use, what my friend from Kentucky described as a mere bagatelle, \$40,000,000 of public funds to buy ships that can only have one destination, and that is confiscation in a prize court. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My colleague, Dr. TEMPLE, quoted decisions here on the floor which nobody has attempted to answer, which prove that if we purchase these ships now in belligerent ownership and attempt to operate them, they will be seized and sent into a prize court, and under these precedents there can be only one decision in those courts, and that is one adverse to our interests. Certainly you must have your eyes on the purchase of these ships. All the others are already engaged in carrying cargoes abroad. As Dr. TEMPLE pointed out, the owner of a German ship now tied up in one of our ports can only convey a title to that ship subject to the same restrictions that he himself would be subject to in operating the ship. He has shown that these restrictions involve the seizure of the ship, and the trial of the question as to whether or not it should be confiscated in a foreign prize court, and under the decisions that he cited we would suffer an adverse decision.

As I said in the beginning, the whole bill impresses me as not being progressive legislation, and the way in which it is presented to us as reactionary as we could possibly imagine. Therefore I shall vote against the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were 71 yeas and 137 noes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 78, nays 218, answered "present" 4, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 73.]

YEAS—78.

Anderson	Fordney	Knowland, J. R.	Scott
Anthony	French	Langham	Sinnott
Barchfeld	Good	Lenroot	Slomp
Barton	Green, Iowa	Lindquist	Sloan
Bell, Cal.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Butler	Hawley	Mapes	Stafford
Campbell	Hinds	Martin	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Hinebaugh	Mondell	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Howell	Moore	Sutherland
Cramton	Hughes, W. Va.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Norton	Temple
Dillon	Johnson, Utah	Paige, Mass.	Thomson, Ill.
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Towner
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Walters
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Woods
Fairchild	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Young, N. Dak.
Farr	Kindel	Powers	
Fess	Kinkaid	Rogers	



## NAYS—218.

Abercrombie	Deitrick	Hensley	Pou
Adair	Dershem	Hill	Price
Adamson	Dickinson	Holland	Quinn
Aiken	Dies	Houston	Ragsdale
Alexander	Difenderfer	Howard	Rainey
Allen	Dixon	Hughes, Ga.	Raker
Ashbrook	Donohoe	Hull	Rayburn
Aswell	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly, Conn.
Bailey	Doolittle	Igoe	Reilly, Wis.
Baker	Doremus	Jacoway	Rothermel
Baltz	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Rouse
Barkley	Driscoll	Jones	Rubey
Bartlett	Dupré	Keating	Rucker
Bathrick	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Russell
Beakes	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Seldomridge
Blackmon	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Shackleford
Boeber	Ferris	Kitchin	Sherley
Borchers	Fields	Konop	Sherwood
Brockson	Finley	Korbly	Sims
Brodbeck	Fitzgerald	La Follette	Sisson
Brown, N. Y.	FitzHenry	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Brumbaugh	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Small
Bryan	Foster	Leshner	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan, Ill.	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan, Tex.	Francis	Levy	Stanley
Bulkley	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Stedman
Burke, Wis.	Gallivan	Lieb	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Garner	Lindbergh	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tenn.	Linthicum	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tex.	Lloyd	Stevens, N. H.
Callaway	George	Lobeck	Stone
Candler, Miss.	Gilli	Logue	Stout
Cantor	Gillmore	Loneragan	Stringer
Cantrill	Glass	McAndrews	Summers
Caraway	Goeke	MacDonald	Taggart
Carlin	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Talcott, N. Y.
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Tavener
Casey	Gordon	Metz	Taylor, Ark.
Church	Goulden	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Clancy	Graham, Ill.	Montagne	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Gray	Moon	Tribble
Claypool	Gregg	Morrison	Vaughan
Cline	Griffin	Moss, Ind.	Vinson
Coady	Gudger	Murdock	Vollmer
Collier	Hamlin	Murray	Watkins
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Neeley, Kans.	Watson
Connolly, Iowa	Harris	Neely, W. Va.	Weaver
Conry	Harrison	O'Hair	Webb
Cox	Hay	Oldfield	Williams
Crisp	Hayden	Padgett	Wingo
Crosser	Hellin	Page, N. C.	Witherspoon
Cullop	Helm	Park	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Helvering	Peterson	
Decker	Henry	Phelan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Beall, Tex.	Hulings	Mann	Moss, W. Va.
-------------	---------	------	--------------

## NOT VOTING—123.

Ainey	Frear	Loft	Scully
Austin	Gard	McClellan	Sells
Avis	Gardner	McGillcuddy	Shreve
Barnhart	Gerry	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Md.
Bartholdt	Gillett	McKellar	Smith, Minn.
Borland	Gittins	Maher	Sparkman
Bowdle	Godwin, N. C.	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Britten	Gorman	Miller	Talbott, Md.
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Brown, W. Va.	Griest	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Mott	Taylor, N. Y.
Bruckner	Hamill	Mulkey	Thacher
Burgess	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nelson	Thompson, Okla.
Burke, Pa.	Hart	Nolan, J. I.	Thompson
Calder	Haugen	O'Brien	Treadway
Carew	Hayes	Oglesby	Tuttle
Carr	Helgesen	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cary	Hobson	Palmer	Underwood
Copley	Hoxworth	Parker, N. Y.	Vare
Dale	Johnson, S. C.	Patten, N. Y.	Volstead
Danforth	Kahn	Plumley	Walker
Davis	Keister	Porter	Wallin
Dent	Kent	Post	Walsh
Dooling	Kettner	Prouty	Whaley
Dunn	Kiess, Pa.	Rauch	Whitacre
Edwards	Kreider	Reed	White
Elder	Lafferty	Riordan	Wilson, Fla.
Evans	Langley	Roberts, Mass.	Wilson, N. Y.
Faison	Lazaro	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Falconer	L'Engle	Rupley	Woodruff
Flood, Va.	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

For the session:

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a general pair with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

The name of Mr. MANN was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening, when his name should have been called?

Mr. GILLET. No; I was not. I supposed that this was on a no-quorum vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to proceed.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for 51 per cent Government ownership, with the burden on the Government to establish a profitable business for 49 per cent private proprietorship, while the Government bears the cost of operating until the business pays and then abandons it, as the President recommends in his message to Congress. Either the Government should go into the business or it should stay out of the business. It should do the business for all the people or it should not do it at all.

I would vote for absolute Government ownership of ships. I voted for Government ownership of the Alaskan railways, but would have much preferred to have voted for a bill to provide for Government ownership of the railways in the States, where it would serve the economic interests of the people.

I believe this is a bad time to attempt buying ships. There are none for sale, so far as we have been informed, unless it is the interned ships now lying in our ports, and which under present conditions are tied up and can perform no service until the end of the European war. If the Government is going to own ships, I believe in the Government owning ships absolutely, without a partnership or association with any other than the entire people of the United States. I am unable to find any provision in this bill for which I can vote, and for that reason I shall vote against it. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers quote the Speaker of the House as being against Government ownership, but for this bill. I take the opposite stand—I am for Government ownership of certain utilities, but against this bill unless amended. I am against it because I am for Government ownership of certain steamship lines, and think this bill as it is written jeopardizes that cause. I am against it because it proposes to sell stock to individuals, when the stock can not possibly pay money dividends for many years. I do not think the United States Government should engage in "blue-sky" promotions. The Government should own all the stock.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced three different bills favoring Government-owned and Government-operated steamship lines. The last one was put in a short time ago, and is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21440) providing for the construction of naval auxiliaries and for their operation as merchant vessels in time of peace.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to have built in the Atlantic and Pacific shipyards of the United States naval auxiliaries not exceeding 30 in number, said vessels to be suitable for use as merchant vessels in time of peace.

Sec. 2. That the President is hereby authorized to charter, assign, or transfer any or all of the vessels provided for by this act, and such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, to the Panama Railroad Co. or to any other corporation owned wholly by the United States, and organized for the purpose of acquiring and operating vessels in the intercoastal or foreign trade of the United States, on such terms and conditions as the President of the United States shall prescribe: *Provided*, That vessels so chartered, assigned, or transferred shall be used in intercoastal traffic between the principal Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States and between the ports of the United States and the ports of Mexico, Central America, and South America, and such other foreign ports as the President may designate: *Provided further*, That all vessels so chartered, assigned, or transferred shall be retransferred to the Naval Establishment upon the written order of the President of the United States when in his judgment said vessels are needed for the paramount duties of the Navy.

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of constructing the vessels herein authorized, and for organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on of the traffic provided for in this act, the sum of \$30,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That not more than \$500,000 of the \$30,000,000 herein appropriated shall be used in organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on said traffic.

Sec. 4. That for the purpose of reimbursing the Treasury of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury shall, with the approval of the President, issue and sell or use any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to an amount not exceeding the actual expenditure under this act.

Mr. Speaker, if the bill we are to vote on to-day is passed within the next few weeks, the shipping board will find no vessels it can purchase at anything like a fair price except vessels owned by subjects of nations now at war. All American-built ships and all neutral-built ships are engaged at high rates, and if for sale at all are priced at exorbitant figures. Because England has control of the seas many German vessels are now interned in American harbors, and because of recent war-zone proclamations by Germany many British merchant ships are



being laid up in American ports. The maintenance of these in extended idleness is tremendously expensive, and their owners, because afraid to send them out, are willing to sell at a sacrifice.

These war-owned vessels are the only ones, then, that are at all likely to be purchased, and certain it is that the transfer of each and every one of them carries with it either the probability of being tied up in the admiralty courts of one of the nations at war or else the possibility of war between the United States and some one of the belligerents.

Mr. Speaker, why should we purchase trouble? Why should we put ourselves in position to have our flag on a Government-owned vessel hauled into the courts of a foreign nation? Why should we deliberately send out our Government-owned merchant ships to be shot at? Mr. Speaker, would it not be better for every one of us to wait until the war is over to purchase foreign ships? Would not the American people profit more, and would we not be surer of continued peace in the Nation if we postponed our purchases of vessels owned by belligerent people until after the present war has ceased?

Mr. Speaker, what this Nation should do is to build ships, construct them in American shipyards, for the benefit of American labor, American merchants, and American capital, and when finished place them in the intercoastal carrying trade between the principal ports of the Atlantic, including Gulf coast and the principal ports of the Pacific coast of the United States for the benefit of American shippers and American consumers; also place them in trade between the United States, Central America, and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Government-owned ships for regulatory and pioneer purposes, and I know the Pacific coast would profit greatly by an intercoastal Government-owned, through the canal, traffic line. The Atlantic and Gulf coasts would gain still more, and all would in time be benefited by Government lines to South America.

Mr. Speaker, the Panama Railroad Co. has four merchant ships; the Army and the Navy each have several that can be converted. In all there may be 20 vessels which the Government could put into these two avenues of trade. That number would reasonably supply demands, regulate rates, and pioneer trade for the first year. By that time we can have ready at least half of the vessels proposed in this bill. We can build quickly. Evidence given before the House Naval Committee in August, 1914, includes:

STATEMENT OF MR. FREDERICK W. WOOD, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STEEL CO., SPARROWS POINT, MD.

(See pages 196 and 197 of the House hearings on Senate bill 5259, known as the Weeks bill.)

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Wood, you had a conversation with me a few days ago, in which you suggested what you thought might be a good policy for the Government to pursue in the construction of vessels for use in the trade that we wish to develop. I wish you would give us your views about the matter, with a statement of your standpoint, your knowledge of shipbuilding, construction, cost, etc.

Mr. WOOD. It depends, Mr. Chairman, on what you desire to accomplish.

Mr. TALBOTT. Perhaps I can help you a little on that. Suppose we should want a number of colliers of from 10,000 to 12,000 tons displacement and 14 knots speed—taking that as the basis of displacement, speed, and carriage capacity, and then the fact that they are to be converted into auxiliary vessels for the Navy—

Mr. WOOD. Is your question when could they be constructed?

Mr. TALBOTT. How long would it take to construct them, and what would be the probable cost? Just give us your views about it.

Mr. WOOD. Ships of from 10,000 to 12,000 tons displacement would be of the type of the *Hector*, *Mars*, and *Vulcan*, three colliers now owned by the Government. In the present condition of the coast shipyards, 12 ships of that type, I think, could be constructed in from 9 to 11 months.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would the first delivery be made in nine months?

Mr. WOOD. I think so.

Mr. STEPHENS. And how often would deliveries be made afterwards?

Mr. WOOD. I think that you could get six of them in from 9 to 10 months and the other six from 10 to 11 months. They would be scattered over the different shipyards.

Mr. STEPHENS. If a contract were given you to-day for three such vessels, what would be the earliest moment when you could turn them over complete?

Mr. WOOD. If we pursued the ordinary course of working only dry turns, it would require about 12 months. I should say, for any one of the shipyards to handle three of them. If the price or the amount of money involved would permit working double turns, or the entire 24 hours, the time might be cut down a month and a half, making the first delivery in 7½ months and the last in about 10 months.

Mr. Speaker, we can accomplish great good, and along peaceful lines, if we will. We can keep the money in this country or send it abroad. As for me, I am for American homes, American labor, and American capital. I am for Government ownership in the interest and for the welfare of the American people, and for those reasons only. I am against this bill because I believe it is so worded as to bring trouble, perhaps war, and because it does not authorize or permit intercoastal traffic.

If it could have been amended to avoid foreign courts and foreign complications and permit Government-owned vessels in

traffic between the east and west coasts of the United States, I would vote for it. If it is so amended when it comes back from the Senate, I shall support it with all my might. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I know how humiliating it must be to the many Members on the Democratic side of the House who are voting for this bill contrary to their judgments. If it is not humiliating to you, gentlemen, then I mistake your character for manliness, because if there ever was forced upon a majority action that the majority of the majority believed to be unwise, this is the instance. If it were a mere question of domestic policy, then humiliation would be the only thing that might cause you regret.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNER. I have only 10 minutes; however, I yield for a question.

Mr. GLASS. I want to know who commissioned the gentleman to speak for the majority of the majority and to make a statement that is utterly unwarranted in fact?

Mr. TOWNER. And who commissioned the gentleman to speak for the majority? I have just as much right as he to voice my opinion of existing conditions.

Mr. GLASS. I speak because I am of the majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. I have just as much right to my opinion of the majority as has the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. But the gentleman does not assert an opinion. He asserts an alleged fact, which is not a fact at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I am expressing my opinion regarding the matter. That opinion may be of no value in the estimate of gentlemen, but I will venture to say this, that the vast majority of the people of the United States believe that you are humiliated, and they believe that it is contrary to your judgment and they believe that you are doing it—

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

Mr. TOWNER. I decline to yield further. They believe that you are doing it, not because you want to, but because it is forced upon you. That is the opinion of the people of the country. I want to say this to you gentlemen—and I have no desire certainly to be unpleasant in my expression regarding it—that if it were a mere question of domestic policy that would be a question that might be left to settle itself, but this is not a mere question of domestic policy. It is a question that is much more serious than that.

The circumstances that surround this case make it almost certain that if you shall succeed in carrying this measure through and putting this plan into operation, that you will carry the Nation into war. The circumstances make it almost certain to lead to that result. This bill is for the purchase of ships. But it means more than that. It means the purchase of certain ships. It means more than that. It means the purchase of German interned ships. You have refused in this House, and it has been refused elsewhere by those high in authority, to limit the purchase of ships to those that are not interned, to take action to preserve this country from the dangers of war, but you refuse to do that. Logically in your view you are compelled to purchase these interned ships if you desire really to increase the shipping facilities. There are no ships available for purchase that will increase the shipping facilities of this country except the German interned ships. You can not build ships to meet this emergency because you have not the time to do so. There is nothing left for you to do except to purchase the German interned ships, and that this administration proposes to do.

