

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1887.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to announce that Hon. CHARLES B. FARWELL, Senator-elect from the State of Illinois, is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator-elect will please come forward and the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. FARWELL, escorted by Mr. CULLOM, advanced to the desk of the President *pro tempore*, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him he took his seat in the Senate.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. FRYE presented the credentials of EUGENE HALE, chosen by the Legislature of Maine as Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1887; which were read and ordered to be filed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a report from the Court of Claims of their findings of fact and conclusions of law in the cases of claims on account of spoiliations by the French considered by that court under the provisions of the act of January 30, 1885. If there be no objection the communication will be printed and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there not a letter of transmittal?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is quite a long document. Does the Senator make any motion?

Mr. COCKRELL. No. It is proper to have the report referred to the Committee on Claims. I thought there might be a short letter of transmittal which would indicate more fully the subject-matter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no letter accompanying the report, but simply the caption which the Chair has stated.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, in compliance with a resolution of January 17, 1887, a statement showing the value of miscellaneous supplies furnished the several bureaus of that Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, charged to the contingent appropriation for the Department for that year; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2981) to abrogate the powers of the executive officers of the United States in allowing indemnity locations or scrip for confirmed, unsatisfied private land claims, under section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 2, 1858 (United States Statutes at Large, volume 11, pages 294 and 295, chapter 81), and to vest that power in the courts of the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented resolutions adopted by the American Berkshire Association favoring the passage of the agricultural experiment-station bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLUMB. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas in regard to a matter of very great importance, to wit, the method of disposing of lands for sale under the judgments rendered by the Federal courts. I ask that it may be read at length and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and I desire to especially call the attention of that committee to it in connection with the bill which has recently passed the other House on the general subject of the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary, which is now pending before that committee.

The memorial was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

[House concurrent resolution No. 10. By Mr. Bond.]

Whereas under the existing system and laws of civil procedure in the Federal courts of the United States the real estate of judgment debtors is allowed to be advertised for sale and sold at places remote from the county wherein situated; and

Whereas by the means of such system and laws a judgment debtor is often rendered powerless to save his home or lands from being bought in by judgment creditors or speculators, at prices that are ruinous to the debtor, by reason of the fact that those acquainted with such home or lands, and who know their true value and might be disposed to buy the same, have no knowledge of an advertisement for sale of such home or lands, and for the further reason that the distance to the place of sale prevents their presence at such sale, even when such proposed sale is known to them; and

Whereas thousands of such judgment debtors are too poor to defend suits in the Federal courts, and, much more, to procure the attendance of bidders able to protect their interests at such a sale so made, remote from the location of the home or lands, and are thus made liable to be seriously impoverished and injured, when by just procedure and rightful privileges much of the value of their homes and lands might be saved to them in money: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein),

First. That the statutes of the United States should be so amended as to require that all lands to be sold under process from a Federal court be advertised

for sale in the county where such land is situated, and that the sale thereof shall take place at the door of the court-house in such county in pursuance of such advertisement of a sale.

Second. That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, instructed that it is the wish of the people of Kansas that they severally use their utmost endeavors to so cause the statutes of the United States to be amended as to carry out the objects herein stated.

Third. That a printed copy hereof be at once sent by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas.

STATE OF KANSAS, Office of Secretary of State:

I, E. B. ALLEN, secretary of state of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the house concurrent resolution now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal.

Done at Topeka, Kans., this 21st day of January, A. D. 1887.

[SEAL.]

E. B. ALLEN, Secretary of State.

Mr. PLUMB. I present a petition signed by the executive committee of the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars of the State of Kansas, on behalf of a membership of three thousand, petitioning for the favorable consideration and early passage of the bill (S. 1579) granting to the people of the District of Columbia the right to determine by ballot whether intoxicating liquors may hereafter be legally manufactured and sold in said District or not.

I desire to say in regard to the petition that I am in favor of conferring upon the persons of proper age in the District of Columbia the right of suffrage for municipal purposes, and of making the city of Washington the best possible illustration of the republican idea of self-government. I believe it would conduce to the comfort of Congress, to the welfare of the people of the District, and, as I think, to the glory of republican institutions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. EDMUNDS presented the petition of David S. Moody, a citizen of the State of Vermont, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MAHONE presented the petition of John F. Lewis, of Lynnwood, Va.; which was read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

LYNNWOOD, VA., January 19, 1887.

To the Senate of the United States:

I respectfully ask that my salary be paid from the commencement of my term to the time that it was paid, and your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

JOHN F. LEWIS.

Mr. COKE. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas. I ask that it be read, referring as it does to a bill pending in this body.

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, as follows:

House concurrent resolution relating to the right of way through the Indian Territory for the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company.

Whereas the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company is now constructing a railway across the State of Kansas to Caldwell, near the south line of said State, which point will be reached about June 1, 1887, and proposes to extend said line of railway across the Indian Territory, into the State of Texas, and across said State in several directions, and desire to push the construction of said lines as rapidly as possible; and

Whereas said company now have a bill pending in the United States Congress granting right of way across said Indian Territory, which said company desires to have amended so as to authorize the branching of said line in said Indian Territory so as to reach the State of Texas by the different routes desired; and

Whereas said company intends to begin the construction across said Indian Territory about April 1, 1887: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Representatives in Congress be requested and our Senators instructed to use all honorable means to secure the passage of the bill granting said Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company the right of way across said Indian Territory by this the Forty-ninth Congress, and at as early a day as possible.

Be it further resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit to each of our Senators and Representatives a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution.

HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Austin, Tex., January 18, 1887.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing concurrent resolution originated in the house and passed the same January 17, 1887; and, further, that the same was returned from the senate, as passed, January 18, 1887.

WILL LAMBERT,

Chief clerk house of representatives.

Mr. DAWES presented the petition of George W. Stearns and others, citizens of Hadley, Mass., praying for the enactment of an international arbitration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MILLER presented resolutions adopted by Maxson Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Alfred Center, N. Y., urging the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker bill for the suppression of polygamy; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH presented the petition of the Rumford Chemical Works, of Providence, R. I.; the petition of Clarence J. Luce and other citizens of Providence, R. I.; and the petition of W. B. Blanding and other wholesale druggists of Providence, R. I., praying for the repeal of the internal-revenue taxes; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in favor of the interstate-commerce bill, and in-

structing the Senators and requesting the Representatives from that State to vote for the passage of the bill.

I also present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota of the same general character, although somewhat different in form, and a telegraphic communication from the secretary of state of Minnesota, advising the Senators of the passage of these resolutions in accordance with one of the resolves embraced in the joint resolution presented.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The resolutions will be printed in the *RECORD* and ordered to lie on the table.

The resolutions are as follows:

A joint resolution urging upon Congress the passage of the pending bill for the regulation of interstate commerce.

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill to establish a system of national regulation and supervision of the interstate commerce of the country, and for the control of railroad corporations doing business in two or more States on continuous lines: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

That we respectfully urge upon Congress the passage of said bill, and we instruct our Senators and request our Representatives to vote for the same.

The people of Minnesota can not understand why there should not be the same competition between railway corporations as exists between all other forms of business enterprise. The people, having created the railroads by grants of corporate privileges and largesses of lands or money, are entitled to all the benefits justly derivable from the same. And all combinations, by pooling of business or earnings to prevent competition, simply mean high rates of profit to the holders of railroad stock at the expense of low rates of earnings to the people. It is the duty of Congress to so act as to insure the general prosperity of the many, for therein will be found the best guarantee for the success of the few. The prosperity of the people is a national necessity; the continued existence of railway companies, based largely on fictitious and fraudulent capital, is not. Even should some of these companies be driven to the wall under the pressure of unlimited competition, the railroads themselves will still remain, and they would, in all probability earn a reasonable interest on the money actually invested in their construction. But if they did not, they would have no more to complain of than thousands of manufacturing, commercial, agricultural, and mining enterprises which have utterly failed under the fierce ordeal of competition. Railroad companies have no more right to ask that the Government shall make them profitable at the expense of the people than the owner of a mill, a shop, a farm, or a mine would have to make the same demand. Unrestricted competition is the great force to which all men and interests in the world have to submit, and we see no reason why the common carriers of this country should, by the action or non-action of Government, be permitted to make themselves an exception to the universal law.

The people of Minnesota do not ask that on long lines of railway the rate of charge for transportation of property shall be the same per mile for every mile hauled; but we do ask that the aggregate charge for a short distance shall not be greater than the aggregate charge for a longer distance in the same direction. In other words, while we do not demand that the charge for 10 miles shall be one-tenth of the charge for 100 miles, we do object to making the charge for 10 miles greater than the charge for 100 miles. Neither do we ask that Congress, or the commission to be appointed under the act of Congress, shall fix minimum rates below which charges shall not fall, but maximum rates above which they shall not rise. We respectfully urge that nothing shall be done by Congress that will lessen or limit the commercial facilities of the intercontinental portions of the nation. It is their right to reach the seacoast and the external world by the cheapest and best instrumentalities that civilization can give them.

Resolved, That the secretary of state telegraph the substance of these resolutions to our Senators, and forward a copy of the resolutions themselves to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress; "and that our Senators and Representatives in Congress be further specially urged and instructed to favor an amendment to said bill, as in their judgment, to endeavor to procure an enactment: *Provided, further*, That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act to charge or receive any greater compensation per ton per mile for the transportation of like kind or class of property under substantially similar circumstances and conditions for a longer than a shorter distance over the same line in the same general direction, or from the same original point of departure, or to the same point of arrival, but this shall not be construed as authorizing any common carrier within the terms of this act to charge and receive as great a rate of compensation per ton per mile for the longer as for the shorter distance."

WILLIAM R. MERRIAM,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
A. E. RICE,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 18, A. D. 1887.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, Department of State:

I hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing with the original now on file in this department, and that it is a true and correct copy thereof, and of the whole of the same.

Witness my hand and the great seal of the State this 20th day of January, A. D. 1887.

[SEAL.]