The man who will be the governor of this board stated that was the purpose and intention. Time and time again persons who are connected with this movement have refused to say that such was not their purpose and intention. Now, gentlemen, what will that mean? It will not do, as has been said on the floor of this House by gentlemen who are here to-night, to say that it has long been the policy of the United States, that it has long been the policy of Great Britain, to allow the transfer of belligerent vessels to a neutral power after war had commenced. That will not do in this emergency, for the reason that those nations that are at war have declared that for this time and during this period, during this emergency, during this war, they will hold that such transfers can not be made. And so it makes no difference what has been our past policy, it makes no difference what has been the past policy of Great Britain, when Great Britain said, as she did say, shortly after the opening of the war along in last August, that she expected to be governed by the rule of the declaration



of London, except with regard to certain things that are not involved in this controversy, when she affirmatively said that she would adopt a rule that, in effect, says that no belligerent ship can be transferred to a neutral Government after war had been declared for the purpose of escaping the consequence of the war, you are led inevitably into this position—that if you purchase these German interned ships, knowing that the purchase will be held void by those who are now engaged in war, you know that those ships will be taken before their prize courts. You know that their prize courts will hold that the transfer was illegal. You know that the ships, and perhaps their cargoes, will be confiscated. Under these circumstances, what will the United States do? We should remember that in the face of this statement by those countries, knowing what their position would be, knowing what the result of their prize-court finding would be, we have deliberately engaged in this business.

Now, we must either say we insist on our rights to that transfer, and that leads inevitably to war, or else we will submit under circumstances that this Nation can never agree to, if I know anything regarding its spirit. Why should we be forced into such a position as this? Why do you gentlemen force the country into such a condition as this?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly I do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Iowa introduced a bill providing for Government ownership and control of ships. I think it was referred to my committee. Does the gentleman think if that were enacted into law that these same results might follow an indiscreet administration of the law?

Mr. TOWNER. That measure was for the purchase of ships as auxiliaries of the Navy. That certainly would not lead us into war.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And were they not to be used for commercial purposes?

Mr. TOWNER. They were to be used for commercial purposes under certain circumstances; yes—

Mr. ALEXANDER. And that might not lead us into war, according to the gentleman's theory.

Mr. TOWNER. There would be nothing in such a purchase that would in any way embarrass us in our relations with any country now at war. It is perfectly proper for us to increase our Navy in this form and for this purpose, and certainly we can do so without incurring any violation of neutrality. But to do as is now proposed to do, to purchase these interned vessels and send them to belligerent ports, load them with that which will be regarded as contraband of war, and send them into prize courts, where they are almost certain to be subject to confiscation, is to lead us almost inevitably into war. These are the circumstances which surround us now, and I believe that there ought to be enough independence of character, there ought to be enough regard for the rights of our country, there ought to be enough regard for the opinion of this Nation that would keep us from such a dangerous course of procedure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the other side to use some time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that any time be yielded me; but, perhaps, I should express appreciation of the invitation of the gentleman from Missouri to me to indicate to the House my views on the pending question. Mr. Speaker, I experience not one particle of difficulty in giving my support to this measure.

I do not believe it is socialistic; I do not believe it is undemocratic; I do not believe it is un-American, but I believe it is an essential, though latent, function of Government, proper to be exercised whenever the time arrives for its expression. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has been exercised, in greater or less degree, by the municipalities of this and other countries, by the States, and not infrequently by the United States Government. The town in which I live has for 90 years owned its own waterworks and has in recent years expended \$1,000,000 upon the system. A town not far removed from mine, in the district of my colleague, Judge SAUNDERS, has for 10 or 15 years owned its own gas plant. The great city of New York, if I mistake not, has expended recently several hundred millions of dollars to acquire rights and to establish its own waterworks system. The States have exercised this function. My own State of Virginia has built railroads and canals; and the most valuable investment that it has to-day, contributing largely to the educational facilities of the Commonwealth, is its partnership in the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad, operating between Washington and Richmond.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I have but 10 minutes, which seem to have been thrust upon me, and I want to express my attitude in that time without controversy upon this or the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. GLASS. And I think that the exercise now of this function of government to acquire ownership of or partnership in a corporation to operate vessels in the across-seas trade is a perfectly legitimate exercise of a governmental function. Nor am I so anxious to make it temporary as some gentlemen seem disposed to be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not so sure that the emergency is as great as has been described; but, Mr. Speaker, I venture the assertion that the greatest good, if not the only good, that will come to America out of this war is the accentuation at this time of the failure of the Government of the United States to guard the Republic against just such a situation as that which confronts us to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party, having possession of the Government for 40 out of the last 55 years, has neglected to do that, although in its national conventions since 1884 it has solemnly and emphatically declared that an efficient merchant marine is one of the greatest necessities of the country. And while here, to-day, the Democratic Party is charged with neglect and omission, one of the very gentlemen who persist in making this a partisan question stood upon the floor of the House four years ago—I mean the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]—and charged his own party with the responsibility and the "shameful neglect" of failing to provide this country with a merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He was unmistakable in his denunciation of the Republican Party and in his ascription to that party, and that party alone, of responsibility for this failure. He stated in terms that the Republican Party up to the time of his speech, May 20, 1910, had never made an honest effort to provide a merchant marine for this country.

Mr. Speaker, there has been expended here a good deal of nonsense about "instructions from the White House." There have been no instructions from the White House. The spirit of independence on the Democratic side of the House certainly has always equalled, if it has not surpassed, the independence of action that has characterized the conduct of the Republican Party in the House during the 14 years that I have been a Member of this body. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instructions from the White House! Have you gentlemen forgotten the time when your President sent down to this body a railroad bill drafted by his Attorney General, and not one of you would dare to offer to cross a "t" or dot an "i" in it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Socialism! Have you gentlemen forgotten that, within the last 60 days, the greatest Republican President, perhaps, who has sat in the White House since the time of Lincoln, has stated over his own signature that, during the memorable industrial disturbance in the State of Pennsylvania, he was prepared to take over, and was on the eve of seizing, the property of the coal operators and conducting those mines for and in the name of the people of the United States? [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are not proposing that sort of confiscation here. We are not proposing in the emergency of war to seize the vessels owned by the Shipping Trust. But we are proposing to exercise a perfectly well-established governmental function in buying vessels and operating them in order to relieve a situation that is a conceded disgrace to the American Government, and for which the Republican Party is largely responsible by years of legislative impotency and neglect. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is never happier than when he is heaping abuse upon Democratic public officials, and especially upon the President of the United States. He tells us that men on this side are "cursing the President in the cloakroom and praising him upon the floor." Well, Mr. Speaker, at least it must be conceded that Members on this side of the House are exercising better taste than the gentleman from the State of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It could well be wished that the coarse and vituperative abuse which that gentleman, on the floor of the House, has persistently heaped upon the President of the United States, regardless of the dignity of the office and the patriotism of the man who occupies it, might be confined to the cloakroom if the cloakroom would tolerate such intemperate beratings. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Indeed it seems to me that the sort of vituperation and disparagement of which the gentleman from Washington is constantly guilty is better suited to the stable than to the cloakroom. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I am sure there is no Member of the House on this side who would challenge the gentleman's preeminence in that species of detraction. I even venture to believe that



there is not a Member of the House on that side who would care to emulate his example or seek to appropriate his laurels. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have observed the course of this debate, and I find two objections urged against this proposition. It is first contended that this bill, if enacted into law, will interfere with private enterprise and, secondly, that it will endanger the peace of the country. No other argument has been advanced why this bill should not be enacted into law. These two objections I will in the course of my remarks answer, if not to the satisfaction of those who oppose this bill, at least to the satisfaction of myself and those who favor the bill.

Serious complaint is indulged by gentlemen that the "gag rule" has been applied; that we intend to jam this bill through without sufficient consideration. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] said that there were no hearings and that this bill was drafted without deliberation and without the information upon which to intelligently act. In this he is very much mistaken. I am not a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine, and do not know what investigation was made by that committee, nor how fully informed the members were when the Alexander bill was reported to this House during the last session. The Weeks bill, which constitutes the first four sections of the present bill, is the product of years of careful study of this subject by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and unanimously, I am informed, passed the Senate upon full consideration early in the month of last August. That bill was sent to this House and was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and by that committee referred to a subcommittee, of which I had the honor to be a member. That subcommittee gave much time and thought to the Weeks bill, and had hearings covering a period of 10 days, with many material witnesses who gave valuable information to the committee.

The committee being advised, cooperated in drafting the Alexander bill, and particularly secured in the Alexander bill the incorporation of that provision authorizing that all ships purchased should be of a type, so far as practicable, suitable for auxiliary use in the Navy, and be transferred to the use of the Navy when no longer used for the purposes of commerce or when required for the paramount needs of the Navy, upon the order and direction of the President. The Alexander bill formed the basis of the Gore bill, which constitutes a part of the pending bill. So I say that it is not true and the gentlemen misstate the fact when they inform this House and the country that there has been no consideration of the present bill. The Gore bill is but an amendment of the Alexander bill, so that the bill now pending in this House is the Weeks bill and the Alexander bill as amended by the Gore bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If the Weeks bill was considered to be of such great value, why is it that in its present form it is not expected to go into effect until two years after its passage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not said that the Weeks bill standing alone is of such great importance. I do see much merit in the Weeks bill. What I was speaking of was the consideration that has been given to these bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to be informed. I find that in the print put out early this morning of House resolution 722, on page 9, section 9, no mention is made of Alaska, but in a later print of the same resolution, on line 10 of page 9, section 9, it says, "Vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and owned by such corporation," and so forth, "shall engage in trade with foreign countries or Alaska, the Philippines," and so forth. Now, what I want to know is, Will it be possible for one of these Government ships to load with an out cargo and then load abroad a foreign cargo, bring it through the Panama Canal and around to Alaska as against the coastwise trade of Alaska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand this bill, the amendment which the gentleman indicates precludes these vessels from engaging in the coastwise trade and limits their operation to trade with foreign countries, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and

Alaska, the amendment including Alaska being added by the authority of the caucus last evening—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Without debate on the part of anyone who knew anything about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS (continuing). After full discussion, and for the purpose of enabling these vessels to reach the coal fields of Alaska and to deliver that coal wherever it may be needed for purposes of commerce and trade.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. This bill allows ships owned by this company to engage in the coastwise shipping trade, just as ships owned by private companies are allowed to engage in the coastwise shipping trade if they are American-built ships. If they are not American-built ships they can not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not Alaska by this bill included in the foreign shipping trade?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but I understand by the terms of this bill ships built in the United States may engage in the coastwise trade.

Much has been said in this argument about who is to blame for the fact that we have no merchant marine. I do not propose to go into that question here to-night. It is sufficient to say that the Democratic Party is not responsible for the disappearance of our merchant marine from the high seas. That has occurred within the 50 years since the Republican Party has been dominant in this country. But I do want to invite attention briefly to the conditions that surround us to-day. These conditions consist of absolute extortion in the way of freight rates for the transportation of American products which are needed in the foreign markets, and to meet this condition we propose to do what private capital has refused to do.

I want to communicate a fact to this House which has not been mentioned thus far in this debate. I can give you, gentlemen, some reason why the President is very much concerned about this proposition. Following the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, when our shipping was disturbed, when German ships were interned in our ports, the President of the United States sent for and held conferences with men engaged in trans-Atlantic transportation. He pointed out to them the conditions which prevailed; he pointed out to them the fact that these interned ships, idle in our harbors, could be purchased in good faith and put into commerce at a very reasonable price; in fact, that they were upon the bargain counter; and he asked these men as patriotic American citizens to invest their capital in these ships and give outlet to the products of the American farm and factory.

What answer do you suppose these patriotic gentlemen, the Shipping Trust, which has been defended for hours upon that side of the House, gave to the President in response to his plea that they invest their money in these enterprises? Their conditions, stated briefly, were these: "We will put our money in this project if you, the Government of the United States, will insure our ships and our cargoes free and guarantee us 4 per cent net upon our investment."

Before proceeding to reply to the contentions of gentlemen that this bill, if enacted into law, will interfere with private business and endanger the peace of America, I wish to invite the attention of the House to the conditions which confront the country now and which appear to render this bill necessary. One thing is true, and all men admit it: That we have no merchant marine; that more than 90 per cent of our foreign trade, both exports and imports, is carried in foreign bottoms at foreign rates fixed by shipping companies which have no interest in America or in American trade other than to profit by the extortionate charges imposed upon us. There has never been but one remedy proposed for this condition of things by the Republican Party, and that in keeping with their usual habit of diverting the American Treasury to the use and benefit of special interests—the proposed ship subsidy—by means of which it has been proposed by the Republican Party, sustained by declarations in their party platforms, to vote money out of the Treasury as a direct subsidy to the shipping interests in order to foster and encourage that industry. The solicitude of our Republican friends for the shipping interests, one of the greatest monopolies on earth, is clearly manifested not only by their former attempts to vote a direct ship subsidy, but by their anxiety here lest we, by creating competition and a means of conveying American products to foreign markets, may interfere with and reduce the profits of this great trust. Some one said this afternoon that the Republican Party can always be depended upon to come to the defense whenever a blow is struck at special interests, and that the Democratic Party can always be relied upon to defend the cause of our country against the en-



croachments of organized greed. Such has been the course of events during the present Congress, and this spirit has been manifested not only in the opposition to the tariff bill and the enactment of the Federal reserve act, but in the opposition which was urged so strenuously against the repeal of the Panama tolls act and the enactment of the amendments to the antitrust law.

What are the conditions which justify—or, if you please, render necessary—the enactment of this bill? I have already mentioned the fact that we have no merchant marine and that we are at the mercy of the foreign shipping industry, which has at all times practiced extortion upon us. But what of the present conditions? The fact must not be overlooked that the ships engaged in the carrying trade of one of the great commercial nations of the world are completely out of the business. German ships that have not been destroyed on the high seas have taken refuge in neutral ports, and are idle. This affects the shipping business generally and removes the principal competition in the world's commerce, which tended not only to maintain reasonable shipping facilities but to secure reasonable freight rates. In addition to this many of the English ships which formerly were engaged in the ocean carrying trade have been withdrawn and are used in connection with the army and navy, and that again has materially reduced the number of ships engaged in trans-Atlantic trade. So that by these means the number of ships engaged in transporting American products to the marts of the world have been materially reduced, and as a consequence the most extortionate rates exacted ever known in the commercial history of the world. A reference to the tables, which show the tremendous increase in freight rates of 100 to 300 per cent in the brief time since the European war opened, startles the imagination and arouses a sense of indignation that the necessities of man should be taken advantage of by the cupidity of the shipping interests to such an extent as to deprive the people of the world of those commodities which are necessary for the sustenance of life and the maintenance of national existence. These tables, furnished by the Department of Commerce, demonstrate to an absolute certainty that extortion, unjustified and unprecedented, is being practiced upon Americans, and that the profits that we would otherwise derive from the present high prices for food products and the output of our factories are being consumed by a merciless shipping trust, which our Republican friends fear will be interfered with by competition created by this proposed legislation.

When gentlemen assert that we will destroy or seriously impair private industry by Government ownership and regulation of ocean commerce, they mean that we will interfere with the profits that the Shipping Trusts are receiving as a result of extortionate freight charges practiced upon our people. This is the reason for the great concern manifested here and the solicitude expressed by gentlemen on that side of the House who oppose this bill.

The next proposition advanced is that this project will endanger the peace of America. It will be difficult to convince the American public that this administration, which has so nobly maintained the peace of the United States in Mexico and abroad when three-fourths of the civilized world is locked in a death struggle, will do an act or take a step which will endanger the peace of our country. The American people have absolute confidence and implicit faith in the judgment, the wisdom, and the patriotism of Woodrow Wilson, and can not be persuaded by partisan attacks and bitter denunciation that he will, by his recommendation and his solicitude for the welfare of his country and his splendid efforts to secure a market for American products, endanger the peace of our country and involve us in war. The arguments advanced why this bill may endanger our peace are that we have not the legal right under international law to acquire interned vessels, and that if the Government is engaged in the transportation of contraband goods it will become directly involved with nations now engaged in war. The hearings before the committee include the statements of Mr. Lansing, Counselor of the Department of State, who appeared before the committee and gave his views on this important question, and expressed his belief that the use by a private corporation of ships transferred to it by the United States would not involve the United States in serious foreign complications any more than ships otherwise owned and operated by a private corporation.

What does this bill propose? That the United States may become a stockholder in a corporation the object and purposes of which are to aid the commerce of the United States; that the Government shall finance the concern by purchasing and acquiring ships and transfer them to the corporation, in consideration of the bonds of the corporation secured by a lien

upon all of its assets; that the United States shall own a controlling interest in the stock of the concern, and reserve the right to withdraw these vessels and use them as auxiliaries in the Navy in case they should be required for that purpose. Now, it is argued from the mere fact that the Government would own stock in a corporation engaged in transportation that the Government itself would be engaged in the business, and that a seizure or search of a vessel owned and operated by the corporation would directly involve the United States. I fail to see the force and logic of this contention. Certainly the corporation itself could not become involved in the use of ships acquired in good faith and for actual consideration in the transportation of food products and other commodities not contraband of war, and I think it may be safely said here that the Government of the United States, owning and controlling a majority of the stock in the concern, will not permit contraband goods to be transported in ships thus acquired and in which the Government has a reversionary interest. It is not the purpose of this bill to convey arms and ammunition and munitions of war to belligerents, but to convey products of the American farm and factory—food and provisions—to stricken people across the Atlantic, who need the necessities of life which we possess in such great abundance. Shall the American Government, for fear that it may interfere with private enterprise and depreciate the excessive profits of the Shipping Trust, refuse the demand for transportation facilities and an outlet to American products?

Let me ask you, gentlemen, if you honestly and in good faith believe that the President of the United States, who has so nobly maintained the peace of our country in Mexico and abroad during these troublous times, proposes to do one thing that will endanger the peace of our country or bring our honor or our integrity into dispute?

Shall the Government of the United States be so unmindful of the interests of its own people as to deny their just demands because somebody says, for political reasons, that we may endanger the peace of the country? Now is the opportune time. I do not advocate the high-handed tactics of some nations who would take advantage of world-wide conditions for territorial aggrandizement and the exaction of treaties and terms and conditions, long coveted, which can not be had in ordinary times or under ordinary conditions, but I do take the position that it is the duty of the Government of the United States to take advantage of conditions as they are and enforce its just demands against the world. I believe it the duty of the Government of the United States to hoist the American flag on every vessel sailing the seas which may become entitled to American registry, load these ships with the surplus products which we have in such great abundance, and say to the world, "There flies the American flag. This cargo bears the seal of the Government of the United States. Hands off!"

What nation now engaged in war would have either the means or the disposition to interfere? England and Germany and France and Russia and Austria have their hands full, each a check on the other, and dare not turn upon the United States and assail the integrity of the American flag on the high seas. As an American, I would give them to understand and proclaim to the world that the bounty of Providence, so liberally bestowed as a reward for American enterprise and American industry, shall be conveyed on the high seas under the American flag to God's creatures everywhere.

It has been said that the people of this country are not in sympathy with this proceeding. Let me say to you that I can speak for one section of this country. I believe I can speak with entire confidence as to the sentiment in the State of Illinois. I say to you that the people of that State, not only Democrats, but Republicans and Progressives as well, are with the President in his effort here to secure fair transportation rates, and they will uphold his hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have been delightfully entertained here to-day, but I have not heard a man yet tell you that the trust that is behind this proposition is the real cause of this filibuster that you have had here all day long. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are confronted with a very serious proposition. We have the greatest trust, a thieving, piratical trust that is oppressing the poor people, the producers of wealth, the farmers, and all other people of this Republic who actually make it a Nation worth living in. Who is it that says the Republican side knows nothing of a Shipping Trust? The distinguished Republican gentleman from Pennsyl-



vania [Mr. MOORE] volunteered that remarkable information to this great body about two hours ago. I would like to know if you could take a white-oak maul and a hickory glut and knock Republican eyes open wide enough to see as big a giant as the shipping monopoly is? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Is it possible that these gentlemen are unaware of the existence of a trust that has been capable of raising the price of freights across the ocean \$18,018,700 in the one month of December? These figures are authentic from the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. And if you put this off 12 months, according to that rate, on your export freight alone you will have a total of \$216,000,000 in one year increase over the amount charged for hauling the same freight before the ships of some of the nations engaged in war were forced off of the high seas. Then put on to that your import trade, and you have an increase of \$312,000,000 in one year for the same quantity of freight carried between the United States and European countries over the normal freight rates. That is eight times this \$40,000,000 that this Government proposes to put into the business now. Who has the "gall" to vote against this ship-purchase bill when he knows it will save the American people nearly one-half of a billion dollars in one year on freight that crosses the Atlantic Ocean? Do you tell me there is not a shipping trust? [Applause on the Democratic side.] After the war broke out in Europe this Congress passed a bill authorizing the United States Government to insure the cargoes going to Europe. The insurance rate is one-eighth of 1 per cent, so you see it is plain with such a low rate of insurance that the Shipping Trust is robbing our people, when it has raised the freight on cotton from \$1.25 a bale to \$18 a bale. This Government can not regulate the rate on the seas. Shall we let the shipping combine rob our people, or shall we lower the freight rate on the seas by putting ships in commission to compete with this blood-sucking vampire. I tell you that the Republicans on this floor are marching under the banner of the Ship Trust that is oppressing the poor people of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party is aiding the greatest trust that ever oppressed the human race. The Republican Party, claiming not to know that there is such a trust, has filibustered in the other end of this Capitol for three long weeks to keep this law from being enacted.

The Republican Party is causing the fame of the United States Senate to be brought into disrepute, and not satisfied with that, the Republicans in this end of the Capitol have proceeded to filibuster here for the same purpose. I want to tell you, my friends, that the American people have not been asleep. They know that this bill will save the situation. They know that none of you are afraid of Government ownership. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They know that the people of this Republic will stand for this bill. They know it is going to build up the merchant marine and break up the Ship Trust, this band of commercial pirates that now has the wealth producers and business men of this country by the throat, and is daily reaching the filthy hands of greed into the pockets of our people. And for one I am not afraid of the Government staying in this business permanently, either. I am for it not only as a temporary measure but I am for it to continue to carry the products of this country to the markets of the world and bring back whatever goods our people need to keep from being plundered by manufacturing trusts in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No farmer can depend on borrowing a wagon to haul his produce to town. We ought to have our own ships to carry our produce across the high seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And there can never be a better time than right now, when the patriotic President of this country, backed up by Mr. Bryan and that grand old commoner, the Democratic Speaker, together with the Democratic majority in the Senate and in this House, with all of the Democratic hosts of this land, is asking this Congress to pass this measure in the interest of fairness to the people of this great Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This is a struggle between the people and special privilege. Shall the Ship Trust be permitted to hold up the people and rob them of the fruits of their toil?

You Republicans as a party have always stood for privilege and all of its freebooting activities in exploiting the people. In opposing this bill you mean to allow the Ship Trust a free hand in continuing to rob the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY], who always speaks words of truth, and who will diversify these proceedings a little. [Applause.]

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut—

CAPT. WILSON ON THE BRIDGE.

There are ships that pass in the night,  
And others that pass in the day;  
There are some that don't pass at all—  
They depend on the syndicate's say.

The Democrats want Uncle Sam  
To now build ships that will sail  
With cargoes of Yankee-made goods  
And land them abroad without fail.

Republicans stand up and howl,  
They bellow and threaten and prate;  
They fear lest the profits will shrink—  
They're friends of the ship syndicate.

They throw out their chests and look wise;  
They accuse Democrats of intent  
To ruin the trade of the seas;  
They claim that we are hell bent.

They say that the syndicate ships,  
Now building and those now afloat,  
Can get all the business there is,  
When they only get Uncle Sam's goat.

The syndicate's real busy now  
Making bluffs about building ships,  
But it's only because it now sees  
The boats in the Government slips.

On the bridge of the great ship of state  
Stands Wilson, our captain is he;  
It's a pleasure to serve him on land,  
It's high honor to sail o'er the sea.

With him in the ships that we own,  
The craft that will set shippers free  
From the grasp of the ravenous crew  
To which we have long bent the knee.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

In his care the people feel safe,  
They know that he knows their will,  
And that's why we rally to-night  
To put through the Wilson ship bill.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Seven minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I yield that time back to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will ask gentlemen on the other side to use some of their time, as there will be only one other speech on this side. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] four minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of the principle of Government ownership involved in this bill, and I am heartily in favor of an American merchant marine; but I do not want this great country, with its high ideals, to establish this principle in the blood, suffering, and sorrow of the great tragedy across the ocean. I am opposed to it because it will involve us in war. [Manifestations of derision on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind gentlemen that the more noise they make and the greater racket they keep up, the later they will get to bed. [Laughter.]

Mr. FARR. It may involve us in war, and not with Great Britain, either, because this, in effect, is a pro-British measure. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must remember that this is not a beer garden or a vaudeville show.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, England never has been opposed to this bill. It wants us to buy the German interned ships. Every advantage from more ships will accrue to the allies and be to the disadvantage of the Germans. Is there any opportunity for us to send one of our ships to a German port? The allies need our munitions of war and foodstuffs. We have ample bottoms to convey to them their legitimate needs.

The additional ships that we put upon the ocean will be sending powder and other munitions of war and foodstuffs to continue that awful war. I have heard men on the floor of this House say that if the Vollmer resolution, to prevent the exportation of munitions of war, came out of the committee, they would support it, and yet they are going to vote for this bill, which means thousands and thousands of tons of powder and



thousands and thousands of tons of other munitions of war to go there to help continue that dreadful warfare.

Let me read from an afternoon newspaper to show you just how thin ice we are skating on:

Germans resent attitude of the United States. Hostile feeling may cause crisis. Americans feeling Berlin, following criticism in press. German papers stir people with charge that United States is siding with the allies.

We are about to enact into legislation a measure that means advantages to the allies and a danger and an affront to Germany. I want to repeat that in effect this is a pro-British measure and that by making it a law we risk war with Germany; and if we escape war with that great nation we invite its bitter attitude toward us for years and will disturb the good feeling of the German citizens of this country.

Let us preserve our neutrality and avoid war.

My first consideration shall be for peace and the prevention of bloodshed.

By my vote you shall not increase the number of widows, orphans, broken hearts, and wrecked homes in Europe for the advantage of the manufacturers of weapons of war.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I was laboring under a misapprehension when I said that there would be only one speech on this side.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, no time is more inopportune to launch into Government ownership of shipping than the present. As I view the pending bill, it means that we are to purchase the only available ships, and those are the interned German ships. As I pointed out on a prior occasion, the purchase by a citizen of a neutral government of ships registered under a belligerent flag after the outbreak of hostilities does not relieve it of seizure by any belligerent power, and this confiscable character does not change when a government is the purchaser; but such a purchase would be more questionable as to the good faith of the transaction to avoid confiscation, in that it is no part of a government's business to engage in the purchase of merchant ships. Article 56 of the declaration of London expresses the principle of international law in forbidding any such transfer after hostilities have arisen.

Everyone who has been following the diplomatic discussion over the *Dacia* realizes that our Government would be buying a lawsuit to purchase these interned ships, which do not dare to be operated for fear of confiscation. But I bottom my main objection on the fact that under existing conditions, with England in control of the seas, they will not be used in an impartial, neutral way so that we can supply our wares and our goods to all the belligerent countries alike, but they will be used for the shipment of our merchandise to the powers that have control of the sea.

Nothing is more certain from statistics cited here than that the increase of foreign commerce resulting since the outbreak of the war has been largely of those articles in which the foreign governments now engaged in war are directly using to carry on the war, such as guns, ammunition, automobiles, wearing apparel, leather, foodstuffs, rubber, and everything that enables the warring powers to maintain the dreadful struggle that is going on to-day. If you think that the purchase of these ships will relieve us of embarrassment, I fear you are too sanguine as to the result. As I view it, they will only accentuate the difficulty that now confronts the administration.

Mr. METZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I can not yield. I know what the gentleman's position is; he is a shipper. Nothing is more certain than that at the present time the American shipper is not paying the freight. The foreign Governments who are taking our foodstuffs, who are demanding our munitions of war, demanding our automobiles, are paying the price asked by the American manufacturers and the American producer, and the European consumer is paying the freight, whether it be a Government or a private establishment. They need our wares and they are paying our price. This bill in its large sense, when you come to analyze its effect, is for the especial benefit, whether so intended I will not say, of those belligerent powers which now have the advantage of getting our supplies—our foodstuffs and munitions of war—and it is certain that Germany and Austria are not in that favored position. It is stated that we are going to use some of these vessels in the South American trade. Why, if the gentleman is sincere in that position, why do you not put the Weeks bill into immediate operation instead of postponing its operation for two years. Everybody who stops to reflect a moment knows that

the direct effect of this bill will be to supply the allies with our products, as we have little or no communication to speak of with Germany or Austria. Certainly this is so as far as munitions of war are concerned.

Great Britain since the outbreak of the war has changed its contraband list two or three times by adding articles that have been generally regarded as conditional contraband. Under the declaration of London foodstuffs are conditional contraband and could be shipped in neutral ships without seizure to neutral countries, and even to belligerent countries when not consigned for the benefit of the Government itself. And yet Great Britain in her imperious way has made foodstuffs contraband. These vessels, under section 5 of the bill, are not to be controlled by the shipping board. If you will examine the provisions of section 5, you will see that the shipping board has control of the rates, but that it has no control of the traffic, neither the course nor the character of the cargo, no control of the routes, and only control over the rates for a period not longer than 12 months.

Take the case of a person who desires to ship foodstuffs abroad—not a highly imaginary case by any means when we find the *Wilhelmina*, a neutral vessel, with a cargo of foodstuffs destined for Germany, being held up by Great Britain and its cargo threatened as a prize if its captain persists on continuing his journey. To what court is that taken? Not to the United States court, as this bill provides. No; it is taken to the prize court of Great Britain to have the question of contraband determined by its Admiralty decrees. Are we keeping aloof from this entanglement by entering upon a venture that may lead to such embarrassment?

A large part of the American people, this great body of German-Americans in this country, believe that we are not acting impartially to-day in allowing munitions of war to be sent to the allies alone, with the allies in control of the sea. Do you mean to say that when they see foodstuffs on American vessels destined for Germany, which we regard as conditional contraband and not liable to seizure, captured by Great Britain, that these 5,000,000 of loyal Americans, true to the flag, will permit that insult without a vigorous protest? Oh, my fellow Representatives, these are acute times that confront the American people. We will be on the verge of embarrassing situations if we pass this measure. My only purpose is to have this Government remain absolutely neutral, but you can not operate this shipping bill unless it is going to involve us in difficulties.

There is no question but that the Weeks bill is only a ruse in order to hang this administration shipping bill on, which, as I view it, only accentuates the difficulties that may confront our Government. The mere fact that freight rates are increasing is no justification for our launching into this Government-ownership proposition. Every speech, save one, of the advocates of this proposition has been bottomed on the argument in favor of Government ownership. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] justified his position because municipalities and States had indulged in Government ownership of natural monopolies. But I say to him and I say to you, that where the seas are open to everyone who can build a ship, shipping can not be considered a natural monopoly. It is free, and to-day when American capital is seeking to invest its surplus capital that is lying idle in the financial centers, you are driving that capital away from investment, because American capital will never seek investment in competition with the Government. It can not compete, because in every line of activity where the Government has undertaken to invade private employment the rates charged for that service have not been based upon the actual cost of service, but have been rates where fixed charges, allowances for depreciation, and other elements of cost have been ignored completely. Just when the time is auspicious for American capital to invest in ships the Government plans to check this movement by this fatuous policy.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. METZ. Does the gentleman suppose for one moment that if Germany and the Germans felt as the gentleman says he does, we could buy these German ships that are interned here?

Mr. STAFFORD. The German Government has no control over those ships.

Mr. METZ. It has, absolutely.

Mr. STAFFORD. The persons in the companies who own these ships are controlled by the same selfish instincts that the gentleman and I would be in a business matter.

Mr. METZ. Do you—

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield until I can answer the other question, and then I will yield. Those German ships are controlled by private corporations which desire, unquestionably, the release of their capital for investment in lines of profitable employment.



The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on the other side have not taken advantage of the time allotted to them to discuss this bill. They have been indulging in the same tactics here that the Republican Party has indulged in and is indulging in in the Senate, and while the Democratic Party is trying to bring relief to American shippers they are doing the bidding of the Shipping Trust. [Applause.] We can regulate interstate and intrastate freight rates. We can regulate the shipping rates in our country, but we can not regulate them on the high seas, and gentlemen here know that.