H. MATTSON, Secretary of state.

Joint resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to give their support to a pending bill to regulate interstate commerce and to prevent unjust discrimination by common carriers.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Whereas section 4 of Article X of the constitution of the State of Minnesota provides that all corporations being common carriers, enjoying the right of way in pursuance of the provisions of this section, shall be bound to carry the mineral, agricultural, and other productions of manufactures on equal and reasonable terms; and

Whereas many of the railroad corporations, chartered and endowed with munificent grants and valuable franchises, rights, and privileges by this State, have, by their extension through growth and consolidation, become interstate common carriers, and as such claim freedom from State jurisdiction and regulation; and

Whereas all attempts at State regulation designed to protect the people of the State from such common misuse of railroad corporate power as rebates, pooling, and unequal and unreasonable traffic charges have heretofore proved insufficient by reason of the position of these corporations as being mediums of interstate commerce, as claimed by them; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate branch of the Congress of the United States a bill for regulation of interstate commerce, the application of the principles of which to the regulation of the common carriers of this State would

be of great advantage to the agricultural, manufacturing, and mercantile interests of our State; and

Whereas said pending bill does not, but should, in our judgment, include a provision making it unlawful for any common carrier carrying freight from one State into another to charge a higher rate per ton per mile for a longer than for a shorter continuous haul; and

Whereas this conceded correct principle of traffic is constantly violated by the common carriers of this State and of the country, and its violation made a means to enforce unjust discrimination against and in favor of cities and towns of the State and country: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to give their active and earnest support to the pending interstate-commerce bill, and to introduce and support an amendment thereto as above indicated.

Resolved, That a copy of the above preamble and resolutions be sent by the governor of the State to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to our State agent.

A. E. RICE,

President of the senate.

WILLIAM R. MERRIAM,

Speaker of the house of representatives.

Approved January 18, 1887.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, Department of state:

I hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing with the original now on file in this department, and that it is a true and correct copy thereof, and of the whole of the same.

Witness my hand and the great seal of the State this 21st day of January, A. D. 1887.

[SEAL.]

H. MATTSON, Secretary of state.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of William W. Marmon and 6 other druggists of Bloomington, Ill., praying for a reduction of internal-revenue taxes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Orrin R. McDaniel, of Shumway, Ill., praying that he be granted an honorable discharge from the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

Joint resolution adopted by the thirty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Whereas the existence of contagious pleuro-pneumonia among cattle in the United States is the result of negligence upon the part of the Federal Government in failing to enact and enforce proper quarantine measures on the seaboard; and

Whereas the various States and Territories of the Union have, for their own protection, been compelled to resort to embarrassing quarantine regulations, thereby seriously obstructing interstate commerce; and

Whereas this disease has, during the past two years, made rapid progress in spite of the utmost endeavor of State authorities: Therefore,

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein), That we do hereby urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of the bill now pending in the United States Senate for the suppression of exotic contagious diseases among cattle, to the end that one of our greatest business industries may be relieved from an impending calamity, that the meat supply of the nation may be saved from losses which would directly affect every consumer of meat, and that the foreign stigma now attached to one of our principal articles of export may be removed.

Resolved, That the vigorous measures proposed in the Miller bill should be made to apply only to diseases of foreign origin, and not to common diseases to which the cattle of the United States are subject, and which are only equivalent to the ordinary dangers to which other branches of business are subjected.

Adopted by the senate January 12, 1887.

J. C. SMITH, President.

L. F. WATSON, Secretary.

Concurred in by the house of representatives January 13, 1887.

W. F. CALHOUN, Speaker.

JOHN A. REEVE, Clerk.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, Office of Secretary, ss:

I, Henry D. Dement, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the thirty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and now on file in this office.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand and affix the great seal of State, at the city of Springfield, this — day of —, 188—.

[SEAL.]

HENRY D. DEMENT,

Secretary of State.

Mr. INGALLS. I present resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of the citizens of the District of Columbia in favor of the construction of a bridge at the eastern terminus of Pennsylvania avenue across the East Branch. The bill having been reported favorably by the committee, I move that the resolutions lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. INGALLS presented resolutions adopted by Leavenworth Post, No. 120, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic; George Ellis Post, No. 171, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic; Hackleman Post, No. 258, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic; Lookout Post, No. 96, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic; E. C. Johnson Post, No. 336, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic; and James Montgomery Post, No. 154, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, all favoring action upon the anti-polygamy bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL, of Pennsylvania, presented a petition of wholesale druggists of Pittsburgh and Allegheny cities, Pa., and a petition of citizens of Caln Township, Chester County, Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the internal-revenue taxes; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of citizens of Portland, Me., praying that internal taxation be reduced as rapidly as the condition of the Treasury will allow; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GIBSON. I present a memorial of the officers and members of the Louisiana State Ministerial Association, composed of colored people, in favor of the amelioration of the condition of the people religiously, socially, and educationally, and especially in favor of the Blair bill aiding the States in the establishment of public schools. I move that the memorial lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON. I also present a memorial adopted at a meeting of steamboatmen held in the city of New Orleans on November 11, 1886, in favor of the more rapid improvement of the Red, Ouachita, and Atchafalaya Rivers and the Bayou Teche. It is signed by R. Sinnott, chairman, A. P. Trousdale, T. C. Sweeney, W. H. Belt, and J. W. Bryant, who constitute the committee on resolutions. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I submit a report from the conference committee on the army appropriation bill, and ask that it may be disposed of at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10242) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18, and 30.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert before the words proposed to be inserted by said amendment the words "not exceeding;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert before the word proposed to be inserted by said amendment the words "not exceeding;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,661,918.69;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,600;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out from said amendment the word "ordnance" where it first occurs, and strike out the sum named in the last line of the amended paragraph and insert in lieu thereof "\$80,000," and the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. ALLISON,

P. B. PLUMB,

A. P. GORMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD S. BRAGG,

EGBERT L. VIELE,

GEO. W. STEELE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like the Senator to explain the leading topics of this report, as it is impossible, of course, by the mere numbers of the amendments to understand the decision of the conferees.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Vermont that many of these amendments are formal; indeed I may say all of them with the exception, perhaps, of amendment number 26, which is an amendment of some importance relating to the administration of the Army. The Senate struck out that proviso in the bill, and the House conferees have agreed that it shall be stricken out.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Will the Senator just state what the proviso was in the bill? I have it not before me.

Mr. ALLISON. The proviso required that no expenditure should be made for removing troops until the authority of the Quartermaster-General was first procured. That is substantially the proviso. The Senate struck that out, and the House conferees agree to the Senate amendment. It was as we construed it, substantially placing the control of the Army under the Quartermaster-General instead of the General-in-Chief.

The Senate recede from amendments numbered 17 and 18, number 17 being an amendment providing the General of the Army with a clerk. It was insisted upon by the House conferees that this should be provided for in the legislative appropriation bill where the civil force of the Army is provided for, and it was thought that some clerk should be detailed, rather than provided for in this bill, which is a bill for the support of the Army.

The Senate also inserted an amendment providing additional pay to the officer commanding the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, \$1,000, which the House conferees refused to agree to and the Senate conferees recede.

The other amendments are amendments changing amounts and generally reducing amounts.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the total amount of the appropriation now?

Mr. ALLISON. The total amount of the appropriation as provided

for in the bill, if the report of the committee of conference is agreed to, is \$23,724,718.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How much was it last year?

Mr. ALLISON. It was last year \$28,338.52 more. This is a reduction from the bill of last year of \$28,338.52 and is less than the estimates, \$1,799,000, in round numbers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How is that reduction made—in general?

Mr. ALLISON. The most of this reduction of twenty-eight thousand and odd dollars is in a single item, which is an item relating to the incidental expenses of the Ordnance Department. Of course there are some miscellaneous changes, increases and reductions, but as a rule the appropriations for the maintenance of the Army are substantially as made last year for quartermaster and commissary supplies, and the pay of the Army.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The principal reduction is in incidental expenses of the Ordnance Department?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Which means experimental work on guns, I suppose?

Mr. ALLISON. No; it does not curtail the amount necessary to be expended for that purpose. It relates chiefly to the appropriation which has hitherto been used largely for clerical force.

Mr. EDMUNDS. All right.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know any more favorable opportunity to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what has become of the fortification appropriation bill of last season, providing for the wants of the current fiscal year. It was reported some months ago as having gone into conference; indeed, I am credibly informed it did so go. But the year is fast passing. If anything is to be done with that bill we should be glad to know it, I am sure; and if there is not to be anything reported or done, it is time that we should be pressing for some action in the direction of coastwise defenses.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut that at the close of the last session, as he will remember, the Senate amended the fortification appropriation bill and returned it to the other House and a conference was ordered upon it. The conferees were unable to agree. I believe my honorable friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] is chairman of the conference committee. I understand that they have made special efforts at this session to come to an agreement and finally made some effort to secure a meeting, which I believe has failed from time to time. The Senator from Massachusetts can explain that more in detail, and I hope he will.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So do I.

Mr. DAWES. The committee of conference held two or three meetings during the first session of this Congress and were unable to agree. They made report to their respective Houses, and their reports were accepted and a new committee appointed, which held meetings with the same result and made the same report. A new committee was appointed at the close of the last session. Immediately upon the assembling of this session the committee were called together and have had several meetings without being able as yet to agree.

Whether it is proper to state what difficulties are found to exist in the committee of conference I am not certain. I have no objection to stating what the difficulties are, if it is a proper matter for disclosure here. There is some prospect that in some shape there may be an early agreement.

The conferences have been interrupted by the absence of two of the members of the committee of conference on the part of the House, one of them having been called home to Alabama by telegraph on account of sickness in his family. As soon as the conferees can be got together again it is the intention of the committee to make further effort, with what result no one can tell.

The difficulties seem to be radical. The difference in the conference committee is between doing substantially nothing and appropriating \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 to begin the work of coast defenses. No one can need in this body to have his attention called to the necessity and importance of beginning that work. There seems to be a lack of confidence on the part of some of the members of the committee in those who would execute the law under existing administration.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator is not referring to the Senate members of the conference, I suppose?

Mr. DAWES. I am not referring to any member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate. I think if the committee of conference could be induced to establish a new bureau for the purpose of executing the law a good deal of the difficulty could be got over. Whether they will be able to agree to that and report to their two Houses for sanction I am not quite able to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon the adoption of the report of the committee of conference, submitted by the Senator from Iowa.

The report was concurred in.

LANDS IN SEVERALTY TO INDIANS.