The only way at this time to break the hold that this foreign ship trust has upon the throat of the American people is to operate American ships as is here provided, and carry our produce to the markets of the world. This heartless and cruel monopoly has taken advantage of conditions created by war; and in defiance of every principle of justice and fairness, it is robbing the American people of millions of dollars by its outrageous and oppressive ocean freight rates.

From the time the war in Europe commenced in July to December, 1914, the ocean freight cost increased 141 per cent; and by the increased rate now charged on the shipments of American produce the ship trust collects in two months more money than it will cost our Government to buy and operate these ships. Think of that. The increase in ocean freight rates above that being charged in July, 1914, collected now in two months from American shippers is more than the amount necessary to buy ships to carry the produce of our farms and factories to the markets of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this merciless monopoly has increased the shipping rate on cotton from \$1.25 per bale to \$18 and \$20 per bale. It has increased the rate on grain 900 per cent; and it has increased in like fashion the rate on coal and lumber and everything that is produced upon the American farm. And yet the Republican Party in both branches of Congress is doing everything in its power to defeat this bill, which proposes to cut down this tremendous ocean freight rate and stop this holdup and robbery of the American people.

The markets of Europe are calling for the products of our farms and factories and our people are suffering because their produce is outlawed by the high shipping rate, and the produce itself is rotting at the docks. Millions of dollars worth of agricultural products are now waiting for ships to take them to the European markets; but you gentlemen will not vote to bring relief to our own people, but you are voting just as the Ship Trust now robbing our people want you to vote.

Mr. Speaker, these same Republicans who tried to drive the President into war with Mexico in order to protect in Mexico the property of certain interests in this country, and when they failed denounced him as a man who stood for peace at any price, are now expressing fear that he will involve us in war. Their disgusting, quick, and sudden change of front reminds me of the old fellow who went to Texas. He wrote back to his brother, and said: "Dear Bill, if you haven't started to Texas, don't, for this is the most hellacious climate in the world. [Laughter.] Yesterday, while driving a yoke of steers across the prairie, one of them had a sunstroke, and while I was a skinnin' him the other one froze to death." [Laughter and applause.]

Let me say to you, gentlemen, that we will meet you on this issue before the American people, and then you will have an opportunity to explain why you opposed a measure—an emergency measure—to grant them relief from the organized pirates of the sea. [Applause.]

We will call upon you to explain why you opposed a shipping bill that would greatly reduce the shipping rate on American produce and to tell the people why you were willing for a foreign shipping trust to rob our own people, already distressed on account of the war.

Mr. Speaker, here is an opportunity to build up our foreign trade, to get trade that we have never had, but the Republicans are not willing to lose an opportunity to fight a Democratic administration in its efforts to benefit the American people and serve the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have here a telegram from an American consul in Italy, which says:

Italy needs 1,000,000 tons American coal, 300,000 tons steel, hundreds of thousands tons American goods. Beg Government furnish ships. America can get entire trade permanently.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

This message comes to us from the people across the seas, and yet gentlemen stand here and oppose our great President in

his efforts to provide speedy means for carrying American produce to the markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say to gentlemen on that side that the idea in the Weeks bill is not of Republican origin. It is of Democratic origin. Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas more than a year before Mr. WEEKS introduced his bill embodied this idea in a bill that he introduced in this House and it is of Democratic origin. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You Republicans do not want American produce to leave the docks and reach the markets. You do not want business to improve and prosperity to return. You know that this measure will improve business and restore prosperity in a large degree, and you do not want prosperity before the next election.

You had rather be returned to power than to see labor employed, business good, and the country blossom as the rose. [Applause.] But, gentlemen, we are going to provide for sending the products of our farms and factories to Europe. We will see to it that our produce goes abroad. More men here will be employed, money will come into our country, prosperity will come, and you will go. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Weeks bill as it is before this House now. The Democratic Party have permitted it to lie in committee for months, yet now give swift notice that they are in favor of that bill, but strangely enough they would enact only to postpone its action for two years. If it is a good thing, why not put it in operation? I have tried with all my heart to understand the arguments on both sides in this discussion, and when I listened to the admirable speech of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] I was charmed and delighted, and I said to myself if what he says is true this bill ought to go through, but when I listened to the other side and found gentlemen whom I believe quite as honest and I believe somewhat more intelligent upon the subject [laughter], that threw me into doubt again.

If the Democrats of this House, Mr. Speaker, would only do as the great Progressive Party, as represented on this floor, has done [laughter], they would depend upon their own judgment. Men who weigh and consider, as the Progressives do, are divided upon this important proposition. [Laughter.] But we find the Democrats all of one mind. I have heard reasons given for this unanimity that are not complimentary to their personal independence, but let us not go into that. I am in favor of Government ownership [applause] for the purpose of maintaining regulatory rates on the high seas. I do not fear the socialistic idea. Any person who has studied our public-road system, our public-school system, our Postal System, and municipal ownership are no longer scared at this bugaboo of socialism. I believe that certain conditions may arise, such as have been referred to at length on the floor, when it becomes the duty of the organized powers of society to take hold and regulate such conditions in the interest of the public welfare, when private initiative is unequal to the task; and I would be in favor of this bill if it were Government ownership and a fair experiment of governmental operation and control; but this bill, as I study it, as I see it, means nothing of the sort. It is not proposed here seriously that the Government shall operate these lines. It is carefully arranged that these lines of ships may be leased. Who is going to lease and operate these ships? Is it not most likely it will be by men who are already in the shipping business? Will not the great Shipping Trust, if it exists, as I believe it does—will not they see to it that their agents get those leases, and will not they operate them in such a way, notwithstanding the power of the Government to fix regulatory rates, but still operate them in such a way as that it will not interfere much with their monopoly, by delays and lack of facilities driving the shippers away from patronizing the Government-owned ships? Of course this would cost the trust some money, but would not much disturb its control of rates. I do not fear, Mr. Speaker, this idea of war very much. I think the danger of foreign entanglements is overdrawn. I have got the notion that it would serve American interests better if we took a bolder stand upon American rights than we have been taking, for my idea is that Germany, Austria, France, and England have all the war they want and will not have appetite for any more of it in the near future. So, while I do not regard the Government ownership of merchant ships of great hazard, my opposition to this bill is because it will not give the Government control of rates nor the public relief from the extortions of the Shipping Trust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].



Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, these are degenerate and evil days we are drifting into in one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world. It is humiliating to acknowledge it. Within four days after we have dedicated a monument to the memory of the greatest American commoner, Abraham Lincoln, we have to confess that this Government has become for the time being a Government of the White House, by the White House, and for the White House.

Let us see ourselves as others see us and see if the photograph will not be recognized. Take the headlines in the daily press as to what is happening in this body and what, let us ask, has become of the legislative prerogatives of the great representative department in the legislation of the Government? The headlines in the Star of last Friday afternoon are these:

Wilson rejects Gore ship bill—Refuses to agree to amendment limiting activities of United States in shipping business.

The headlines in the Washington Post of the next—Saturday—morning:

Ship fight in House—Administration hopes to force passage by gag rule.

Read the headlines in the Times of last evening:

Crack party whip to jam ship bill through the House.

These are not the heated arguments of partisans in debate. They are the ordinary news indications of what is happening in the House of Representatives, and honest news gatherers could not describe the degeneracy into which this legislative body has descended with accuracy without using phraseology something like this.

By the same token, under orders from the Legislative Mansion—with proper acknowledgments to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—you gentlemen could put through the House with the same vote you had in the caucus last night, which is supposed to be 154, and probably would proceed to do so as heartily, a repeal of the Ten Commandments, of the Apostles' Creed, or the Sermon on the Mount. And you could do it by the caucus methods you have adopted for Democratic legislation.

This is one of the biggest pieces of political junk and undigested, un-American socialism that was ever skidded through the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is not 10 per cent of the membership of this body that believes in the principles of this bill or the provisions that you are supposed to enact into this legislation.

We have heard you talk in the lobbies of the hotels, about the tables in the dining rooms, and on the streets, as we have conversed together, and it is not betraying any friendly secrets to make the estimate that probably there is not 20 per cent of the membership on either side of this Chamber that believes heartily in this measure. And if any of you Democrats who are instructed to pass it should find this bill rising up and embarrassing you in the next campaign I am one of the friends you can call upon to prove an alibi. Your heart is not in this legislation. It is not your bill. As the Speaker is reported to have said to you in the secret caucus last night, the President wants it. If you do not pass it you will have an extra session, and he has prophesied what disaster that would mean to the Democratic Party. The schoolmaster has announced that you Democratic schoolboys will have no recess and will be kept in after school if you do not perform the stunt that is laid out for you, and you are performing under the smart of the ruler of the master and under the threat of the hickory switch. The whole nomenclature of legislation in the Congress of the United States has had to undergo a change in order to adapt itself to present methods of legislation. It is a minority government that we are living under, from the White House, through the House of Representatives, and on through the Senate. If correctly reported, last night 154 Members of this body decided what shall be the destiny of this legislation in the House of 435 Members.

After the last census was taken, believing in a representative Government and in order to have a better representation of the real sentiment of all parts of this Republic, now numbering about 100,000,000 in population, we enlarged the representation of this body up to 435 Members. And yet if you are to legislate by instructions from the White House and then tie up and gag your own membership by a bare majority in a secret caucus, I suggest, in the interest of economy in this administration, which is confessedly confronted with an enormous financial deficit, there is no just reason why Congress should not take a vacation without pay, at least until the termination of the present administration. One good office boy with a couple of rubber stamps could perform the perfunctory duties that are expected to be discharged in these two Houses of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.] It would be an enormous saving to the country.

We do not perform legislative functions upon administrative measures in this body any longer by a combat of intellectual powers and in honest debate. If the cloture rule can be established in the other end of the Capitol, which the evening papers announce the President in his confidential interviews with the members of the press this morning announced he was in favor of, there is no reason why, so far as administrative measures are concerned, you can not hereafter adopt them while you wait. Football legislation, legislation by main strength, legislation by the use of the hollow square, the flying "V," and the athletic wedge, and team work. You have a captain of the team. What will become of you if you still have some vestige of your own independence left and decline to play the game you will find set forth in the Indianapolis speech, which has become the new handbook of a declining Democracy. Here it is:

If any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic team for any purpose or from any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them.

Whether you are to be actually beheaded or are only to suffer political execution does not clearly appear. You have a captain who expects to hold you to account.

We hear a good deal about pernicious lobbying. The most pernicious lobby is the official lobby. Cabinet officers cease to be active heads of great executive departments and become lecturers before commercial clubs and social teas—lobbying for administration measures.

Autocracy is not Democracy; it is government by dictation, instead of government by representatives of the people. One-man government is as bad now as in the middle of the Dark Ages. It can never be justified, except by the tenet of superstition and ignorance, "The King can do no wrong."

Now, as to the merits of this bill. It is claimed it is an emergency measure. No emergency exists that this bill will meet. The exportations from the United States in the month of January were the largest exportations to foreign countries in any single month in the history of the United States. It was an abnormal export, and it was an export demanded by the war, and consisted largely of munitions of war and of foodstuffs. We have exported them and there must have been ships to take them. They could not get across by aeroplanes. The ships were here to take them across. The greatest exportations were during the month of January, and they are continuing during the present month. We could not, with Government-owned ships, export those things now if we wanted to do so. Munitions of war are made contraband by Germany. No American bottom can take them out on the ocean without being liable to confiscation. A dispatch from London this afternoon, published in the evening papers, dated at 4.46 p. m., states that Great Britain will announce officially this evening or to-morrow morning that foodstuffs hereafter shipped to Germany will be considered contraband of war. That absolutely removes all possibilities for this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be recreant to my trust as a representative of the great city of New York if I did not rise in my place in opposition to this measure. You have listened to-day to the remarks of my colleague, Mr. METZ, who favors its passage. He is one of the largest manufacturers of dyestuffs in the city of New York and knows much of the difficulties confronting the Nation in the matter of over-sea transportation. He is one of our best citizens and a man who deserves much from the people of his city and State. He is a large importer from Europe and, like many others in his line, has been seriously inconvenienced as a result of the European war.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield now. I will yield later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CALDER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have here resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York at a meeting held recently. This organization is composed of the leading merchants, importers, exporters, manufacturers, and business men of our State, and they protest against the enactment of this legislation. The president of this organization, the Hon. Seth Low, is a former mayor of New York City. I also have resolutions adopted by the Manufacturers and Business Men's Association of New York opposing this bill.

What is it we propose to gain by the enactment of this measure? Shall we add to the visible tonnage by a single ship? And if so, where do we expect to obtain these vessels? It is not proposed in this measure that we shall enter into contracts to build merchant vessels, but are to purchase ships already



in existence. This will not relieve the situation, for the ships that we purchase are at present engaged in carrying freight. Is it intended that we shall purchase the German and Austrian ships now interned in our harbors? There are 66 of these vessels with a total of 518,706 tons gross, and most of them are of the passenger-carrying class. It has been maintained in some quarters that if this bill passes it is not the intention of the Government to buy these interned vessels, and I sincerely trust such is the case. It would be taking an unusual risk in view of the attitude of all of the belligerents on this question. It has been repeated over and over again to-day that the rules of the London convention, to which all of the belligerents subscribe, plainly indicate that they would consider a ship sold subsequent to the war subject to capture if overtaken on the high seas. If these German and Austrian vessels are to be considered, would it not be much better to permit their purchase by individuals? Private capital will be very glad to take them and operate them if they can be placed under our flag without the opposition of the warring powers. If purchased and operated by the Government, there is a possibility of our being involved in grave difficulties. If one of these ships owned by a private individual was to be captured or destroyed, the matter would be one for settlement by the rules of war, and our Government could not be directly involved; but if owned by this Government and captured or destroyed we would be immediately involved, and there is grave probability that it would end in serious complications that might be most disastrous to the peace of this country.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said to-day about the excessive freight rates charged in our over-sea trade. Everyone knows that the rates are higher than ever before and that they are really more than they should be. I am reliably informed that on vessels owned by citizens of Great Britain and France that the freight rates are little higher than under normal conditions prevailing before the war. This is a natural situation. A vessel sailing under the flag of any of the belligerents is subject to capture with all they contain, while ships sailing under a neutral flag are safe, but these unusual rates on neutral ships are to be expected. Many of the English and French merchantmen are being used in connection with their army and navy, and all are subject to capture if encountered by the enemy; so there is every good reason under these circumstances why rates attain their unusual high mark.

But, gentlemen, practically all the great maritime nations of the world except our own are at war. Conditions are extraordinary, and when one stops to consider all of the facts, have we much to complain of? I have heard on the floor to-day of the difficulties that the farmers of the West and South are faced with. We are told of the extraordinary prices charged the grower of wheat and corn for shipping his product. I am advised that these excessive rates are paid by the consumer and that the farmer is receiving an unusually high price. In my city and State an investigation is under way because of the shortage of wheat and the high price of flour. It is maintained that a combination of wheat growers and those interested in the great exchanges of the country are responsible for this condition of affairs. It seems to me that the European war is responsible. The other countries are unable to raise enough to supply their needs, and, naturally, they come to us, the great food-producing nation, to feed them. It has been suggested that it might be well to stop the exportation of foodstuffs, and thereby reduce the freight rates and, incidentally, the cost to the American consumer.

Now I will yield to my colleague, Mr. METZ, for a question. I promised him that I would.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me a question, and I am going to make an explanation.

Mr. CALDER. My time is very short. I can only yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. METZ. How many ships do you suppose the business I am engaged in needs for the transportation of its products to this country?

Mr. CALDER. I should say one ship a month.

Mr. METZ. Five thousand tons will do the whole thing and keep the woolen mills in operation.

Mr. CALDER. I have no desire to intimate that the gentleman is supporting this measure because of any personal interest he may have. I know him too well to believe that he is actuated in this or other matters by his personal interests. I sincerely trust that whatever business he has abroad will go on without serious inconvenience.

Mr. METZ. The gentleman need not worry about me.

Mr. CALDER. I know that my colleague is able to take care of himself.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most unusual proceeding. To-day we are discussing a great measure, establishing a new policy for the Government without reasonable consideration. This bill is to be debated for six hours. It ought to have at least two weeks. Hardly a man on this floor knows the contents of the measure we are asked to vote upon to-day. A careful reading would indicate to me that we will repeal all our navigation laws by passing this bill—measures enacted during all the years of the existence of this country safeguarding the lives and property of the people on the high seas. If for no other reason I would vote against this bill. Having assisted in preparing some of these important navigation laws, I am not willing to vote to repeal them without some knowledge as to what will be substituted in their place and without an opportunity for reasonable debate. There are many other provisions in this bill which should be discussed and open for amendment, and to which careful and deliberate consideration should be given. The bill is brought in here under a special rule as the result of caucus dictation and will be voted upon exactly as reported, without any opportunity for amendment. There is no demand for this legislation. The business men throughout the country realize that if this bill is enacted into law it will simply mean the expenditure of \$40,000,000 of the people's money without appreciable relief to the world's commerce. Yesterday I inquired from the Commissioner of Navigation the amount of tonnage of all the maritime nations, and will print as part of my remarks the number of ships of each nation and their tonnage. This statement indicates that all the gross tonnage of the maritime nations of the earth in 1914 amounted to approximately 50,000,000 tons, and of that amount the tonnage of Austria and Germany amounted to 6,500,000 tons, about one-eighth of the total. The effect of the withdrawal of these two countries from trade has, of course, seriously inconvenienced business.

The operation of steamship lines by the Government is a new departure in this country. It is true that this was undertaken in a limited extent when we took over the Panama line of steamers at the time of the purchase of the rights of the French interests which had the canal under construction. We were compelled to use them for the purpose of carrying supplies necessary in the building of the canal. I venture the statement that a careful examination of the cost of operation will prove that it has been a losing venture as against privately owned and operated steamship lines. One of the important planks in the socialistic platform of 1912 provides for "the collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamship lines, and all other means of social transportation and communication, and all land." Has the Democratic Party in this House committed itself finally to the doctrine of socialism? Is this one of the new ideas that President Wilson has criticized the Republican Party for not having? Is this to be the beginning of a movement whereby this Government shall operate the railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and other means of transportation?

Gentlemen speak of this measure as a temporary one, but they do not attempt to advise us where they are going to get the vessels to operate. It seems to me rather, Mr. Speaker, that we are entering upon a new field of activity. The experiences of the last 20 years have shown us that when we undertake things of this kind we are adding unnecessary expense to the conduct of the business of the Nation, which results in an excessive burden on the people.

I voted for the Alaskan railroad bill although I hesitated in so doing. My reason for voting for it was because it was a new country which contained Government land of great value, that we sorely needed the coal that it is claimed exists there, and we were advised private capital would not invest in an enterprise of this character. I am informed that the appropriation authorized in this year's sundry civil bill is to be used in the purchase of an existing railroad. I have sufficient confidence in the Secretary of the Interior to be sure that he will obtain a good bargain for the Government, but I am satisfied now that I erred when I voted for the measure. When the European war is over, if this bill is passed, the Government merchant ships will be brought in direct competition not only with American privately owned vessels but merchant ships of all the nations of the world. Does anyone believe that with the higher wages and better living conditions required on Government-owned American ships we can hope to compete at a profit? Either we will be compelled to conduct our shipping business at a loss or lay our vessels up. What method shall we pursue to build up our much-needed merchant marine?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is only one of two things to do. First, to give to foreign-built vessels the permanent right to



come in under the American flag, to operate in both the over-sea and coastwise trade under the same conditions as now afforded our own ships, or, second, to follow the policy of Great Britain in granting a subsidy to their mail and merchant lines. I am heartily in favor of the latter. I believe that if we should devote the interest on the \$40,000,000 contemplated in this measure to give Government aid to privately owned lines of vessels we would encourage the building of a merchant marine that would in the end in a large degree take care of at least our South American commerce. Those of us on this side believe in protection to American industries, and in your own Underwood tariff bill, while it is a nonrevenue-producing measure as compared with the Republican system of a protective tariff, nevertheless, in many of its provisions you have sought to take care of special interests, to protect them against foreign competition. The same principle is involved in the building of the merchant marine. We can not hope to succeed until we follow the policy of Government aid.

I have been a Member of this House for 10 years. I had hoped that I might aid in doing something to establish a merchant marine. I can not vote for this measure. It is socialistic. It is apt to involve us in serious trouble with the Governments of Europe now engaged in war with each other and will not appreciably contribute to the relief of the present trying situation. It will be unprofitable from the standpoint of the Government, and will be, I am convinced, a failure.

My attention was called this morning to a speech delivered by President Wilson about three years ago. I believe it was in the spring before his nomination for the Presidency. It occurred at Indianapolis, where he delivered another speech recently, and the meeting was presided over by the then governor, now Vice President Marshall. In the former speech Gov. Wilson spoke with unusual vigor and with compelling force. First, he insisted that all legislation should be conducted under the public eye; that committees should transact their business with wide-open doors; that the public should be freely admitted at all times to hear and see what might transpire in the course of legislation. And yet our history furnishes no parallel to the secrecy that shrouded the preparation of this bill. Upon this measure no hearings have been held in the House. It was formulated behind closed doors and almost wholly in the dark and without one note of protest coming from the White House. Secondly, he inveighed most vigorously against the party caucus in this same speech at Indianapolis and took the position that all the representatives of the people, in both House and Senate, should have the full privilege of debate and amendment and that the individual conscience

should never be bound by caucus domination. Imagine it, gentlemen! He was a candidate then. How things have changed since that day. It seems to me that never in any period of the history of the United States has any great party been so dominated by caucus rule. In the main every great measure which we have considered during the present Congress was formulated behind closed doors, out of view of the public and the minority of this House. The Democratic side has voted at all times its caucus determination, no matter whether or not our view was the correct one. As an evidence of this, take the Federal currency act, which came to the House as a result of caucus. It was amended in one or two small particulars, and went to the Senate with the assurance that it was a perfect measure, meeting the hearty approval of the President, but before it got through the Senate it was amended six hundred times. The President's third pre-election statement was that each of the three coordinate branches of government should be absolutely independent of the other two; that the Executive should never encroach upon or invade the sphere of the others, and that neither should ever tolerate any interference whatever by either of the other two. And yet, neither Jackson, whom the President said in his recent speech he was following, nor Roosevelt, at whom three years ago he was striking, ever interfered more with legislation and its passage than the President has done in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this measure with many gentlemen on the other side of the House. They are opposed to it in their hearts. They doubt its value. Many of them are confident that it is a step in the dark and one that in the end will be a failure, and still they vote for it because of the pressure from the White House.

The business men of the great city of New York, which I have the honor in part to represent, are almost to a man against this measure. They are much better informed on the subject than are we. They know the intricacies of trade and are unlike the President, who in his last Indianapolis speech stated that he had never been in business and therefore could not be prejudiced in the matter.

We are living in difficult times. We are at peace with the world. Let us do nothing that will mar this peace.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation, dated February 15, advising me that on June 30, 1914, there was employed in the coasting trade of the United States 23,562 vessels, of 6,818,363 gross tons.

Mr. Speaker, I shall print here a statement of Lloyds, the great English authority on the merchant marine, indicating the number of vessels engaged in the world's commerce, with their gross and net tonnage.

*Number and net and gross tonnage of steam and sailing vessels of over 100 tons, of the several countries of the world, as recorded in Lloyd's Register for 1914-15.*

Flag.	Steam.			Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	Net tons.	Gross tons.	Number.	Net tons.	Number.	Tonnage.
British:							
United Kingdom.....	8,587	11,545,746	18,892,089	653	364,677	9,240	19,256,766
Colonies.....	1,536	949,386	1,631,617	552	156,666	2,088	1,788,283
Total.....	10,123	12,495,132	20,523,706	1,205	521,343	11,328	21,045,049
American (United States):							
Sea.....	1,113	1,315,976	2,026,908	1,377	943,376	2,490	2,970,284
Northern lakes.....	579	1,704,039	2,260,441	31	92,323	610	2,352,764
Philippine Islands.....	65	25,876	42,729	9	2,417	74	45,146
Total.....	1,757	3,045,891	4,330,078	1,417	1,038,116	3,174	5,368,194
Argentinian.....	244	112,165	188,892	69	32,789	313	221,681
Austro-Hungarian.....	433	653,873	1,062,346	12	3,373	445	1,055,719
Belgian.....	173	218,800	341,025	9	11,099	182	352,124
Brazilian.....	395	185,120	307,607	53	16,322	448	323,929
Chilean.....	91	60,865	96,473	32	19,444	123	125,917
Chinese.....	73	59,255	93,095	2	323	75	93,418
Cuban.....	53	26,334	58,450	4	641	57	59,091
Danish.....	576	454,262	770,430	246	49,751	822	820,181
Dutch.....	709	910,123	1,471,710	97	21,745	806	1,496,455
French.....	1,025	1,099,914	1,922,286	551	397,152	1,576	2,319,438
German.....	2,090	3,116,968	5,134,720	298	324,576	2,388	5,459,296
Greek.....	407	515,549	820,861	78	16,007	485	836,868
Italian.....	637	872,308	1,430,475	523	237,821	1,160	1,668,296
Japanese.....	1,103	1,088,333	1,708,386	.....	.....	1,103	1,708,386
Mexican.....	48	27,328	45,069	9	2,129	57	47,198
Norwegian.....	1,656	1,173,936	1,967,353	535	547,369	2,191	2,504,722
Peruvian.....	19	15,226	28,771	46	23,935	65	52,706
Portuguese.....	105	55,449	92,429	105	28,502	210	120,931
Roumanian.....	34	32,072	56,164	2	678	36	56,842
Russian.....	747	500,352	851,949	507	201,869	1,254	1,053,818
Siamese.....	11	7,741	12,360	.....	.....	11	12,360
Spanish.....	589	537,575	883,926	58	14,897	647	898,823
Swedish.....	1,088	591,382	1,015,364	378	102,722	1,466	1,118,086
Turkish.....	142	68,096	116,317	60	16,841	202	133,158
Uruguayan.....	42	29,472	38,837	16	14,320	58	53,157
Other countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Persia, Salvador, Samoa, Sarawak, Tunis, Venezuela, Zanzibar, etc.....	74	31,161	54,798	80	28,911	154	83,709
Total.....	24,444	27,987,782	45,403,877	6,392	3,685,675	30,836	49,089,552



Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Missouri going to occupy all of his time for one speech? If not, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the record made by this Congress, a Congress pledged to the enactment of legislation to lighten the burdens of the people, I do not know whether to laugh or to cry. You enacted a tariff law that made the high cost of living higher to the consumer. You passed a currency law that increased interest rates to the borrower. Your proverbial economy in expenditures has become the most profligate extravagance in administration of the country ever witnessed. No wonder our people are staggering under the burdens of taxation. Business is stagnant. Industry is paralyzed. You seem to recognize that the patient is sick, but you do not seem to have sense enough to prescribe the remedy. You have the captain of the team, as the President calls himself, and you seem to think that legislating for 100,000,000 of your countrymen is mere boys' play.

We are told that we have no ships, and that this is the reason for this measure; yet during the month of December, 1913, we sent abroad of our corn, our wheat, our oats, and our barley only 5,000,000 bushels. In December, 1914, we sent abroad over 41,000,000 bushels of these cereals. Apparently we have no difficulty in securing an abundance of ships to carry our produce abroad.

But some one says that ocean rates are high. I would be very glad to vote for a bill to bring about a reduction in those rates. How about that side of the Chamber, whose party in convention in Baltimore adopted a platform promising cheaper railway rates? In the Interstate Commerce case where the eastern roads were asking for an increase of 5 per cent, the president of the New York Central lines testified that in 1913 that after setting aside all that was necessary for depreciation, and after setting aside \$11,000,000 to the surplus fund, they still had enough to pay 11 per cent on the entire capitalization of the road. The president of the Pennsylvania Railroad testified that in 1913, after setting aside a sufficient fund to cover all of the depreciation charges they still had net earnings sufficient to pay more than 9.6 per cent on the total capitalization of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Yet, notwithstanding such magnificent earnings, the President of the United States, on September 11 wrote a letter which appears in the New York Times of that date under the following headlines:

President asks aid for railroads—Calls country's attention to the necessity of giving them every possible help—Finds their needs vital—In open letter to Frank Trumbull he insists their credits must be sustained—May seek rate increase—Reopening of interstate ruling of August 1 probably will be asked by eastern lines.

The President says to Mr. Trumbull:

Since you read it to me yesterday I have read again the statement you made on behalf of the committee of railroad presidents whom I had the pleasure of meeting and conferring with at my office. It is a lucid statement of plain truths.

You asked me to call the attention of the country to the imperative need that railway credits be sustained and the railroads helped in every possible way, whether by private cooperative effort or by the action, wherever feasible, of Government agencies, and I am glad to do so, because I think the need very real.

I am confident that there will be active and earnest cooperation in this matter, perhaps the one common interest of our whole industrial life.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Active cooperation! Active cooperation with whom? With whom could the President cooperate? Who had the power to grant the increase? The Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission alone. The President wanted freight rates increased for railroads that were earning 11 per cent in 1913 after they had paid all operating expenses, charged off all that was necessary for depreciation, and set aside \$11,000,000 for the surplus fund. And yet you gentlemen on that side now claim that you are in favor of bearing down on the trusts and putting them out of business and of bringing lower freight rates to the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But gentlemen say, "Oh, we would put the Ship Trust out of business. How about the Ship Trust?" Are you anxious to put it out of business? If so, you have the power through the Attorney General. In a previous Congress I voted against a ship subsidy. I will vote against it again. But before I would vote for this bill I would willingly vote for a ship subsidy. With such a law we would know what it would cost the country. Then I would know that I was voting for the Shipping Trust and would admit it. But with this bill enacted into law, who can say what the cost to the Government will be? You gentle-

men talk about a Ship Trust, when you know, if you have read the report of the Attorney General, that the only Ship Trust he can find that is engaged in commerce is the German-American Packet Co., and that is one of the companies that you intend to help by buying their interned ships. They can not use these ships; we should not; but you propose to help this trust out of a very tight place by buying their interned ships. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the light of the testimony of the Attorney General, may I ask who is in favor of or is helping the greatest Shipping Trust in the world? [Applause on the Republican side.] Yes; I should like to see some law enacted that would reduce the rates on ocean freights. I would vote for a bill to-day to build ships auxiliary to our Navy. I would vote for a bill to-day to put to work a few out of millions of my countrymen who are out of work. I would gladly vote to set them to building ships, instead of buying interned ships, as you propose to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But you say this is an emergency measure. We have a law, enacted by Congress a few years ago, that not a dollar can be paid out of the Treasury unless it is appropriated in specific terms.

If you will turn to section 7 of this bill, you will find that the \$30,000,000 is not appropriated. Not a penny of that \$30,000,000 is appropriated, but you have done a most unusual thing—a thing that Congress should never do. You have authorized the Secretary of the Treasury not only to sell Government bonds to buy or build ships but, by this provision, you authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to trade the bonds of your country and mine—Panama bonds of the value of \$30,000,000—for old ships. He is to be the judge of the value of the old ships traded for and the price at which the bonds are to be accepted. Ordinarily you would offer these bonds to the public and sell them to the highest bidder; not so in this bill. You are proposing now that the Secretary of the Treasury may exchange these bonds for ships. You may have a very high and exalted opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury; but I submit that our American crown prince, the Secretary of the Treasury, should not be permitted to trade our Government bonds in this way for any merchandise.