Mr. DAWES submitted the following report, which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 54) to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the pro-

section of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the said amendment of the House, and insert in lieu thereof the following, namely:

"That in all cases where any tribe or band of Indians has been, or shall hereafter be, located upon any reservation created for their use, either by treaty stipulation or by virtue of an act of Congress or executive order setting apart the same for their use, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized, whenever in his opinion any reservation or any part thereof of such Indians is advantageous for agricultural and grazing purposes, to cause said reservation, or any part thereof, to be surveyed, or resurveyed if necessary, and to allot the lands in said reservation in severalty to any Indian located thereon, in quantities as follows:

"To each head of a family, one-quarter of a section;
 "To each single person over eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section;
 "To each orphan child under eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section;
 and

"To each other single person under eighteen years now living, or who may be born prior to the date of the order of the President directing an allotment of the lands embraced in any reservation, one-sixteenth of a section: *Provided*, That in case there is not sufficient land in any of said reservations to allot lands to each individual of the classes above named in quantities as above provided, the lands embraced in such reservation or reservations shall be allotted to each individual of each of said classes pro rata in accordance with the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That where the treaty or act of Congress setting apart such reservation provides for the allotment of lands in severalty in quantities in excess of those herein provided, the President, in making allotments upon such reservation, shall allot the lands to each individual Indian belonging thereon in quantity as specified in such treaty or act: *And provided further*, That when the lands allotted are only valuable for grazing purposes, an additional allotment of such grazing lands, in quantities as above provided, shall be made to each individual."

And that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Strike out the word "two" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "four;" and that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Insert after the word "may" and before the word "in" in said amendment, the words "in any case;" and that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Add to said amendment the following words:

"*And provided further*, That no patents shall issue therefor except to the person so taking the same as and for a homestead, or his heirs, and after the expiration of five years' occupancy thereof as such homestead; and any conveyance of said lands so taken as a homestead, or any contract touching the same, or lien thereon, created prior to the date of such patent, shall be null and void."

And that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Insert in place of the words to be stricken out by said amendment, the following words:

"And the sums agreed to be paid by the United States as purchase-money for any portion of any such reservation shall be held in the Treasury of the United States for the sole use of the tribe or tribes of Indians to whom such reservations belonged, and the same, with interest thereon at 3 per cent. per annum, shall be at all times subject to appropriation by Congress for the education and civilization of such tribe or tribes of Indians or the members thereof."

And that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Strike out the words proposed to be inserted by said amendment, and insert instead thereof the following:

"SEC. 11. That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from their present reservations in Southwestern Colorado to a new reservation by and with the consent of a majority of the adult male members of said tribe."

And that the House agree to the same.

H. L. DAWES,
 THOS. M. BOWEN,
 J. K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. SKINNER,
 S. W. PEEL,
 B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report.

Mr. DOLPH. I have not been able to follow the conference report so as to ascertain what changes have been made in the bill. It is a very important bill, affecting the future relations of the Government to the Indians and the future welfare of the Indians. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee of conference a question or two so as to know if I am correct. Do I understand that the changes made by the House amendments and the conference committee permit a lien or disposition of lands that shall be allotted to Indians in severalty after the lapse of a less period than that provided in the bill as passed by the Senate—twenty-five years? Also, do I understand that the provision inserted in the bill in the Senate—

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator put his first interrogatory again?

Mr. DOLPH. My question is whether such changes have been made in the bill that instead of the bill as it passed the Senate providing that the land which shall be allotted to Indians in severalty can only be disposed of or be subject to liens after a period of twenty-five years, it now allows that to be done after five years?

Mr. DAWES. No; that has not been changed, except in this way, that the President may, in his discretion in any particular case, extend the time after the twenty-five years. The time limiting the power of alienation is not reduced at all, but has this further extension in the discretion of the President as to any particular case.

Mr. DOLPH. According to the conference report, when are patents to issue to the individual Indians?

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator will get the bill he will see. As soon as the individual Indian takes up his allotment he is to have a patent which shall be of the legal effect that the United States holds in trust this particular tract of land for the sole use and benefit of the particular Indian for the period of twenty-five years, at the end of which time the United States is to give him a patent in fee of the land; and then to that is added a provision that in any particular case the President may extend that twenty-five years' limit so that the United States shall in that particular case hold the land in trust for the Indian a further time.

Mr. DOLPH. I am familiar with the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate, but the first amendment read at the desk seemed to be a long one, providing for the allotment of the lands and also a new provision in regard to the issuance of patents. Of course I have had no opportunity to examine the report.

Mr. DAWES. The other House rewrote the clause which that amendment superseded, and it was thought in confidence that it was not improved by their rewriting; and so they have receded from their phraseology and have agreed to restore the original text of that section almost entirely. It was necessary, however, in putting it into the report to put in the new form in which it was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to ask the Senator another question. When the bill was under discussion I proposed an amendment to the effect that the proceeds of the lands which should be sold should be placed in the Treasury of the United States at interest, that the interest might be used at any time for educational or other purposes for the benefit of the Indians, but that the principal should not be subject to be diminished until the expiration of twenty-five years. That was recommended to me by General Sheridan and by others who are familiar with the Indian question. The argument was that by the bill we proposed to break up the reservations and take the means which the Government now has for taking care of these Indians and dispose of them, distribute the lands, sell the surplus, place the money in the Treasury, and that the principal of the proceeds of the lands sold was to be used in the mean time before the expiration of the twenty-five years for the benefit of the Indians, and at the end of the twenty-five years, if the policy now being pursued by the Government is changed, instead of the Indians being self-sustaining and self-supporting we should have a large number of paupers on our hands without anything but the money in the Treasury derived from taxation to support them. I understand, if I have correctly heard the reading of the conference report, that has been changed and that provision has been abandoned and the principal as well as interest may be appropriated at any time.

Mr. DAWES. I will state to the Senator that the bill as it passed the Senate in this regard was in these words:

And the principal of all sums agreed to be paid by the United States as the purchase-price of any portion of any such reservation shall be payable only to the Indians or Indian tribe from whom such purchase was made by express authority of Congress, after the expiration of twenty-five years from the purchase of said lands; but the same shall, in the meantime, be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe or tribes of Indians entitled thereto; and in the meantime, and until such principal sum shall be paid over to or expended for the benefit of said Indians, the United States shall pay interest annually upon said principal sums at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, which interest shall be paid to the Secretary of the Interior for the use and benefit of such Indian tribes, and shall be used for the purpose of educating and preparing them for self-support, and applied to their support and maintenance, as may be necessary.

That was deemed by the Senate a very wise provision. It was stricken out entirely by the other House without any substitute for it, leaving the purchase-money for any portion of the reservation of any tribe to be disposed of just as the United States might choose to dispose of it, unless the Indians who made the agreement with the United States to sell were provident enough to make a condition of sale such as would secure it to them. The conferees on the part of the House insisted that the proceeds of the Indian lands were the common property of the United States, and should be put in the Treasury of the United States, to be appropriated for the benefit of Indians generally. They adhered very strongly to the House amendment to strike out this provision, insisting upon it that the Indians could take care of themselves in making any agreement with the United States to sell, and that it was competent for them to say, we will sell, provided the proceeds of the sale shall be devoted to our use after twenty-five years, or after ten, or after any number of years. It was deemed by the Senate conferees a very dangerous thing to leave it to the discretion of the Indians themselves. They said that if the Indians were as keen as a Yankee they would be likely to make a provident contract; but not yet have they quite arrived at that advanced stage of civilization.

After long conference the conferees agreed to substitute for nothing on the part of the other House and for this provision on the part of the Senate, a stipulation which the Secretary will read. Let the Secretary read the substitute for the amendment that "the principal of all sums agreed to be paid," &c.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows, namely: Insert in place of the words to be stricken out by said amendment the following words:

"And the sums agreed to be paid by the United States as purchase-money for

any portion of any such reservation shall be held in the Treasury of the United States for the sole use of the tribe or tribes of Indians to whom such reservations belonged, and the same, with interest thereon at 3 per cent. per annum, shall be at all times subject to appropriation by Congress for the education and civilization of such tribe or tribes of Indians or the members thereof."

And that the House agree to the same.

Mr. DAWES. The difference, the Senator will see, between that and the text as it went from the Senate is this: "It enables the United States, in cases where they think the exigencies of the Indians require it, to make an appropriation from time to time to these funds for the very purposes that the Senator sought to secure by his amendment." It also provides that instead of its being at 5 per cent. interest while it remains in the Treasury it shall be at 3.

The conferees on the part of the House were unwilling to put it beyond the control of Congress in all cases for twenty-five years. They thought and I think there are cases, and we have had an experience in dealing with Indians where there are cases, where it is wise to take a portion of the principal for present exigencies or future exigencies of the Indians, and it is better than it is to wait twenty-five years. The objection to it is that it will be an improvident appropriation from time to time, that it will be frittered away, that the Indian or some person in the interest of the Indian will be coming here to get portions of it taken until it gets away. That is the danger of it, but it was impossible to get the conferees on the part of the House to agree to tie it up absolutely for twenty-five years.

The other change is the difference between 5 per cent. and 3 per cent. interest. Five per cent. is the uniform rate of interest paid for Indian funds, and the answer to that on the part of the House was that that rate was established at a time when all interest was at that high rate; all interest now is at 3 per cent. and less, and they insisted upon those two amendments, and the Senate yielded.

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded I desire to say a word.

I understand now the effect of the modified amendment of the House in regard to the disposition of the proceeds of the sale of the surplus lands of the reservation. I do not think the Senator is right in saying that the main object to be secured by the Senate amendment was to prevent an improvident disposition of the proceeds of these lands. The provision in the Senate bill for the retention of the principal of the proceeds of these lands in the Treasury for twenty-five years was prepared by myself, and after discussion and consultation with the committee I understood the committee to favor the proposition. I do not understand that the committee now have concluded that the provision was not a wise one.

There are some two hundred and fifty thousand Indians in the United States who are the wards of the Government. We control their persons, to a certain extent, and their property. We make large annual appropriations out of the Treasury for their maintenance and their support. What I fear is that if the reservations are allotted to Indians in severalty and made alienable after twenty-five years and the residue of the reservations sold and the money placed in the Treasury and from time to time appropriated for the benefit of the Indians, we shall have this state of facts within a very few years after the expiration of the twenty-five years when the lands allotted to them are alienable: As soon as they come in control of these lands they will pass out of their control, be sold, the proceeds squandered, and the proceeds of the sale of their lands will have been exhausted by Congressional appropriations for their benefit in the mean time, and they will not have been prepared by the policy of the Government to be self-supporting; and the result will be that we shall have a quarter of a million paupers, or more, on the hands of the Government, to be supported by annual appropriations from the Treasury.