No; let us refuse this un-American request; let us do what was finally determined by the Committee on Naval Affairs to do; let us build these ships. It was determined by that committee, after full hearing, that after the lapse of seven or eight months there could be one ship produced of from 8,000 to 10,000 tons capacity, and that thereafter two ships could be turned out every month by American labor. You say this is an emergency measure, and you also say the Secretary of the Treasury will trade the Panama Government bonds for old ships. Then you must admit that there will be no funds authorized with which he can purchase ships except the \$10,000,000 appropriated in section 15 of this bill. If such an emergency exists, why wait until after the next Congress convenes in December before appropriating this \$30,000,000? If an emergency exists satisfy it now by adequate appropriation; if an emergency does not exist, then let us drop the consideration of a measure that may involve us in international difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, \$40,000,000 may not be a large amount of money. The way that side of the House has appropriated money, it does not so regard it; but, Mr. Speaker, \$40,000,000 is too much money for us to pay for an international quarrel. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is not the expenditure of money alone of which I complain, but it is the great risk that we take in buying these interned ships. Let us understand that if we are to become involved in war with any European powers it will be because we have rushed headlong into the shipping business at a time when prudence and common sense would dictate to us that we should attend to our own business. This is not the time to embark in this industry.

The Democratic mayor of New York has called the President's attention to the fact that the wheat supply of this country is becoming exhausted and that the price of bread in this country is becoming a problem, but even that does not seem to prevent gentlemen on that side from rushing blindly into this program to buy these ships from the only Shipping Trust that exists in all the world and give them Panama bonds in payment for them. I shall vote against the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the limited time granted for debate. I have noticed before the six hours expired the remarkable effect of the debate. When this debate opened on this side there was a strenuous charge that the



bill was not a House of Representatives bill, but that it was a bill originating in the Executive Mansion. No sooner was the charge made than the denial came from the Democratic side. Within the last hour of the debate so much progress was made that in Addisonian prose the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] arose and boastfully said that this bill is a President Wilson bill. And, as if to clinch the admission, our able poetic friend from Connecticut arose and in his piquant rhymes and near poetry boasted this bill to be the bill of President Wilson.

So that the debate has established that one fact. I have considerable faith in the knowledge of the man who produced that bill; and when I heard within the last few days mooted about the Capitol the charge that the Shipping Trust was the obstruction to the passage of this bill, I submitted a question to the Department of Justice, officered by the appointees of the President of the United States, asking that department what actions had been begun against the so-called Shipping Trust, how far the actions had proceeded, and how many convictions there had been, and this is the answer:

Referring to your letter of the 10th instant, three cases under the Federal antitrust law have been instituted in the southern district of New York against alleged combinations of ocean steamship lines, in none of which was the Government successful in the lower courts.

The Department of Justice saw fit to begin these cases. They were tried before the courts of the United States by the best talent this administration could present, and he makes the statement that he was unable to obtain convictions in any of the cases he had selected for prosecution. He goes on to add that he will take the cases to the Supreme Court.

The case against the Hamburg-American Line and others, decided October 13, 1914, is now pending on appeal in the Supreme Court; and the cases against the American-Asiatic Steamship Co. and others and the Prince Line (Ltd.) and others, both decided February 3, 1915, will be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The admission by the Department of Justice that the existing cases selected by it have thus far failed; and the charge that is made so promiscuously from the other side of the House has no foundation whatever, so far as the present is concerned. No man with confidence in the Department of Justice and the courts of this land will make the charge until they have succeeded in establishing a conviction.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SLOAN. I can not yield. I want to say that I object to this bill because I believe it an indirect and objectionable declaration of war. The White House induced the Members of this House last spring to make a declaration of war, not against a great nation, but against an individual. Then was projected our fleet against an officer of another Government. It captured the greatest port of that nation, drove out the head of the only part of that nation where American life, limb, and property were safe and left anarchy throughout the Republic of Mexico, overrun by the outlaw followers of unstable Carranza, the blood-thirsty Zapata, and the villainous Villa.

We have been furnished from the same source heretofore a great many ships, but they are all hardships. [Laughter.] They have fallen upon our National Treasury, upon our laborers, and upon our industries. Plenty hardships have been furnished us, and we do not want any ships of commerce forced upon us from the same source.

In nearly every speech I have heard to-day on that side there were crocodile tears shed for the producers of the land and the farmers who desired to send their products abroad. The bill which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Williams] said was substantially the same bill as the one now being considered on page 2 says that the purpose of the bill is to stimulate shipping between the ports of the United States and South and Central America. What does that mean to the American farmer? It means that every ship that goes from the American ports to South America will carry back—what? Not manufactured articles; but they will carry back grain, corn, wheat, alfalfa, beef and other meat, as they have been during the last year, in great cargoes from Argentina. In the report I find here in support of the Alexander bill a statement that there were 16,000,000 bushels of corn came in last year.

It was said that was only a negligible quantity, and yet, according to the evidence submitted before the Committee on Agriculture in the grain-grading hearings, and uncontradicted, although 50 grain dealers were there, it reduced the price of our corn to our producers at least 10 cents a bushel. Every man who knows anything about grain knows that to be absolutely true, and the farmers of the United States are not interested in having first placed upon the free list the products of the farm, and then to put our hands into the Treasury of the United States, or rather strain the credit of the United States, to buy ships to haul grain from South America to the American ports and there compete directly with the products of our

farms. We lost in revenue enough on those 16,000,000 bushels of corn to have kept our Treasury going for three days, and that would have been a fine breathing spell both for the Treasury and for you in these times. The party which has spurned the farmer and scorned the farmer in all its legislation will not gain much favor in prescribing this specious and dangerous measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann.] [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the pending bill, because, first, it is not needed, and, second, it is dangerous. It is said that freight rates on the ocean are too high and that the Shipping Trust controls the vessels. If the Shipping Trust controls the vessels, from whom will we buy our vessels? From the Shipping Trust? If the Shipping Trust are making the enormous profits out of freight rates to-day, why should they sell their vessels to the Government of the United States or the shipping board? If, as was said by one gentleman here, a vessel is making its cost out of its rates in a year, at what price will they sell that vessel? I have waited in vain to-day for any answer to these questions. Who will sell the vessels to the United States? Is it proposed to expend \$30,000,000 in buying vessels from the Shipping Trust and take those vessels which the Shipping Trust will give up? It certainly must be plain that if a trust controls the freight rates on the ocean and controls the vessels, there will be no vessels for us to buy, unless we are willing to pay exorbitant prices for old ships which are practically old hulks. [Applause on the Republican side.] How, then, will the passage of this bill reduce freight rates? Under the terms of this bill you can not build any vessels to meet the emergency which you say now exists, because that will take time, and before the ships can be constructed this emergency will have passed away. It is said that we can not send our produce abroad rapidly enough.

If all of the wheat in the United States to-day, or four-fifths of it, or one-half of it, could to-day be put on the Atlantic on its way to Europe, the price of wheat would have the bottom drop out of it. If we send our wheat abroad too rapidly, it will put the price of wheat down so that we will not get as much for all of the wheat as we would if one-half of it is sent more slowly. [Applause.] And if to-day we could send abroad all of the cotton that lies in the ports of the country, the price of cotton would break, and you would not get 5 cents a pound for it abroad. You maintain the price of these products abroad largely because there has been and is some delay in endeavoring to ship abroad at the present high prices. Otherwise, you would break the price.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill because it is dangerous. You can not buy the vessels from the Shipping Trust unless you pay enormous prices, and is it proposed, then, to buy the interned vessels of belligerent nations? Everyone knows that the moment we buy one of the interned vessels and load upon that vessel foodstuffs which England has declared to be conditional contraband and which she will not permit to be sent to Germany, we are treading upon dangerous ground. I believe that the President of the United States is sincere in his desire to preserve the absolute neutrality of this country as between the warring nations. In that respect I stand with him and behind him. I want to keep this country out of war [applause] and out of provocation for war. Of course, if we reach the point where we must fight for our rights, we will all do it with enthusiasm, but we do not wish to reach that point.

In this fight between the allies and Germany and Austria we know that in the end these nations, in a desperate struggle for existence, will not be too careful in their treatment of the rights of neutrals. We should make every effort to keep out of trouble, to keep our nose out of the affairs of other people. [Applause.] We should set ourselves absolutely against any kind of alliances or entanglements which may bring us to the point where we may have to vote for or against war. This is the great opportunity of the United States, while these other great powers are warring, to reach preeminence through peace. We must preserve peace, and we ought not under any circumstances to take a step which, whether it actually leads to war or not, leads to difficulties. We can send our foodstuffs, we can send our cotton, abroad as rapidly as they will be taken up at good prices in other countries. We do not need this bill. If we pass it and it is put into operation, we shall run the risk of embroiling our country in foreign difficulties and perhaps in war. Let us remember to be patriots first, and to uphold the rights of our country peaceably, and keep out of trouble. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to detain the House at any length. If I were inclined to traverse the ground which gentlemen on the other side have endeavored



to cover and to correct the misstatements—the reckless misstatements—made by them, I would require far more time than is at my disposal. I can understand partisan feeling. I am sometimes inspired by it myself, but I have never stooped so low as to be absolutely indifferent to the truth when undertaking to criticize the adversary party. Take it for granted that this bill did originate at the White House. Could it have originated at a better source? [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is possible you gentlemen on the other side do not have that high regard for the gentleman who is now the Chief Magistrate of the United States which is entertained by the gentlemen on this side. But I want to tell you that in lofty patriotism, in scholarship, in statesmanship there is not another man in the United States to-day better or greater than Woodrow Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But it is not becoming, it is undignified, it is contemptible for you to try to slur him. It is beneath the dignity of any American citizen [applause on the Democratic side], much less the minority in this body, that in times past has represented a great political party in this country. Some of you say you are in favor of Government ownership, but this bill does not go far enough. Some of you are in favor of subsidy, some of you are not.

Gentlemen, is there anything in the situation in this country to-day growing out of the war in Europe to arrest the attention of the American people and demand a remedy? Is there anything in the situation that suggests to you the necessity of an American merchant marine? Have you given any thought to that subject, or have you been so diligent in your criticism of the President of the United States that you have overlooked what to my mind is one of the greatest problems before the American people to-day demanding solution? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regard an American merchant marine as an essential part of the national defense. It has been my aspiration ever since I came to Congress to be an humble instrument of my party to do something to rehabilitate the American merchant marine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While my party was in the minority and I was serving on the committee under the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], I cooperated with him in every rational way to help solve this great problem, but I was unwilling to support such measures as the Humphrey bill, which contemplated the expenditure of about \$5,000,000 a year to be paid to about 20 ships belonging to certain favorite ship lines. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MURDOCK. And under a 10-year contract.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader, quite in contrast with his associates on that side of the House, says that he believes the President of the United States is intent on maintaining or observing our duty as a neutral Nation; that he will not knowingly do anything that will compromise us as a Nation or involve us in war with one or the other of the belligerents. That is a sentiment worthy of the gentleman from Illinois [applause], but it is in contrast with and a reproach to every gentleman on that side who has spoken to-day in criticism of the President.

Mr. MANN. I represent the sentiment of every gentleman on this side; all of them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If that is true, if the gentleman from Illinois reflects the true sentiment of the gentlemen on that side of the House, and believes in good faith what he says, what is this talk that we have had to-day about the risk of involving ourselves in war if this bill should become a law? The President of the United States is charged with the administration of this law. No ship can be purchased without his consent. The representatives of all the belligerent nations are here, and before any ship is purchased we can ascertain whether or not they will object to that purchase. But, gentlemen, we have heard much about the duties, our obligations as a neutral. Why, gentlemen, I can not understand why you emphasize our duties, and are seemingly indifferent to our rights.

In years past the Republican Party was wont to point to the splendid flag yonder as an emblem of the greatest and the freest Nation on earth and it was their boast that under its ample folds we should not only observe our obligations but dared assert our rights. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet timorous, cowardly you seem to be now, and voicing the sentiment of the Shipping Trust, you do not want us to buy any ships nor to assert any rights we may have, notwithstanding the war in Europe, for which we are not responsible, has paralyzed our commerce. It is possible that there are no ships to be purchased except the interned ships. It is possible if we should buy those ships we might not be permitted to use them in the trade with Europe. That we would be guilty of a violation of any of our duties as a neutral if we should use those vessels in the South American, the South African, or the Far Eastern

trade I have never yet heard anyone assert. But assuming that to be true, and assuming that we could not buy them, and that under the provisions of this bill we could do no more than utilize the vessels of the Panama Railroad Co., the Army transports, and such naval auxiliaries as might be used for auxiliary purposes, so much the pity, because then the remedy would be that much adequately less. But it is worthy of an effort on our part to do all we can to relieve the situation, and this administration could not excuse itself to the American people unless it should do all in its power to relieve the American people from the extortionate freight rates of the ships now engaged in the foreign trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I can not imagine how you gentlemen can be so indifferent, and if I understand your position, and I undertake to sum it up now, it is that notwithstanding freight rates on cotton, wheat, lumber, and other commodities for export have increased from 500 to 1,100 per cent, you regard the situation with absolute indifference and excuse yourselves upon the ground that the foreigner pays the freight. Gentlemen, I investigated the Shipping Trust by direction of this House. I was engaged in that task for more than two years. I found that there was not a single trade area in the world that was not controlled by the Shipping Trust. I found that within three years prior to 1913 ocean freight rates had increased from 50 to 200 per cent, whereas the costs of operation had not appreciably increased at all. I have here a statement of British lines for a number of years past showing their dividends during that time were from 10 to 100 per cent per annum, and each year they accumulated a large surplus.

And yet you say we should regard this situation with indifference; that it does not call for a remedy. I think it is of the utmost importance to us as a Nation if we would extend our foreign trade that we must have reasonable ocean freight rates in order to do so. We can not rest upon the assumption that the foreigner pays the freight. If that logic is true, the farmer might be indifferent as to the rate upon his goods from the farm to the market in the city. But, gentlemen, as I said, it is not my purpose to extend this discussion. The gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, some time before the gentleman concludes will he yield to a question about one of the amendments?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; but I would rather not do so just at this point.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], who, after my friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], is one of the fiercest partisans in this House, had much to say in the way of harsh criticism about the provision of this bill that the Government should use \$30,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds with which to buy ships.

Now, I have before me a copy of a bill introduced in the Senate of the United States by the senior Senator from Iowa. The bill I hold in my hand was introduced in this House by my good friend from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. This bill was referred to my committee, and it reads in part:

That the President is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase or construction, at a cost not exceeding in the aggregate \$30,000,000, vessels which shall be both suitable for naval auxiliaries and for use in foreign commerce. In order to provide a fund for the payment of vessels so to be purchased and the cost of the construction of vessels so to be built and equipped hereunder the President may issue and sell or use any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to an amount not exceeding \$30,000,000.

The language in the Towner bill is almost identical with the language in the pending bill, and provides for the purchase of ships by issue of Panama Canal bonds.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The second amendment proposes to strike out of the original bill the word "shall," in line 5, on page 2, and insert the word "to." I think that is an inadvertent mistake. The effect of that would be to pay civilian officers on these ships the pay and allowances of naval officers. I think the gentleman has plenty of time, and I will ask him if he will let me read it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill without the amendment reads:

Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired lists, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary, shall be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines.

I stop there at present. Now, the amendment is to strike out "shall" and insert the word "to," and make it read this way:

Such civilians, such officers of the naval auxiliary service, and such officers and enlisted men of the Navy, including officers on the retired



list, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary to be employed in the business of the said mail line or lines, and retired officers of the Navy so employed at sea or on shore shall, in all respects, be held and considered to be in an active duty status, and shall receive the pay and allowances of officers of the active list of the same rank and length of service.

The effect of the amendment would be to pay the civilian officers the pay and allowances of naval officers, whereas the gentleman only means the pay of officers on the retired list put on active duty with the rank and pay of officers on the active list.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman may be correct.

The gentleman has spoken about the division on this side of the House, and that the majority is being coerced from the White House. Gentlemen, in a few minutes we are going to give you an exhibition of solidarity. If it is the result of coercion from the White House, I hope it will always continue, because under this administration we have had more constructive legislation than at any other time in the last 25 years. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Missouri concluded?

Mr. ALEXANDER. While that is a mistake to which the gentleman from Illinois has called attention, it can be corrected later. I call for a vote now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It was reported this morning, but the Clerk will report it again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 3, after the word "that," by inserting "with the approval of the President."

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—yeas 221, noes 98.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands tellers and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] demands the yeas and nays. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays, 31, answered "present" 5, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 74.]

YEAS—301.

Abercrombie	Chandler, N. Y.	Frear	Hulings
Adair	Church	French	Hull
Adamson	Clancy	Gallagher	Humphrey, Wash.
Aiken	Clark, Fla.	Gallivan	Humphreys, Miss.
Alexander	Claypool	Gardner	Igoe
Allen	Cline	Garner	Jacoway
Anthony	Coady	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.
Ashbrook	Collier	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, S. C.
Aswell	Connelly, Kans.	George	Johnson, Utah
Bailey	Connolly, Iowa	Gill	Johnson, Wash.
Baker	Conry	Gillett	Keating
Baltz	Cooper	Gilmore	Kelley, Mich.
Barchfeld	Cox	Gittins	Kelly, Pa.
Barkley	Cramton	Glass	Kennedy, Conn.
Barton	Crisp	Goeke	Kennedy, Iowa
Bathrick	Crosser	Goldfogle	Kent
Beakes	Cullop	Good	Kettner
Bell, Cal.	Dale	Goodwin, Ark.	Key, Ohio
Bell, Ga.	Decker	Gordon	Kiess, Pa.
Blackmon	Deitrick	Goulden	Kinkaid
Booher	Dershem	Graham, Ill.	Kirkpatrick
Borland	Dickinson	Gray	Knowland, J. R.
Bowdle	Difenderfer	Green, Iowa	Konop
Britten	Dillon	Greene, Mass.	Korby
Brockson	Dixon	Greene, Vt.	Lafferty
Brodbeck	Donohoe	Gregg	La Follette
Brown, N. Y.	Donovan	Griffin	Lazaro
Brown, W. Va.	Doolittle	Gudger	Lee, Ga.
Browning	Doremus	Guernsey	Lee, Pa.
Bruckner	Doughton	Hamilton, Mich.	Lenroot
Brumbaugh	Driscoll	Hamlin	Leshner
Bryan	Dupré	Hardy	Lever
Buchanan, Ill.	Eagan	Harris	Levy
Buchanan, Tex.	Edmonds	Harrison	Lewis, Md.
Bulkley	Esch	Haugen	Lieb
Burke, S. Dak.	Estopinal	Hay	Lindbergh
Burke, Wis.	Farr	Hayden	Lindquist
Burnett	Fergusson	Hedin	Linthicum
Byrnes, S. C.	Ferris	Helm	Lloyd
Byrns, Tenn.	Fess	Helvering	Lobeck
Callaway	Fields	Henry	Logue
Campbell	Finley	Hill	Loneragan
Candler, Miss.	Fitzgerald	Hinds	McAndrews
Cantor	FitzHenry	Hinebaugh	McKellar
Cantrill	Flood, Va.	Holland	McKenzie
Caraway	Floyd, Ark.	Houston	MacDonald
Carlin	Foster	Howard	Maguire, Nebr.
Carter	Fowler	Howell	Mahan
Casey	Francis	Hughes, Ga.	Manahan

Mann	Peters	Seldomridge	Tavener
Mapes	Peterson	Shackelford	Taylor, Ala.
Martin	Phelan	Sherley	Taylor, Ark.
Miller	Porter	Sherwood	Taylor, Colo.
Mitchell	Post	Sims	Temple
Montague	Pou	Sinnott	Ten Eyck
Moon	Powers	Sisson	Thomas
Morin	Price	Slayden	Thomson, Ill.
Morrison	Prouty	Sloan	Towner
Moss, Ind.	Quin	Small	Townsend
Mott	Ragsdale	Smith, Md.	Tribble
Mulkey	Rainey	Smith, Saml. W.	Vaughan
Murdock	Raker	Smith, Minn.	Vinson
Murray	Rauch	Smith, N. Y.	Volmer
Neeley, Kans.	Rayburn	Smith, Tex.	Walsh
Neely, W. Va.	Reilly, Conn.	Stafford	Watkins
Nelson	Reilly, Wis.	Stedman	Watson
Norton	Riordan	Stephens, Cal.	Weaver
O'Hair	Roberts, Mass.	Stephens, Miss.	Webb
Oldfield	Rogers	Stephens, Nebr.	Whitacre
Padgett	Rothermel	Stephens, Tex.	White
Page, N. C.	Rouse	Stevens, N. H.	Williams
Paige, Mass.	Rubey	Stone	Wingo
Palmer	Rucker	Stringer	Young, Tex.
Park	Russell	Summers	
Parker, N. J.	Scott	Taggart	
Patton, Pa.	Scully	Talcott, N. Y.	

NAYS—31.

Anderson	Griest	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Borchers	Hamilton, N. Y.	Madden	Steenerson
Browne, Wis.	Hawley	Mondell	Sutherland
Butler	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore	Switzer
Calder	Kennedy, R. I.	Morgan, Okla.	Volstead
Curry	Kindel	Parker, N. Y.	Woods
Drukker	Langham	Slomp	Young, N. Dak.
Fordney	Langley	Smith, Idaho	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Beall, Tex.	Davenport	Dies	Metz
Carew			

NOT VOTING—86.

Ainey	Faison	McClellan	Stevens, Minn.
Austin	Falconer	McGillcuddy	Stout
Avis	Gard	McGuire, Okla.	Talbot, Md.
Barnhart	Gerry	Maher	Taylor, N. Y.
Bartholdt	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, La.	Thacher
Bartlett	Gorman	Moss, W. Va.	Thompson, Okla.
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Nolan, J. I.	Treadway
Burgess	Hamill	O'Brien	Tuttle
Burke, Pa.	Hart	Oglesby	Underhill
Carr	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Cary	Helgesen	Patten, N. Y.	Vare
Copley	Hensley	Platt	Walker
Danforth	Hobson	Plumley	Wallin
Davis	Hoxworth	Reed	Walters
Dent	Jones	Roberts, Nev.	Whaley
Dooling	Kahn	Rupley	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keister	Sabath	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagle	Kitchin	Saunders	Winslow
Edwards	Kreider	Sells	Witherspoon
Elder	L'Engle	Shreve	Woodruff
Evans	Lewis, Pa.	Sparkman	
Fairchild	Loft	Stanley	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. WHALEY (for) with Mr. DAVENPORT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. ELDER with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. CARR with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. METZ with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. RUPLEY with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. L'ENGLE with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. CARY.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. WALTERS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the second amendment.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, that was to strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to," was it not?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Debate is not in order.

Mr. WEBB. I was asking for information.



The SPEAKER. Yes; on line 5, page 3, strike out the word "shall" and substitute the word "to." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 212, noes 85.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for tellers. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three gentlemen have arisen for tellers—a sufficient number—and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 159, noes 60.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the second amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 100, answered "present" 3, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 75.]

YEAS—230.

Abercrombie	Donohoe	Hull	Raker
Adair	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Adamson	Doolittle	Igoe	Rayburn
Aiken	Doremus	Jacoway	Relly, Conn.
Alexander	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Relly, Wis.
Allen	Driscoll	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan
Ashbrook	Dupré	Keating	Rothermel
Aswell	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Rouse
Bailey	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Rubey
Baker	Estopinal	Kettner	Rucker
Baltz	Evans	Key, Ohio	Russell
Barkley	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Saunders
Bathrick	Ferris	Kitchin	Scott
Beakes	Fields	Konop	Seldomridge
Bell, Ga.	Finley	Korbly	Shackleford
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Lafferty	Sherley
Booher	FitzHenry	Lazaro	Sherwood
Borchers	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Sims
Borland	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Sisson
Bowdle	Foster	Leshner	Slayden
Brockson	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Md.
Brodbeck	Francis	Levy	Smith, N. Y.
Brown, N. Y.	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Tex.
Brown, W. Va.	Gallivan	Lieb	Stanley
Bruckner	Garner	Linthicum	Stedman
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Stephens, Miss.
Bryan	Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Stephens, Nebr.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gill	Logue	Stephens, Tex.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gilmore	Loneragan	Stevens, N. H.
Bulkley	Gittins	McAndrews	Stone
Burke, Wis.	Glass	McKellar	Stringer
Burnett	Goeke	MacDonald	Summers
Byrnes, S. C.	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Taggart
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Mitchell	Taylner
Cantor	Goulden	Montague	Taylor, Ala.
Caraway	Graham, Ill.	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Carlin	Gray	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Gregg	Moss, Ind.	Ten Eyck
Casey	Griffin	Mulkey	Thomas
Church	Gudger	Murdock	Townsend
Clancy	Hamlin	Murray	Tribble
Claypool	Hardy	Neeley, Kans.	Vaughan
Cline	Harris	Neely, W. Va.	Vinson
Coady	Harrison	O'Hair	Vollmer
Collier	Haugen	Oldfield	Walsh
Connelly, Kans.	Hay	Padgett	Watkins
Conry	Hayden	Page, N. C.	Watson
Cox	Heflin	Palmer	Weaver
Crisp	Helm	Park	Webb
Cullop	Helvering	Peterson	Whitacre
Dale	Hill	Phelan	White
Decker	Holland	Porter	Williams
Deitrick	Houston	Post	Wingo
Dershew	Howard	Pou	Witherspoon
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Price	Young, Tex.
Difenderfer	Hulings	Quin	
Dixon		Rainey	

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Dillon	Guernsey	Kinkaid
Anthony	Drukner	Hamilton, Mich.	Knowland, J. B.
Barchfeld	Edmonds	Hamilton, N. Y.	La Follette
Barton	Esch	Hawley	Langham
Bell, Cal.	Farr	Hinds	Langley
Britten	Fess	Hinebaugh	Lenroot
Browne, Wis.	Fordney	Howell	Lindbergh
Browning	Frear	Hughes, W. Va.	Lindquist
Burke, S. Dak.	French	Humphrey, Wash.	McKenzie
Butler	Gardner	Johnson, Utah	McLaughlin
Calder	Gillett	Johnson, Wash.	Madden
Callaway	Good	Kelley, Mich.	Manahan
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Kennedy, Iowa	Mann
Cooper	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, R. I.	Mapes
Cramton	Greene, Vt.	Kiess, Pa.	Martin
Curry	Griest	Kindel	Miller

Mondell  
Moore  
Morgan, Okla.  
Morin  
Moss, W. Va.  
Mott  
Nelson  
Norton  
Paige, Mass.

Parker, N. J.  
Parker, N. Y.  
Patton, Pa.  
Peters  
Platt  
Powers  
Prouty  
Roberts, Mass.  
Rogers

Sinnott  
Siemp  
Sloan  
Smith, Idaho  
Smith, J. M. C.  
Smith, Minn.  
Smith, Saml. W.  
Stafford  
Steenerson

Stephens, Cal.  
Sutherland  
Switzer  
Temple  
Thomson, Ill.  
Towner  
Volstead  
Woods  
Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Beall, Tex.

Carew

Metz

NOT VOTING—90.

Ainey  
Austin  
Avis  
Barnhart  
Bartholdt  
Bartlett  
Broussard  
Burgess  
Burke, Pa.  
Campbell  
Cantrill  
Carr  
Cary  
Clark, Fla.  
Connolly, Iowa  
Copley  
Crosser  
Danforth  
Davenport  
Davis  
Dent  
Dies  
Dooling

Dunn  
Edwards  
Elder  
Fairchild  
Faison  
Falconer  
Gard  
George  
Gerry  
Godwin, N. C.  
Gorman  
Graham, Pa.  
Hamill  
Hart  
Hayes  
Helgesen  
Hensley  
Hobson  
Hoxworth  
Jones  
Kahn  
Keister  
Kent

Kreider  
L'Engle  
Lewis, Pa.  
Loft  
McClellan  
McGillicuddy  
McGuire, Okla.  
Maher  
Morgan, La.  
Nolan, J. I.  
O'Brien  
Oglesby  
O'Shaunessy  
Patten, N. Y.  
Plumley  
Ragsdale  
Reed  
Roberts, Nev.  
Rupley  
Sabath  
Scully  
Sells  
Shreve

Small  
Sparkman  
Stevens, Minn.  
Stout  
Talbot, Md.  
Taylor, N. Y.  
Thacher  
Thompson, Okla.  
Treadway  
Tuttle  
Underhill  
Underwood  
Vare  
Walker  
Wallin  
Walters  
Whaley  
Wilson, Fla.  
Wilson, N. Y.  
Winslow  
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. PATEN of New York with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. COPLE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall of the House listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was attending an important committee meeting.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the rule of the House observed which prohibits Members gathering around the desk during a roll call.

The SPEAKER. They were not interfering with the roll call.

Mr. MANN. The rule says they shall not be at the desk.

The SPEAKER. That is true. They were consulting with the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. I can not help that; it was during the roll call.

The SPEAKER. It is all over. It does not make a bit of difference. [Laughter and applause.]

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider—well, I will not.

Mr. SHERLEY. You can not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add new sections, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ALEXANDER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The amendment that is now being read was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and was read. Is it in order now to read the amendment again except by unanimous consent? It has been read once and considered, and is pending under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point made by the gentleman from Missouri is well taken.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then I object to the further reading of it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. In what regard?

Mr. MANN. There are 13 sections in the amendment, 13 separate propositions, besides a dozen or so other propositions which are divisible. I only ask for a division of the sections.

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly the gentleman is right. The Clerk will report the first section, so that Members will know what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first subdivision.



The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm, or individual citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes, and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share: *And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than 12 months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels as a maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual, party to such charter or lease, shall violate the provisions of the same. The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stock at any meeting thereof.

Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, section 5.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 171, noes 77.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers and the gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 100, answered "present" 4, not voting 96.

[Roll No. 76.]

YEAS—223.

Abercrombie	Carlin	FitzHenry	Howard
Adair	Carter	Flood, Va.	Hughes, Ga.
Adamson	Casey	Floyd, Ark.	Hull
Aiken	Church	Foster	Humphreys, Miss.
Alexander	Clancy	Francis	Igoe
Allen	Clark, Fla.	Gallagher	Jacoway
Ashbrook	Claypool	Gallivan	Johnson, Ky.
Aswell	Cline	Garner	Johnson, S. C.
Bailey	Coady	Garrett, Tenn.	Keating
Baker	Collier	Garrett, Tex.	Kelly, Pa.
Baltz	Connelly, Kans.	Gill	Kennedy, Conn.
Barkley	Connolly, Iowa	Gilmore	Kent
Bathrick	Conry	Gittins	Kettner
Beakes	Cox	Glass	Key, Ohio
Bell, Ga.	Crisp	Goeke	Kirkpatrick
Blackmon	Cullop	Goldfogle	Konop
Booher	Dale	Goodwin, Ark.	Korbly
Borland	Decker	Gordon	Lafferty
Bowdle	Deltrick	Gorman	Lazarro
Brockson	Dershem	Goulden	Lee, Ga.
Brodbeck	Dickinson	Gray	Lee, Pa.
Brown, N. Y.	Dixon	Gregg	Lesher
Bruckner	Donohoe	Griffin	Lever
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Gudger	Levy
Bryan	Dooling	Hamlin	Lewis, Md.
Buchanan, Ill.	Doolittle	Hardy	Lieb
Buchanan, Tex.	Doremus	Harrison	Linthicum
Bulkley	Doughton	Hay	Lloyd
Burke, Wis.	Driscoll	Hayden	Lobeck
Burnett	Eagan	Healin	Logue
Byrnes, S. C.	Eagle	Helm	Lonergan
Byrns, Tenn.	Evans	Helvering	McAndrews
Candler, Miss.	Fergusson	Henry	McKellar
Cantor	Ferris	Hill	MacDonald
Cantrill	Fields	Holland	Maguire, Nebr.
Caraway	Finley	Houston	Mahan

Mitchell	Post	Sherwood	Taylor, Ark.
Montague	Pou	Sims	Taylor, Colo.
Moon	Price	Sisson	Ten Eyck
Morgan, La.	Quinn	Slayden	Thomas
Morrison	Rainey	Small	Townsend
Moss, Ind.	Raker	Smith, Md.	Tribble
Mulkey	Rauch	Smith, N. Y.	Vaughan
Murdoch	Rayburn	Smith, Tex.	Vinson
Murray	Reilly, Conn.	Stedman	Vollmer
Neeley, Kans.	Reilly, Wis.	Stephens, Miss.	Waish
Neely, W. Va.	Riordan	Stephens, Nebr.	Walters
O'Hair	Rothermel	Stephens, Tex.	Watkins
Oldfield	Rouse	Stone	Watson
Padgett	Rubey	Stout	Weaver
Page, N. C.	Rucker	Stringer	Webb
Park	Russell	Summers	Whitacre
Patten, N. Y.	Scully	Taggart	Williams
Peterson	Seldomridge	Talcott, N. Y.	Wingo
Phelan	Shackleford	Tavener	Young, Tex.
Porter	Sherley	Taylor, Ala.	