Therefore, in order that there may be economy in the money which we appropriate for their use during this period of twenty-five years, economy in the disposition of the moneys which belong to them, the proceeds of the sales of their reservations, in order that they may not be paupers at the end of these twenty-five years, I desire to retain the principal of the proceeds of the sale of their lands for their use at the expiration of that time; and I think it is a very dangerous policy even to announce that the money shall be expended, that appropriation shall be made.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator goes upon the ground that there will not be any future Congress nearly as wise as this. That may perhaps be the case, though I shall not speak with any great confidence of it. We have got to trust future Congresses in a great many things, and while I agree with the Senator that I would like to put this beyond the reach of future Congresses, I would not give up this whole bill for that.

I want to say further that there were a great many suggestions of improvement of this bill which reached the committee of conference. After both Houses had passed upon the bill some very valuable suggestions came from the executive department and others from other quarters, but it was impossible for the committee of conference to embrace any new matter in their report not passed upon by either House. I make this statement so that those who are interested in these suggestions of improvement will know why they do not appear in this bill. It was not because the suggestions were not wise in themselves, but because they came too late to be incorporated in the bill.

Why the bill has this difference in it from the bill as it passed the Senate I have sufficiently explained. To my mind it is not a very great objection to this bill that we trust future Congresses to say when they will make appropriations from the principal of this fund. I believe that it had better be kept in most cases entire on interest, but there are cases to-day and there will arise every year cases where it will be the wisest thing in the world to take some portion of the principal for pressing exigencies.

Mr. DOLPH. Why not make appropriations from the general fund in the Treasury as we do now in such cases?

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator will go upon the Committee on Appropriations and get a little experience in that matter, he will see why anybody who has been on that committee does not like to trust to that source.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not think the suggestion that I suppose future Congresses will not be as wise as the present one was called forth by any remark I made. We are now passing a law that is in the nature of an agreement and contract with these Indians, and certainly it is prudent to put it in the best shape in which it can be placed. That was the cause of my remark, not that I supposed there was to be no wisdom or disposition to economy in any future Congress.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the report of the committee of conference.

The report was concurred in.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1740) for the relief of William K. Hammond, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

- A bill (H. R. 8258) granting a pension to Waitie F. Harris;
- A bill (H. R. 5398) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret Cashin;
- A bill (H. R. 7983) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Schier;
- A bill (H. R. 9025) for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Sprain, widow, and two minor children of Louis F. Sprain;
- A bill (H. R. 9169) to place on the pension-roll the name of Charles T. Wornom;
- A bill (H. R. 9250) for the relief of William B. Barnes;
- A bill (H. R. 7911) granting a pension to Daniel Schultheis;
- A bill (H. R. 8227) granting a pension to Seth Weldy;
- A bill (H. R. 9004) for the relief of Caroline P. Bolton;
- A bill (H. R. 3167) to restore the name of Lifurs Roberson to the pension-roll;

- A bill (H. R. 8949) granting a pension to Luke Horobin;
- A bill (H. R. 7547) granting a pension to Livingston Clark;
- A bill (H. R. 6069) granting a pension to Owen P. Wilson;
- A bill (H. R. 7699) granting a pension to E. A. McFadden;
- A bill (H. R. 9443) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. King;
- A bill (H. R. 9444) granting a pension to Frederick Richmond;
- A bill (H. R. 7689) granting a pension to Caroline C. McNair;
- A bill (S. 2421) granting a pension to Mrs. Maria C. McPherson; and
- A bill (S. 2834) granting a pension to Mrs. Hettie K. Painter.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1649) for the relief of William M. Bryant, of Washington city, D. C., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

- A bill (H. R. 7352) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Randles;
- A bill (H. R. 10152) granting a pension to Ellen M. Sturtevant;
- A bill (H. R. 5506) granting a pension to Emily Louisa Spicer;
- A bill (H. R. 8424) granting a pension to James H. Young;
- A bill (H. R. 8002) to increase the pension to Loren Burritt;
- A bill (H. R. 9426) granting a pension to Betsey Cooney; and
- A bill (H. R. 8632) for the relief of Emily Luther.

Mr. MITCHELL, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

- A bill (H. R. 9130) granting a pension to Sarah O'Brien; and
- A bill (H. R. 6026) granting a pension to John Selby.

ALLEGED OUTRAGE IN TEXAS.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the memorial of Stephen A. Hackworth, James L. Moore, and Carl Schutze, citizens of the State of Texas and of the United States, residents of Washington County, Texas, showing that they have been denied their rights as such citizens by the citizens and the constituted authorities of said county, and appealing for redress to the Government of the United States, to report two resolutions, the second of which I desire to have referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

Whereas Stephen A. Hackworth, a native citizen of the United States and of the State of Texas; James L. Moore, a native of Alabama, and now for twenty years a citizen of Texas; and Carl Schutze, a native of Germany, for thirty years a resident of the United States, and now a naturalized citizen thereof, have presented their petition to the Senate, wherein they allege that they have been driven from their homes in Washington County, Texas, and compelled to abandon their property at a great sacrifice, and that armed and lawless bands of ruffians have taken possession of and destroyed the ballot-boxes in said county at a late election therein for county officers and members of Congress, and have murdered three citizens of said county, and overthrown republican government therein, and committed other outrages and crimes, all of which have been done in order that the majority of the voters therein may be deprived of their lawful and constitutional right of suffrage, and that the minority may unlawfully usurp and exercise control in said county, and that the constituted authorities of said county and State refuse all remedy for said outrages and crimes;

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire into all the circumstances of, and connected with, the said alleged events, and that it report as soon as may be; and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers, to employ a stenographer, and to act by any subcommittee, and that any such subcommittee shall, for the purposes of such investigation, be a committee of the Senate to all intents and purposes.

Resolved, That the necessary expenses of said committee in said investigation be paid out of the appropriation for the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman thereof.

Mr. COKE. I ask that the resolutions lie over.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to say that the resolutions are reported by the committee of which I am a member without my consent. I recorded my vote against them in the committee, and I shall record my vote against them in the Senate.

Mr. EUSTIS. I desire to make the same statement as a member of the committee.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the resolutions and the memorial on which they are based be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The memorial and resolutions will be printed under the general rule, and will be placed on the Calendar under objection.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose the Senator from Texas has no objection to having the second resolution referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses under the rule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The rule requires the reference, but no action can be taken if a single objection is made.

Mr. HARRIS. The memorial can not be printed under the general rule for printing unless the Senate orders it. The resolution can be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is only the report that will be printed necessarily, but if there be no objection the order to print the memorial and report will be entered.

Mr. HOAR. And the second resolution referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that will be done.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. MAHONEY. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10051) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, S. C., have directed me to report it without amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator if he will not have that bill put on its passage at once. I ask the indulgence of the Senate for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill at the present time. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. I gave notice yesterday morning that I would object to calling up bills out of their order, because I think we ought to devote the morning hour to the regular call of the Calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. BUTLER. It will not require three minutes to read and dispose of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. That may be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House insisted on its amendments to the bill (S. 542) for the relief of William Ervin, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KLEINER, and Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested elections, and a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOYLE, and Mr. PAYNE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8869) granting a pension to Mrs. Henrietta Drum Hunt, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the said bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ELDRIDGE, and Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (S. 229) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wilmington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1532) to regulate commerce;

A bill (S. 1813) to amend the law relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyright;

A bill (S. 2220) granting a pension to James G. Mathes;

A bill (S. 2335) for the relief of the heirs of Malitty Rose;

A bill (S. 2369) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Price;

A bill (S. 2721) to remove the political disabilities of John K. Mitchell; and

A bill (S. 2848) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall, of the State of Virginia.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BECK introduced a bill (S. 3207) to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, introduced a bill (S. 3208) for the relief of Henry M. Rector; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VANCE introduced a bill (S. 3209) for the relief of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 3210) granting a pension to Ellen Smith;

A bill (S. 3211) granting a pension to Asa Wilson;

A bill (S. 3212) granting a pension to William M. Houghton; and

A bill (S. 3213) granting a pension to Elvira A. Pierce.

Mr. MAHONEY introduced a bill (S. 3214) to provide for paying certain advances made to the United States by the States of Maryland and Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. INGALLS introduced a bill (S. 3215) to amend chapter 35 of the Acts of Congress, approved February 8, 1881, entitled "An act to provide for the furnishing of certain public documents to soldiers' homes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. INGALLS. I also introduce a bill (S. 3216) to provide for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States.

This bill was prepared at the Department of Justice and transmitted to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], who is temporarily absent from the Chamber and at whose request I introduce the bill, saying for him that, while not vouching for its provisions, he has no doubt that the subject is one which requires early attention by the committee. It is accompanied by certain papers that I ask may be referred to the committee with the bill.

The bill was read twice by its title, and referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANDERSON. At the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON] I introduce a bill.

The bill (S. 3217), granting a pension to Hannah Phillips, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 3218) granting an increase of pension to Maria Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5190) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture and to create an executive department to be known as the department of agriculture and labor; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3026) granting to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3041) granting the Spokane and Palouse Railway Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHONE. Mr. President, after eighty years had gone by the Congress of the United States passed a law empowering and instructing the Court of Claims to ascertain the liability, if any, of the Government to the citizens of the United States on account of French spoliation, and, if any, to whom and for what amount. That court has determined these questions in respect of four claimants and reported to Congress, as required by the terms of the law, their findings; and to cover the awards made by the court in these cases, I propose an amendment to the sundry civil bill, and ask its reference to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

COMPILATION OF VETO MESSAGES.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the compilation of the veto messages of the Presidents of the United States, made in obedience to a resolution passed by the Senate on the 24th of July, 1886, be printed, and that 3,000 additional copies be printed, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

PAYMENT OF SENATORS' SALARIES.

Mr. MAHONE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved. That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to report to the Senate from what time, according to custom and precedent, the salary of Senators is reckoned and paid.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I find the following on page 952:

Mr. GRAY (when Mr. RANSOM's name was called). The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM] asked me to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS]. If the Senator from North Carolina were present he would vote "yea."