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Frear	Kinkaid	Parker, N. Y.
Anthony	French	Knowland, J. R.	Patton, Pa.
Barchfield	Gardner	La Follette	Peters
Barton	Gillett	Langham	Platt
Bell, Cal.	Good	Langley	Powers
Borchers	Greene, Mass.	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Britten	Greene, Vt.	Lindbergh	Rogers
Browne, Wis.	Griest	Lindquist	Scott
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLaughlin	Slemp
Butler	Haugen	Madden	Sloan
Calder	Hawley	Manahan	Smith, Idaho
Callaway	Hinds	Mann	Smith, J. M. C.
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Mapes	Smith, Minn.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hughes, W. Va.	Martin	Smith, Saml. W.
Cooper	Hullings	Miller	Stafford
Cramton	Humphrey, Wash.	Mondell	Steenerson
Curry	Johnson, Utah	Moore	Stephens, Cal.
Dies	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Dillon	Keister	Morin	Temple
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Moss, W. Va.	Thomson, Ill.
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Nelson	Towner
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Volstead
Fess	Kless, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Parker, N. J.	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Bartlett	Beall, Tex.	Carew	Difenderfer
----------	-------------	-------	-------------

NOT VOTING—96.

Ainey	Faison	Kreider	Shreve
Austin	Falconer	L'Engle	Sparkman
Avis	Fitzgerald	Lewis, Pa.	Stanley
Barnhart	Fowler	Loft	Stevens, Minn.
Bartholdt	Gard	McClellan	Stevens, N. H.
Broussard	George	McGillicuddy	Sutherland
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	McGuire, Okla.	Talbott, Md.
Burgess	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Taylor, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Metz	Thacher
Carr	Graham, Pa.	Mott	Thompson, Okla.
Cary	Green, Iowa	Nolan, J. I.	Treadway
Copley	Guernsey	O'Brien	Tuttle
Crosser	Hamill	Oglesby	Underhill
Danforth	Harris	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Davenport	Hart	Palmer	Vare
Davis	Hayes	Plumley	Walker
Dent	Helgesen	Prouty	Wallin
Drukker	Hensley	Ragsdale	Whaley
Dunn	Hobson	Reed	White
Dupré	Howell	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, Fla.
Edwards	Hoxworth	Rupley	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Jones	Sabath	Winslow
Estopinal	Kahn	Saunders	Witherspoon
Fairchild	Kitchin	Sells	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. WHITE with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. I wish to vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. I was in the balcony.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand for a division of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his demand for a division, and the question is on the remaining part of the amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. PADGETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PADGETT. The title to the bill should be amended.

The SPEAKER. That comes after the passage of the bill. The question is on the passage of the bill.



Mr. MANN. And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 121, answered "present" 7, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 77.]

#### YEAS—215.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey
Adair	Dixon	Hull	Raker
Adamson	Donovan	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Aiken	Doolittle	Igoe	Rayburn
Alexander	Doremus	Jacoway	Reilly, Conn.
Allen	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Reilly, Wis.
Ashbrook	Driscoll	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan
Aswell	Dupré	Keating	Rothermel
Bailey	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Rouse
Baker	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Rubey
Baltz	Estopinal	Kettner	Rucker
Barkley	Evans	Key, Ohio	Russell
Beakes	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Scully
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Konop	Seldomridge
Blackmon	Fields	Korbly	Shackelford
Booher	Finley	Lafferty	Sherley
Borland	FitzHenry	Lazaro	Sherwood
Bowdie	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Sims
Brockson	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Sisson
Brodbeck	Foster	Leshner	Small
Brown, N. Y.	Fowler	Lever	Smith, Md.
Bruckner	Francis	Levy	Smith, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Tex.
Bryan	Gallivan	Lieb	Stanley
Buchanan, Ill.	Garner	Linthicum	Stedman
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Stephens, Miss.
Bulkley	Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	George	Logue	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett	Gill	Loneragan	Stevens, N. H.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilmore	McAndrews	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Gittins	McClellan	Stout
Candler, Miss.	Glass	McKellar	Stringer
Cantor	Goeke	MacDonald	Summers
Cantrill	Goldfogle	Maguire, Nebr.	Taggart
Caraway	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Carlin	Goulden	Mitchell	Tavener
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Taylor, Ala.
Casey	Gray	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Church	Gregg	Mulkey	Taylor, Colo.
Clancy	Griffin	Murdock	Ten Eyck
Claypool	Gudger	Murray	Thomas
Cline	Hamlin	Neeley, Kans.	Townsend
Coady	Hardy	Neely, W. Va.	Tribble
Collier	Harrison	O'Hair	Vaughan
Connelly, Kans.	Hay	Oldfield	Vinson
Connolly, Iowa	Hayden	Padgett	Walsh
Conry	Heflin	Palmer	Watkins
Cox	Helm	Park	Watson
Crisp	Helvering	Peterson	Weaver
Cullop	Henry	Phelan	Webb
Dale	Hill	Post	Williams
Decker	Holland	Price	Wingo
Deitrick	Houston	Quin	Young, Tex.
Dershem	Howard	Ragsdale	

#### NAYS—121.

Anderson	Gerry	La Follette	Prouty
Barchfeld	Gillett	Langham	Roberts, Mass.
Barton	Good	Langley	Rogers
Bathrick	Gordon	Lenroot	Saunders
Bell, Cal.	Greene, Mass.	Lindquist	Scott
Borchers	Greene, Vt.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Britten	Griest	McLaughlin	Slayden
Browne, Wis.	Guernsey	Madden	Slemp
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Manahan	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Haugen	Martin	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Hawley	Miller	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Hinds	Mondell	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Hinebaugh	Moore	Stafford
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Morgan, Okla.	Steenson
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Morin	Stephens, Cal.
Cramton	Hulings	Morrison	Stevens, Minn.
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, Ind.	Sutherland
Dies	Johnson, Utah	Moss, W. Va.	Switzer
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Mott	Temple
Donohoe	Jones	Nelson	Thomson, Ill.
Drukker	Keister	Norton	Towner
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Palge, Mass.	Whitacre
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. J.	White
Fess	Kent	Parker, N. Y.	Witherspoon
Fitzgerald	Kiess, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Fordney	Kindel	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Kinkaid	Platt	
French	Kitchin	Porter	
Gardner	Knowland, J. R.	Powers	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Beall, Tex.	Davenport	Mann	Pou
Carew	Difenderfer	Metz	

#### NOT VOTING—80.

Ainey	Cary	Faison	Hensley
Anthony	Clark, Fla.	Falconer	Hobson
Austin	Copley	Gard	Hoxworth
Avis	Crosser	Godwin, N. C.	Kahn
Barnhart	Danforth	Gorman	Kreider
Bartholdt	Davis	Graham, Pa.	L'Engle
Bartlett	Dent	Green, Iowa	Lewis, Pa.
Broussard	Doelling	Hamill	Lindbergh
Brown, W. Va.	Dunn	Harris	Loft
Burgess	Edwards	Hart	McGillcuddy
Burke, Pa.	Elder	Hayes	McGuire, Okla.
Carr	Fairchild	Helgesen	Maher

Morgan, La.	Roberts, Nev.	Thacher	Walker
Nolan, J. I.	Rupley	Thompson, Okla.	Wallin
O'Brien	Sabath	Treadway	Walters
Oglesby	Sells	Tuttle	Whaley
O'Shaunessy	Shreve	Underhill	Wilson, Fla.
Patten, N. Y.	Sparkman	Underwood	Wilson, N. Y.
Plumley	Talbott, Md.	Vare	Winslow
Reed	Taylor, N. Y.	Vollmer	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the session:

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

On the vote:

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia (for bill) with Mr. AVIS (against).

Mr. POU (for bill) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. VOLLMER (for bill) with Mr. GREEN of Iowa (against).

Mr. HENSLEY (for bill) with Mr. FAIRCHILD (against).

Mr. J. I. NOLAN (for bill) with Mr. COPLE (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for bill) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. EDWARDS (for bill) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. WALKER (for bill) with Mr. AINEY (against).

Mr. HOBSON (for bill) with Mr. DAVIS (against).

Mr. UNDERHILL (for bill) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. CARR (for bill) with Mr. SELLS (against).

Mr. METZ (for bill) with Mr. PLUMLEY (against).

Mr. RUPLEY (for bill) with Mr. HELGESEN (against).

Mr. WILSON of Florida (for bill) with Mr. WALLIN (against).

Mr. L'ENGLE (for bill) with Mr. AUSTIN (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for bill) with Mr. DAVENPORT (against).

Mr. ELDER (for bill) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. CROSSER (for bill) with Mr. WALTERS (against).

Mr. SABATH (for bill) with Mr. KREIDER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. CARY.

Mr. DENT with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who is unavoidably detained from the House. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded as answering "present."

The name of Mr. MANN was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended so as to include the words "and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CROSSER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KAHN, for three days, on account of sickness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a. m., Wednesday, February 17, 1915), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon this day.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14895) to create a new division of the Bureau of Education, to be known as the Federal motion-picture commission, and defining its powers and duties, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1411), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21465) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 21474) to provide better credit facilities and lower interest for farmers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 21475) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of a corporation for the purpose of promoting the commerce of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS: Resolution (H. Res. 738) opposing the reorganization of the Rural Mail Service by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 737) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 423) providing for the appointment of a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALCONER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging amendment of act of February 22, 1899, providing for formation of constitutions of several States, including Washington, so as to permit greater latitude of leasing public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARD: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Iowa, indorsing S. 6857, to authorize the retirement from active service with increased rank of officers now on the active list who served in the Civil War, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, requesting and urging Congress to enact a grazing homestead law similar to H. R. 15799; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 21466) granting a pension to Ellen Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21467) granting an increase of pension to Silenus A. Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 21468) granting an increase of pension to Adam E. Haughn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 21469) granting a pension to James M. Odell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21470) granting an increase of pension to Evans M. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 21471) for the relief of the estate of Mary Davis Denny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 21472) granting a pension to William E. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 21473) granting a pension to Frank D. Lukens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 21476) granting a patent to a certain strip of land to Elisha A. Crandall; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 21477) granting a pension to Lucy T. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 21478) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21479) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Hannawalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of Rincheval Post No. 572, Grand Army of the Republic, Rhineland, Mo., and other Grand Army of the Republic posts of Missouri, urging action on pensions for the Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Kingston (N. Y.) Branch of American Neutrality League, urging legislation on an embargo of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Alsace and Lorraine Mutual Relief Society, of Cincinnati, Ohio, disapproving protests against exporting food and war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 21456, for relief of John W. Warman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of citizens of Egg Harbor City, N. J., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of Col. William Wilkinson Post, No. 65, Grand Army of the Republic, Mound City, Mo.; Tarkio Post, No. 67, Grand Army of the Republic, Tarkio, Mo.; and Christian Meyer Post, No. 45, Grand Army of the Republic, Oregon, Mo., favoring House bill 15, to pension all State militia, etc., who served in Union Army for 90 days or more; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN: Petition of citizens of Washington State, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Aberdeen (S. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of 64 citizens of Beaver Dam and Reeseville and vicinity, of Dodge County, Wis., favoring an embargo on war material except foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of Indiana citizens, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Indiana citizens, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Indiana citizens, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Indiana citizens, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of 5,000 Indianapolis (Ind.) citizens, appealing for a firm administration policy in protecting American commerce on the seas with neutral countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Badger Council, No. 109, Royal League, Kenosha, Wis., favoring bill to retire aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens of Aurora, Ill., relative to embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of Stockton, Cal., and Clements County, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of State Camp of the Missouri Enrolled Militia; also sundry citizens of the sixth Missouri district, members of Posts Nos. 327, 566, 172, and 238, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 15, to pension militia-men serving in Union Army in Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Ward, S. Dak., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petitions of Thomas J. Anderson, Cleveland, Ohio; citizens of Catawba County, N. C.; Chicago and Oak Park, Ill.; Schenectady, N. Y.; and Charleston, S. C., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of Lisbon, Iowa, W. M. S., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of A. L. Ostman, protesting against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, favoring passage of House bill 15; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of C. C. E. Brandt and others, of Ironton, and W. J. Knorpp and others, of De Soto, Mo., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of citizens of Bellingham, Wash., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Hoquiam and Olympia, Wash., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Stanley Prenis, of Bristol, Conn., relative to the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.



Also, petition of Anton Fafner, of New Britain, Conn., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Memorial of Kingston (N. Y.) Branch of American Neutrality League, favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 54 citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of associated dailies of New York State, against postage-rate increase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, against legislation by Congress providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORE: Petitions of German Sunday School Society, veterans of the German Army and their sons, and sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Wilhelm Rauff, Gustav Schaun, and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON: Petitions of citizens of Hammond and Hessville, Ind., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry physicians of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Fulton County, N. Y., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of citizens of Alleene, Ark., protesting against House bills 20644 and 20780; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 17, 1915.

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

Almighty God, we come before Thee helpless to meet the needs of our day and hour without Thy help. Show us how helpless we are. We seek that eternal and national freedom that can only find expression in the prayer, Thy will be done. Grant us such an enlarged vision of God's great purpose that in giving ourselves to the world we shall be giving the largest and the best service. Give us that spiritual quality that shall impart tone and uplift to all that we touch. May all our service be acceptable to God, because it is the gift of consecrated souls to their fellow men. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

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:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Gore	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bristow	Hardwick	Oliver	Stephenson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Overman	Sterling
Burleigh	Hollis	Owen	Stone
Burton	Hughes	Page	Sutherland
Camden	James	Penrose	Swanson
Catron	Johnson	Perkins	Thomas
Clapp	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pomerene	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Warren
Culberson	Lewis	Shafroth	Weeks
Cummins	Lippitt	Sheppard	White
Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
du Pont	McCumber	Simmons	Works
Fall	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of February 15, 1915, was read and approved.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL, PHILADELPHIA, PA. (S. DOC. NO. 947).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, suggesting that certain items be included in the sundry civil appropriation bill relating to the

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 948).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the sloop *Ruby*, Ezra King, master, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the municipal council of Babatngeg, Province of Leyte, P. I., praying for the passage of the so-called Jones bill, to confer self-government upon the Filipino people, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a telegram from William M. Randolph, of the Pittsburgh branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 16, 1915.

HON. GEORGE T. OLIVER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Pittsburgh branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, expressing the sentiment of the colored people of Pennsylvania, most emphatically registers its protest against the striking out of Howard University money from appropriation bill now in Senate Appropriation Committee. Our association appeals to you as a member of said committee to use your influence and exert every possible effort to have said money restored to the appropriation bill.

WM. M. RANDOLPH,

President Pittsburgh Branch National Association  
for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. SIMMONS. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina, favoring the immediate passage of the administration ship-purchase bill. I ask that the joint resolution may be read.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read, as follows:

[Resolution No. 20.]

Joint resolution memorializing the North Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress in favor of the administration bill to secure ships for transportation.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to do all within their power to secure the immediate passage of the administration bill to secure ships for the transportation of American products to the markets of the world.

We urge prompt action by our Senators and Representatives.

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be mailed immediately to each of our Senators and each of our Representatives in Congress at Washington.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this the 16th day of February, 1915.

E. L. DAUGHTRIDGE,

President of the Senate.

E. R. WOOTEN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Raleigh, February 16, 1915.

I, J. Bryan Grimes, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached (one sheet) to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh this 16th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1915.

[SEAL]

J. BRYAN GRIMES, Secretary of State.

Mr. CHILTON. On the same line I have received a communication from John F. McNamee, editor and manager of the Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND  
ENGINEMEN'S MAGAZINE,  
Indianapolis, Ind., February 13, 1915.

HON. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would respectfully remind you that about 3,000,000 men are out of employment in the United States and that a large pro-