That statement is entirely correct, but it leaves the inference that if I had been present I should have voted "nay." If I had been present, I should have voted for the passage of the bill.

FLORIDA LAND FORFEITURE.

Mr. CALL. If the morning business is through, I ask the Senate to take up the resolution which I have urged before the Senate; and I ask for a vote upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Are there further "concurrent or other resolutions?" If not, the morning hour is closed. The Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution submitted by him, instructing the Attorney-General to bring suit for an injunction against the Florida Railway and Navigation Company. On that question the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, it is not at all pleasant to me to oppose any wish of the Senator from Florida in respect to a matter that concerns his own State, and I should not do so if I did not feel that this resolution, if adopted in the terms in which it stands, would be entirely useless, and would also commit the Senate to a line of action that I think would be very improper.

A bill is pending now before the Committee on Public Lands having for its purpose the forfeiture of the land grant to which the resolution refers. That bill covers all the ground that is designed to be taken by the Senator from Florida, I suppose. The opinion of the Interior Department in reference to the propriety of such a measure was requested by the Committee on Public Lands. I read the other day, when the subject was under debate, the reply of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in regard to this bill. That reply shows, as I think, that the bill itself is open to very grave objection. The matter is now pending in the Committee of Public Lands, and will be very soon considered. Indeed I may state that the committee have agreed that they will consider this bill on next Monday, the first committee meeting day.

It is an intricate subject, very involved. The facts about it are not definitely ascertained; the official facts, the facts to be gathered from official records, are certainly not; but other statements which have been made in respect to the bill and the propriety of its passage are dependent upon a condition of facts that we have not yet been able to get hold of. The committee have been urged to report that bill for quite a while, but they have not acted upon it and have not made a report, in the hope that they will be supplied by the parties interested with sufficient information to justify whatever report they may see proper to make.

Now the Senator from Florida comes in with a resolution, entitled "a joint resolution." Of course, upon its being adopted it will become a law. The object of the resolution is to effect what was intended to be effected by this bill, and a good deal more. It proceeds in the first section, which is now abandoned by the Senator from Florida, to forfeit the land grant of this railroad company; and in the second section the Attorney-General of the United States is instructed to bring suit, through the district attorneys of the United States, for an injunction against the Florida Navigation and Railway Corporation or their agents, attempting to sell, or selling, or advertising for sale the lands

of the United States embraced in the grant made to the State of Florida under the act entitled "An act granting public lands in alternate sections to the States of Florida and Alabama to aid in the construction of certain railroads in said States," approved May 17, 1856, while bills for the forfeiture of the same shall be pending before Congress, which have been or shall be recommended by the committees of either House of Congress to be forfeited.

Waiving for the present the peculiar character of this resolution of instruction to the Attorney-General, I wish to state that this committee, at least I, as a member of it—and I am satisfied it is true in respect to all the members of the committee—were not informed of the fact which the Senator from Florida now seems to think is the vital turning point in this case, until he submitted his remarks to the Senate the other day, within the space of seven or eight days—I do not remember precisely when he first made the statement in the Senate—that the State of Florida had never given its assent to the grant of this land to the Florida Railroad Company, or any of its successors. The committee have been entirely ignorant upon that proposition and that question; they have had no information from any source of the existence of this state of facts, or this alleged state of facts.

When they were informed of it, as soon as the committee could get together, the persons who were representing this railroad company, and who have always been very vigilant about the rights that they claimed, were notified of this statement, and they say to us that they can overturn it, that they can satisfy the Senate that the State of Florida has given its consent to this grant. I have not had the opportunity of looking over the statutes of the State of Florida which affect this subject, and I do not understand that they have been put in the RECORD by the Senator. I have not seen them. Have they been put in the RECORD in full?

Mr. CALL. They have been put in the RECORD to such an extent as to show that the State of Florida in 1858, upon the recommendation of the governor and the opinion of the attorney-general, and by an almost unanimous vote of the Legislature, refused to allow the Florida Railroad Company to have the benefit of this grant, and incorporated another company and gave to it the benefit of the grant.

Mr. MORGAN. That is quite a different answer from what I expected. I expected the answer to state this proposition, that the statutes of Florida had been put in the RECORD, all of them which showed any right on the part of this railroad company to this land grant.

Mr. CALL. They have.

Mr. MORGAN. That is a proposition upon which there is controversy. This railroad company and its successors claim that it had the consent of the State of Florida to the land grant, and demand from this committee a right to show that it has. This committee have warned those persons that they must make this proof by next Monday, the time the committee meets again, in order that we can have a fair chance to weigh both sides of this question and not be acting in the dark. They controvert the position of the Senator from Florida. Pending this controversy, will the Senate of the United States take this bill out of the hands of the committee so far as to authorize a suit for an injunction to be brought by the Attorney-General of the United States to enjoin further proceedings of the railroad company in the sale or disposal of any of these lands? I do not, for one, feel disposed to venture upon ground of that kind until both sides can have an opportunity for a hearing. I do not think it would be just to the committee or to the parties interested that we should rush along and make this rash disposition of this case while a committee of the Senate are laboriously and earnestly looking into the matter to ascertain whether there is ground of relief in this case.

Now I will advert to the statement made this moment by the Senator from Florida, that in 1858, I believe the Senator said it was, the Legislature of Florida denied that the Florida Railroad Company, whose property is here sought to be confiscated or to be forfeited, had the right to these lands and conferred the right upon another company. That matter is, I think, easy of explanation.

This grant was made, as the resolution recites, May 17, 1856, for a railroad extending from Fernandina on the Atlantic coast to Cedar Key on the Gulf coast, with a branch road running down to Tampa Bay. That was in 1856. Before 1860, before more than four years of the time within which this road was to be completed had expired, this railroad was built and completed and running from Fernandina, in Florida, across to Cedar Keys. A somewhat greater distance of the road had been graded and cross-ties prepared upon it and the work was being prosecuted with vigor, and would have been completed at least within the period of ten years, from the place where it leaves the main line down to Tampa Bay, but for the fact that the war came on and suspended all operations upon that part of the road.

Just here it is worthy of remark that this railroad company has been more diligent, or was, up to the time of the occurrence of the war, more diligent in the building of its line of railroad than any railroad company in the United States, I think, having a land grant; for it had built practically two-thirds of the lineal extent of its entire line from Tampa Bay leading up to the point of intersection with the main line—I forget the name of the town at that point. Of course the war not only interrupted the building of this road, but there is a letter here from one of the engineers who was engaged in building it who traversed on foot the entire length of the road several times after the war had con-

cluded, and he found that the iron had been taken up by the Confederate authorities for miles and miles and transferred to other roads and put he did not know where. The cross-ties had rotted; the bridges had become rotten, the road having gone into disuse. The houses for the accommodation of the trains on the road had been torn down or burned up. So the road by the war was made a complete wreck. It was put into bankruptcy by the war.

It was then a matter of impossibility that that road should progress until it had received assistance from other sources. Nevertheless this corporation went to work upon it in good faith, and acquiring capital from other parts of the country commenced to rebuild it. They also commenced to complete that part of the road which had been graded in the direction of Tampa Bay and progressed with considerable rapidity in that way. Nevertheless the road was largely encumbered. Its franchises and property of every kind were necessarily put under mortgage to raise money to go on with the construction of the road.

After the war was over another railroad company sprang up in Florida—I believe it was called the Peninsular Railroad Company—for the purpose of taking this property out of the hands of the old company and building the road; and the controversy, as I understand it, is now really between that other company and the company whose property is now sought to be forfeited. The case of *Schulenberg vs. Harriman* had not been decided. The Legislature of Florida and all other people almost, except the Supreme Court of the United States, conceived the idea, which was certainly a very plausible one, that under the ten-year limitations and grants, the express language of the statute being that if the road was not completed within ten years the property should revert to the United States, the property did revert the instant that the ten years expired without the road having been completely built; that unless the condition of the act had been complied with within the ten years the land reverted to the United States Government.

That was the prevailing opinion. Mr. Secretary Chandler had that opinion, and he, upon an application being made by this railroad company to withdraw the lands from market in order that it might enjoy the benefits of the grant, ruled that all interest in that grant had been forfeited; that it had entirely lapsed, because the ten years had expired before the roads were completed, and as to this branch to Tampa Bay before, as he alleged, anything had been done during the lifetime of the grant. Under the influence of that decision the railroad company were declared to have no right, and the lands were put upon the market. In fact Mr. Chandler made an order that the lands should be open to entry as other public domain in the United States, and so the matter went along.

But after the decision of *Schulenberg vs. Harriman*, Mr. Secretary Schurz, upon a petition to review the former decision upon the ground of a mistake in law as well as a mistake of fact, did review it and did reverse it, and he held that these lands were still subject to the grant; that the fee was in the railroad company subject to be divested only on forfeiture being declared by Congress.

Pending this interregnum, after Mr. Chandler had made his decision that these lands were part of the public domain and that the grant in favor of the Florida Railroad Company had lapsed because the road had not been completed within ten years, the Florida Legislature commenced its proceeding to make a new grant of this land to a new company in the hope of thereby reviving it or getting Congress to revive it, and getting the benefit to the State and the community down there of this land grant.

The Legislature of Florida in this action, of which the Senator speaks, was just as mistaken as anybody else about the rights of this railroad company, and it was not legislating for the purpose of declaring that the company had no rights because it had not complied with certain provisions of the Florida law, but it was legislating to make a declaration following that of Mr. Chandler (and confirming it, contrary to the decision in *Schulenberg vs. Harriman*, afterwards made), that this grant had lapsed because the ten years had expired before the completion of the road. Reading in the light of these facts that statute of Florida, it is very easy to understand that the Legislature of Florida never intended to deny the rights that had been conferred upon this Florida Railroad Company, but merely taking it for granted, as everybody did, that these rights had absolutely lapsed, the Legislature was free to go on to organize a new company or permit its organization, and to claim for that company the land grant which had been made.

Mr. GEORGE. Was that action before the decision referred to?

Mr. MORGAN. The dates are here. We shall see.

Mr. GEORGE. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that the action of the Legislature was long prior to that.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Mississippi is entirely correct. The Legislature of Florida, in 1858, upon the recommendation of the governor, denied the right of the Florida Railroad Company to the benefit of this grant and granted it to another company. I have the act right here in my hand.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. BECK. I ask the Senator from Alabama why not have this matter go to the Committee on Public Lands and have the facts ascertained?

Mr. MORGAN. That is my motion. I am insisting on it now.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, I will tell the Senator from Kentucky why.

Mr. MORGAN. I prefer to go on.

Mr. BECK. The subject is pending before a committee and this is a resolution about that subject. Why not have a report of the committee?

Mr. MORGAN. That is what I want. The Senator from Florida brings facts before the Senate not known to the committee, and, I dare say, not known to the Senator twenty days ago.

Mr. CALL. A long time ago, all my life.

Mr. MORGAN. If he has known them all his life, the Senator is a younger man than I thought he was. I venture that the Senator from Florida did not intend to make this point twenty days ago, and that he did not know, although he might have surmised, the condition of the statutory enactments of Florida on this subject twenty days ago. The matter has been sprung on the Senate and on the committee, and I object to it. I want a fair showing about this matter. Let every man have a fair chance before the committee, no matter what his rights may be, whether he is interested in a railroad or not. When you bring men up for judgment let them have a fair trial.

I am giving you the interpretation of this proceeding as it is given to me by the counsel of the railroad company. Whether that is correct or not I am not prepared to vouch; but if we are to act as judges in this matter I think it is my duty to listen when suggestions are made, and then to arrive at a knowledge of the facts and decide fairly and impartially between the parties. That is my idea of my duty. While I would be perfectly willing to accommodate the Senator from Florida in any particular, I am not willing as a member of the Senate, and particularly as a member of the Committee on Public Lands, to have this matter taken out of our hands in this way and the Senate sit in judgment on that which the committee have had no opportunity to report and no opportunity to understand.

Mr. GEORGE. Did not the Senator from Florida point out the act of the Florida Legislature forfeiting the lands of this railroad company?

Mr. MORGAN. I will state to the Senator from Mississippi that the counsel for this railroad company take the ground that the State of Florida had granted land under its general internal-improvement law; a bill was passed by which a grant was made of lands to trustees in trust that they were under certain regulations to dispose of the proceeds of certain lands in Florida to internal improvements, this company being one of them. They claim now that these trustees under this general internal-improvement law received a large body of lands which had been granted to the State of Florida under the swamp and overflowed land law; that Florida intended to convey those lands to the different railroad companies mentioned in the law, and also intended to prepare in advance of action by Congress, which was the fact, that these same trustees should have the management of such land grant as Congress might thereafter make or might before that time have made in aid of the same roads. So the act of the Florida Legislature in organizing this board of trustees to hold the title was an act that related to the land that belonged to the State of Florida under the swamp-land law, and also related to such grants as Congress might make thereafter to these same railroad companies. That was the situation.

It will be perceived by the Senate that two classes of lands would fall into the hands of these trustees: one, lands belonging to the State and transferred to them as a public trust; the other, lands that might be granted directly by an act of Congress.

The act of Congress which is the subject of this controversy now was passed after the internal-improvement act of the Florida Legislature. That act of Congress named this corporation in the act as being one of the three in whose behalf this grant was made. The grant was made *eo nomine* to the State of Florida, but for the benefit and for the purpose of constructing three railroads, of which the road in question to-day was one.

Now these gentlemen allege against the position taken by the Senator from Florida, that the State of Florida has no other act upon the subject; that while it never made a law conferring the title of these lands upon either of these three railroad companies, it had previously provided that these titles should go into the hands of the trustees of the general-improvement fund, the internal-improvement act standing as the means of taking in, appropriating, and applying all of the grants that Congress made to these three railroads; that no special act of the Florida Legislature was necessary, because this railroad company was mentioned in the internal-improvement act as one of the roads to which the lands should be applied, and that therefore it does not appear affirmatively upon the legislation of the State of Florida that this railroad, by that name, had any separate and special act in its behalf conferring upon it these lands; but they insist that the general-improvement act of Florida being for the purpose of constructing this very road named in the act covers the case and transfers the land, if not by legal title, at least by a perfect equity, through the hands of these trustees of the internal-improvement fund of Florida into the rightful possession and ownership of this railroad company.

It is alleged, also, as I understand, by the Senator from Florida, that some conditions were imposed by the act of Florida; for instance, that

a map should be filed within a certain time, or, if I am not mistaken in that, that the consent of the railroad to accept the grant should be filed within a certain time. Upon inquiry made as to whether these formalities had been complied with, these lawyers said, "Yes, and we can prove it by next Monday." Upon being asked whether or not a literal compliance had been made, they said, yes, they could establish it.

But it is beyond all controversy that the State of Florida, without objection, saw this railroad company go on to the completion of its road, enabled it to receive without objection, and it did receive without objection, that part of the land grant which Florida made to the railroad company, and I think it is rather sharp conduct to say that that State never consented to this railroad receiving the grant of the United States Government, when the Congress in passing the law named this railroad and did not name any other except the other two that were in the act, but certainly named no successor to it, and gave Florida no right to appoint another railroad to the enjoyment of this grant of the Government of the United States, except that named in the act. I will read from the act of Congress to show its terms:

That there be, and is hereby, granted to the State of Florida, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads from Saint John's River, at Jacksonville, to the waters of Escambia Bay, at or near Pensacola; and from Amelia Island, on the Atlantic, to the waters of Tampa Bay, with a branch to Cedar Key, on the Gulf of Mexico.

That is this road.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not name the company.

Mr. MORGAN. You mean it does not designate the corporation.

Mr. GEORGE. The State is authorized to provide for a road between those points.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good; the act of Florida did contain the names of these companies.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Alabama is entirely wrong in all his statements.

Mr. MORGAN. Let us come down to particulars. I know I am not wrong in all my statements or in all my facts.

Mr. CALL. The act did not confer upon the Florida Railroad Company or any other railroad company any right to any part of that land.

Mr. MORGAN. Did it not contain these three lines by express mention?

Mr. CALL. What three lines?

Mr. MORGAN. Those I read here of course.

Mr. CALL. It did not mention any railroad company.

Mr. MORGAN. Did it not say that the grant was to be applied to these three lines of road?

Mr. CALL. It did not.

Mr. MORGAN. I will read it, and let us see.

Mr. CALL. Probably I had better read to you what the governor of the State says.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; I want to read the act of Congress.

Mr. CALL. I can not lay my hand on the act of Florida itself, but I will read the act from the pamphlet in my hand which cites it. Section 4 is what is referred to I presume:

Sec. 4. *Be it further enacted*, That a line of railroad from the Saint John's River, at Jacksonville, and the waters of Pensacola Bay, with an extension from suitable points on said line to Saint Mark's River, or Crooked River, at White Bluff, on Apalachicola Bay, in Middle Florida, and to the waters of Saint Andrew's Bay, in West Florida, and a line from Amelia Island, on the Atlantic, to the waters of Tampa Bay, in South Florida, with an extension to Cedar Key, in East Florida; also a canal from the waters of Saint John's River, on Lake Harney, to the waters of Indian River, are proper improvements to be aided from the internal-improvement fund, in manner as hereinafter provided.

Mr. MORGAN. That is all I wanted to know. Now, the Senate see that the grant to these trustees of this property, owned by Florida, was made for the benefit of the same lines of railroad that are mentioned in the very same language in the act of Congress. I think it would take a very sharp lawyer to have anticipated that any question would ever be made as to the right of this railroad company to these lands when the railroad company was already chartered and was ready to build the road, and it went on immediately afterward and built the road from Amelia Island to Cedar Keys, and commenced the construction of and built 30 or 50 miles of it, also from the point of junction on the line toward Tampa Bay.

I understand that that criticism upon the action of the State of Florida and of the United States Government is entirely hypercritical, and that the point that the Senator from Florida thinks so entirely solid has really no solidity in it, and certainly no equity and no justice.

Mr. CALL. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. MORGAN. I mean this, that because we can not trace, or it is said we can not trace, in some special act of Congress or of the Florida Legislature following the act of Congress a particular corporation named which should enjoy the grant, therefore Florida has never given its consent to it.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Alabama will allow me to interrupt him. This is the proposition I have made: First, that the State of Florida never granted to the Florida Railroad Company the benefit of this grant of May, 1856; and, secondly, that the Florida Legislature, by expressed act of the Legislature upon the opinion of the attorney-general, refused to grant to this company the benefits of that act for any part of the line of the road—expressly refused.

Mr. MORGAN. That act of the Florida Legislature, if tested in court, would probably be found to be entirely invalid.

Mr. CALL. Why?

Mr. MORGAN. Because it is an *ex post facto* act to divest property which the railroad company had enjoyed, and was intended to enjoy, under a grant made by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CALL. It was passed in 1858 by the Florida Legislature, and the attorney-general of the State and the governor declared that the Florida Railroad Company had never availed itself, or sought to avail itself, of the line to Tampa.

Mr. MORGAN. That opinion of the attorney-general is quoted continually here as being the final and decisive opinion of this whole question. The Senate of the United States can not afford to accept that opinion. I have the greatest doubt about it both as a matter of law and as a matter of justice.

Mr. CALL. Do I understand the Senator from Alabama to state to the Senate that when the State authorities, by whose approval the location of a grant may be made, have decided that a particular company has no right or interest in it whatever, has never complied with the conditions of which they are the sole judges, the Senate of the United States, the Interior Department, or anybody else, can set up its judgment against that of the State?

Mr. MORGAN. Most unquestionably whenever it is ascertained that the State of Florida had made a previous grant, or had taken previous action, which vested rights in this railroad company, it has no power to divest them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 372) to establish agricultural experiment-stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President—

Mr. CALL. I would ask the consent of the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the pending resolution, and that it be determined by vote of the Senate. It is a matter of very great importance to thousands of people whose homes are threatened in the State of Florida, and it ought not to take a very long time. I have been endeavoring to get a vote upon it, and have given way pretty often. I ask the Senate that it be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of the pending resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAIR. I must object, and I desire to say to the Senator from Florida that he will remember himself that at the close of the last session I gave notice that on the first day of the present session I should call up the proposed woman suffrage amendment which has been pending in this body and in Congress for twenty or twenty-five years without ever having reached a vote at all. On the second day of the session, the first not being available for that purpose, I did call up the resolution accordingly, and proceeded to discuss the subject, and it was in order for final action, but the opponents of the measure desired that it be delayed on account of the sickness and consequent absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], a member of the committee, who desired to be heard on the subject. It was so arranged, and an order of the Senate made, which appears in the RECORD, that it should be laid aside with the privileges of unfinished business, to be called up at any time. With that understanding the matter was laid aside for the time being.

The Senator from Georgia appeared soon after the holiday vacation was over, and as soon as he could conveniently fix the time when he could address the Senate I gave notice that I should call up the joint resolution. Last week I gave that notice and stated fully all these circumstances. I have given notice twice this week that this morning at the close of the morning business I desired the consideration of this joint resolution. The morning hour has been occupied as it has been, and now I desire to ask that the unfinished business, the regular order, be informally laid aside that we may proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution referred to. Therefore I object to the request of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HARRIS. I object to the request last made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was made to the further consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Florida; and now the Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to lay aside the regular order, which is the agricultural experiment-station bill—

Mr. HARRIS. To which I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears two objections.

Mr. HARRIS. I object to laying aside informally the unfinished business for the purpose suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I move that it be laid aside informally, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. That motion is not in order, to lay aside informally.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator from New Hampshire has a right to move to proceed to the consideration of his measure.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not desire to displace the bill which is to-day's unfinished business, and with the understanding that I will do anything and everything to replace that bill in its proper position, I will make the motion that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution referred to.

Mr. CALL. I thought I had the floor, and it was my purpose to make a motion to continue my resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. Any remarks are by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALL. It was my purpose to have moved to continue the consideration of the resolution. I so stated, but the Senator from Alabama objected to the further consideration of it. I appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire that we have been discussing this matter at intervals for several days, and facts have been stated and propositions made here which ought not to go uncontradicted. I will say to him that the homes of many people are advertised for sale, and great consternation is felt among the people who own these little pieces of property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must remind the Senator from Florida that the objection to the further consideration of his resolution has not been withdrawn and his remarks are not in order.

Mr. CALL. I am proceeding by unanimous consent, and I am appealing to the Senator from New Hampshire to enable me to make my motion.

Mr. MORGAN. If it is to be debated I want to answer the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BECK. I ask consent to say a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky can proceed if there be no objection.

Mr. BECK. I gave notice yesterday that I would call up to-day a bill which I had up at one time and which was passed by a large vote, and on the motion of the present occupant of the chair it was reconsidered, known as the railroad attorneys' bill, and which has been delayed from time to time to accommodate gentlemen. I have been appealed to by a number of persons who are interested in the resolution of the Senator from New Hampshire to give way until that can be heard. I do not want to give way, and yet I do not want to object. A lady sent for me two or three times this morning, but I declined to go to see her. I refer to Miss Anthony. I think we should arrange in some way or other to have that joint resolution disposed of and then let the bill I have charge of come up next. If that can be done I am willing to have it done. I am willing to consent to any arrangement that gives a chance to put my bill through.

Mr. BLAIR. I will say in reply, first to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida, that his resolution occupies the morning hour. It practically by parliamentary law occupies a preferred position, and he will be sure to get the resolution up to-morrow morning during the morning hour. It is a resolution which really is perhaps, as the Senator from Alabama has stated, somewhat abruptly forced upon the attention of the Senate and has occupied considerable time—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it his duty to call the Senator to order. Objection has been made and it has not been withdrawn. It is hardly worth while to discuss it.

Mr. BLAIR. I made a motion and I was simply replying to the suggestions of both Senators, and at no greater length certainly than they had made those suggestions. I have said all I wish in reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida. His matter will be up. There will be no trouble about that.

So far as the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] is concerned, I shall be glad to reciprocate in any way I can to get early action on his bill. I think he ought to have it. I ask action on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire moves to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. INGALLS. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAIR. It is Order of Business 122.

Mr. HARRIS. Is that motion in order until the unfinished business has been disposed of? It would be perfectly competent for the Senator from New Hampshire to move to postpone the further consideration of the unfinished business until to-morrow or indefinitely; but it must be disposed of and displaced from its position of unfinished business before the motion suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire can be in order. He can not unite the two motions in one. He may move to postpone, if he chooses, and take the sense of the Senate upon that. Then he may move, if the Senate postpone, to proceed to the consideration of the matter that he proposes to consider, but not until then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is inclined to accept the opinion of the learned Senator from Tennessee on that point.

Mr. BLAIR. I submit, then, for the motion already made, one that the unfinished business be postponed until to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HARRIS. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. Before I vote on that I should like to have an inquiry answered. Would the effect of the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire be to leave the experiment-station bill as the unfinished business to-morrow at 2 o'clock? Will that be its position at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suppose so, but he prefers to refer the question to Senators who are more familiar with parliamentary law.

Mr. HARRIS. I should think it would come up to-morrow as unfinished business unless this matter should be left unfinished at the adjournment to-day.

Mr. BLAIR. There can not be any doubt about that. That was the Senator's suggestion before I made the motion.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish only to say one word. The agricultural experiment-station bill is the unfinished business now, as it was before the holidays. I have yielded to everybody, wishing to be accommodating, and I am willing still to yield for this day; but I am unwilling to consent to any action of the Senate which shall take the experiment-station bill from the Calendar as unfinished business.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not desire that any such action be taken by the Senate. I ask for a vote, and the yeas and nays have been called for.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, in order to accommodate all, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the unfinished business be passed over informally until to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire moves to postpone until 2 o'clock to-morrow the further consideration of the regular order for to-day, the unfinished business.

Mr. BLAIR. If that motion passes I shall then move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire (putting the question). The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. BLAIR. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the exact motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to postpone until 2 o'clock to-morrow the regular order for to-day, the unfinished business being the agricultural experiment-station bill; and on that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. I would vote for the motion if I thought it would leave the bill which is the unfinished business in its present position on the Calendar; but if there is any doubt about that I will vote against it.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber. Does his colleague know how he would vote upon this question?

Mr. MORRILL. I do not.

Mr. HARRIS. I withhold my vote because of the pair. I do not know how the Senator from Vermont would vote. I should vote "nay" if I were not paired.

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am generally paired with my colleague [Mr. SEWELL]. I do not know how he would vote upon this question, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHACE].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. KENNA. I am paired on all questions with the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Beck,	Conger,	Hawley,	Ransom,
Blair,	Culom,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Bowen,	Dolph,	Mitchell of Oreg.,	Teller,
Brown,	Evaris,	Morrill,	Wilson of Iowa.
Butler,	Farwell,	Palmer,	
Call,	Frye,	Platt,	
Cheney,	Hale,	Plumb,	

NAYS—16.

Berry,	George,	Morgan,	Sawyer,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Payne,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Gray,	Pugh,	Walthall,
Coke,	McMillan,	Saulsbury,	Whitthorne.

ABSENT—35.

Aldrich,	Fair,	Jones of Nevada,	Sewell,
Allison,	Gorman,	Kenna,	Spooner,
Camden,	Hampton,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Cameron,	Harris,	Mahone,	Vance,
Chace,	Harrison,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Colquitt,	Hoar,	Miller,	Voorhees,
Dawes,	Ingalls,	Mitchell of Pa.,	Williams,
Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Riddleberger,	Wilson of Md.
Eustis,	Jones of Florida,	Sabin,	

So the motion to postpone was agreed to.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. BLAIR. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said Legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the joint resolution introduced by my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, conferring the right to vote upon the women of the United States, is one of paramount importance, as it involves great questions far reaching in their tendency, which seriously affect the very pillars of our social fabric, which involve the peace and harmony of society, the unity of the family, and much of the future success of our Government. The question should therefore be met fairly and discussed with firmness, but with moderation and forbearance.

No one contributes anything valuable to the debate by the use of harsh terms, or by impugning motives, or by disparaging the arguments of the opposition. Where the prosperity of the race and the peace of society are involved, we should, on both sides, meet fairly the arguments of our respective opponents.

This question has been discussed a great deal outside of Congress, sometimes in bad temper and sometimes illogically and unprofitably, but the advocates of the proposed amendment and the opponents of it have each put forth, probably in their strongest form, the reasons and arguments which are considered by each as conclusive in favor of the cause they advocate. I do not expect to contribute much that is new on a subject that has been so often and so ably discussed; but what I have to say will be in the main a reproduction in substance of what I and others have already said on the subject, and which I think important enough to be placed upon the record in the argument of the case.

In connection with my friend, the honorable Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], I have in a report set forth substantially the reasons and arguments which to my mind establish the fact that the proposed legislation would be injudicious and unwise, and I shall not hesitate to reiterate here such portions of what was then said as seem to me to be important.

I believe that the Creator intended that the sphere of the males and females of our race should be different, and that their duties and obligations, while they differ materially, are equally important and equally honorable, and that each sex is equally well qualified by natural endowments for the discharge of the important duties which pertain to each, and that each sex is equally competent to discharge those duties.

We find an abundance of evidence, both in the works of nature and in the Divine revelation, to establish the fact that the family properly regulated is the foundation and pillar of society, and is the most important of any other human institution.

In the Divine economy it is provided that the man shall be the head of the family, and shall take upon himself the solemn obligation of providing for and protecting the family.

Man, by reason of his physical strength, and his other endowments and faculties, is qualified for the discharge of those duties that require strength and ability to combat with the sterner realities and difficulties of life. The different classes of outdoor labor which require physical strength and endurance are by nature assigned to man, the head of the family, as part of his task. He discharges such labors as require greater physical endurance and strength than the female sex are usually found to possess.

It is not only his duty to provide for and protect the family, but as a member of the community it is also his duty to discharge the laborious and responsible obligations which the family owe to the State, and which obligations must be discharged by the head of the family, until the male members of the family have grown up to manhood and are able to aid in the discharge of those obligations, when it becomes their duty each in his turn to take charge of and rear a family, for which he is responsible.

Among other duties which the head of the family owes to the State, is military duty in time of war, which he, when able-bodied, is able to discharge, and which the female members of the family are unable to discharge.

He is also under obligation to discharge jury duty, and by himself or his representatives to perform his part of the labor necessary to construct and keep in order roads, bridges, streets, and all grades of public highways. And in this progressive age upon the male sex is devolved the duty of constructing and operating our railroads, and the engines

and other rolling-stock with which they are operated; of building, equipping, and launching, shipping and other water craft of every character necessary for the transportation of passengers and freight upon our rivers, our lakes, and upon the high seas.

The labor in our fields, sowing, cultivating, and reaping crops must be discharged mainly by the male sex, as the female sex, for want of physical strength, are generally unable to discharge these duties. As it is the duty of the male sex to perform the obligations to the State, to society, and to the family, already mentioned, with numerous others that might be enumerated, it is also their duty to aid in the government of the State, which is simply a great aggregation of families. Society can not be preserved, nor can the people be prosperous without good government. The government of our country is a government of the people, and it becomes necessary that the class of people upon whom the responsibility rests should assemble together and consider and discuss the great questions of governmental policy which from time to time are presented for their decision.

This often requires the assembling of caucuses in the night time, as well as public assemblages in the daytime. It is a laborious task, for which the male sex is infinitely better fitted than the female sex; and after proper consideration and discussion of the measures that may divide the country from time to time, the duty devolves upon those who are responsible for the government, at times and places to be fixed by law, to meet and by ballot to decide the great questions of government upon which the prosperity of the country depends.

These are some of the active and sterner duties of life to which the male sex is by nature better fitted than the female sex. In carrying out the policy of the State on great measures adjudged vital such policy should lead to war, either foreign or domestic, it would seem to follow very naturally that those who have been responsible for the management of the State should be the parties to take the hazards and hardships of the struggle.

Here, again, man is better fitted by nature for the discharge of the duty—woman is unfit for it. So much for some of the duties imposed upon the male sex, for the discharge of which the Creator has endowed them with proper strength and faculties.

On the other hand, the Creator has assigned to woman very laborious and responsible duties, by no means less important than those imposed upon the male sex, though entirely different in their character. In the family she is a queen. She alone is fitted for the discharge of the sacred trust of wife and the endearing relation of mother.

While the man is contending with the sterner duties of life, the whole time of the noble, affectionate, and true woman is required in the discharge of the delicate and difficult duties assigned her in the family circle, in her church relations, and in the society where her lot is cast. When the husband returns home weary and worn in the discharge of the difficult and laborious task assigned him, he finds in the good wife solace and consolation, which is nowhere else afforded. If he is despondent and distressed, she cheers his heart with words of kindness; if he is sick or languishing, she soothes, comforts, and ministers to him as no one but an affectionate wife can do. If his burdens are onerous, she divides their weight by the exercise of her love and her sympathy.

But a still more important duty devolves upon the mother. After having brought into existence the offspring of the nuptial union, the children are dependent upon the mother as they are not upon any other human being. The trust is a most sacred, most responsible, and most important one. To watch over them in their infancy, and as the mind begins to expand to train, direct, and educate it in the paths of virtue and usefulness is the high trust assigned to the mother. She trains the twig as the tree should be inclined.

She molds the character. She educates the heart as well as the intellect, and she prepares the future man, now the boy, for honor or dishonor. Upon the manner in which she discharges her duty depends the fact whether he shall in future be a useful citizen or a burden to society. She inculcates lessons of patriotism, manliness, religion, and virtue, fitting the man by reason of his training to be an ornament to society, or dooming him by her neglect to a life of dishonor and shame. Society acts unwisely when it imposes upon her the duties that by common consent have always been assigned to the stronger and sterner sex, and the discharge of which causes her to neglect those sacred and all important duties to her children and to the society of which they are members.

In the church, by her piety, her charity, and her Christian purity, she not only aids society by a proper training of her own children, but the children of others, whom she encourages to come to the sacred altar, are taught to walk in the paths of rectitude, honor, and religion. In the Sunday-school room the good woman is a princess, and she exerts an influence which purifies and ennobles society, training the young in the truths of religion, making the Sunday-school the nursery of the church, and elevating society to the higher planes of pure religion, virtue, and patriotism. In the sick room and among the humble, the poor, and the suffering, the good woman, like an angel of light, cheers the hearts and revives the hopes of the poor, the suffering, and the despondent.

It would be a vain attempt to undertake to enumerate the refining,

endearing, and ennobling influences exercised by the true woman in her relations to the family and to society when she occupies the sphere assigned to her by the laws of nature and the Divine inspiration, which are our surest guide for the present and the future life. But how can woman be expected to meet these heavy responsibilities, and to discharge these delicate and most important duties of wife, Christian, teacher, minister of mercy, friend of the suffering, and consoler of the despondent and needy, if we impose upon her the grosser, rougher, and harsher duties which nature has assigned to the male sex?

If the wife and the mother is required to leave the sacred precincts of home, and to attempt to do military duty when the state is in peril; or if she is to be required to leave her home from day to day in attendance upon the court as a juror, and to be shut up in the jury room from night to night with men who are strangers while a question of life or property is being discussed; if she is to attend political meetings, take part in political discussions, and mingle with the male sex at political gatherings; if she is to become an active politician; if she is to attend political caucuses at late hours of the night; if she is to take part in all the unsavory work that may be deemed necessary for the triumph of her party; and if on election day she is to leave her home and go upon the streets electioneering for votes for the candidates who receive her support, and mingling among the crowds of men who gather round the polls, she is to press her way through them to the precinct and deposit her ballot; if she is to take part in the corporate struggles of the city or town in which she resides, attend to the duties of his honor, the mayor, the councilman, or of policeman, to say nothing of the many other like obligations which are disagreeable even to the male sex, how is she, with all these heavy duties of citizen, politician, and officeholder resting upon her shoulders, to attend to the more sacred, delicate, and refining trust to which we have already referred, and for which she is peculiarly fitted by nature? If she is to discharge the duties last mentioned, how is she, in connection with them, to discharge the more refining, elevating, and ennobling duties of wife, mother, Christian, and friend, which are found in the sphere where nature has placed her? Who is to care for and train the children while she is absent in the discharge of these masculine duties?

If it were proper to reverse the order of nature and assign woman to the sterner duties devolved upon the male sex, and to attempt to assign man to the more refining, delicate, and ennobling duties of the woman, man would be found entirely incompetent to the discharge of the obligations which nature has devolved upon the gentler sex, and society must be greatly injured by the attempted change. But if we are told that the object of this movement is not to reverse this order of nature, but only to devolve upon the gentler sex a portion of the more rigorous duties imposed by nature upon the stronger sex, we reply that society must be injured, as the woman would not be able to discharge those duties so well, by reason of her want of physical strength, as the male, upon whom they are devolved, and to the extent that the duties are to be divided, the male would be infinitely less competent to discharge the delicate and sacred trusts which nature has assigned to the female.

But it has been said that the present law is unjust to woman; that she is often required to pay tax on the property she holds without being permitted to take part in framing or administering the laws by which her property is governed, and that she is taxed without representation. That is a great mistake.

It may be very doubtful whether the male or female sex in the present state of things has more influence in the administration of the affairs of the Government and the enactment of the laws by which we are governed.

While the woman does not discharge military duty, nor does she attend courts and serve on juries, nor does she labor on the public streets, bridges, or highways, nor does she engage actively and publicly in the discussion of political affairs, nor does she enter the crowded precincts of the ballot-box to deposit her suffrage, still the intelligent, cultivated, noble woman is a power behind the throne. All her influence is in favor of morality, justice, and fair dealing, all her efforts and her counsel are in favor of good government, wise and wholesome regulations, and a faithful administration of the laws. Such a woman, by her gentleness, kindness, and Christian bearing, impresses her views and her counsels upon her father, her husband, her brothers, her sons, and her other male friends who imperceptibly yield to her influence many times without even being conscious of it. She rules not with a rod of iron, but with the queenly scepter; she binds not with hooks of steel but with silken cords; she governs not by physical efforts, but by moral suasion and feminine purity and delicacy. Her dominion is one of love, not of arbitrary power.

We are satisfied, therefore, that the pure, cultivated, and pious ladies of this country now exercise a very powerful, but quiet, imperceptible influence in popular affairs, much greater than they can ever again exercise if female suffrage should be enacted and they should be compelled actively to take part in the affairs of state and the corruptions of party politics.

It would be a gratification, and we are always glad to see the ladies gratified, to many who have espoused the cause of woman suffrage if they could take active part in political affairs, and go to the polls and

cast their votes alongside the male sex; but while this would be a gratification to a large number of very worthy and excellent ladies who take a different view of the question from that which we entertain, we feel that it would be a great cruelty to a much larger number of the cultivated, refined, delicate, and lovely women of this country who seek no such distinction, who would enjoy no such privilege, who would with woman-like delicacy shrink from the discharge of any such obligation, and who would sincerely regret that, what they consider the folly of the state, had imposed upon them any such unpleasant duties.

But should female suffrage be once established it would become an imperative necessity that the very large class, indeed much the largest class, of the women of this country of the character last described should yield, contrary to their inclinations and wishes, to the necessity which would compel them to engage in political strife. We apprehend no one who has properly considered this question will doubt if female suffrage should be established that the more ignorant and less refined portions of the female population of this country, to say nothing of the baser class of females, laying aside feminine delicacy and disregarding the sacred duties devolving upon them, to which we have already referred, would rush to the polls and take pleasure in the crowded association which the situation would compel, of the two sexes in political meetings, and at the ballot-box.

If all the baser and more ignorant portion of the female sex crowd to the polls and deposit their suffrage this compels the very large class of intelligent, virtuous, and refined females, including wives and mothers, who have much more important duties to perform, to leave their sacred labors at home, relinquishing for a time the God-given important trust which has been placed in their hands, to go contrary to their wishes to the polls and vote, to counteract the suffrage of the less worthy class of our female population. If they fail to do this the best interests of the country must suffer by a preponderance of ignorance and vice at the polls.

It is now a problem which perplexes the brain of the ablest statesmen to determine how we will best preserve our republican system as against the demoralizing influence of the large class of our present citizens and voters who by reason of their illiteracy are unable to read or write the ballot they cast.

Certainly no statesman who has carefully observed the situation would desire to add very largely to this burden of ignorance. But who does not apprehend the fact if universal female suffrage should be established that we will, especially in the Southern States, add a very large number to the voting population whose ignorance utterly disqualifies them for discharging the trust. If our colored population who were so recently slaves that even the males who are voters have had but little opportunity to educate themselves or to be educated, whose ignorance is now exciting the liveliest interest of our statesmen, are causes of serious apprehension, what is to be said in favor of adding to the voting population all the females of that race, who, on account of the situation in which they have been placed, have had much less opportunity to be educated than even the males of their own race.

We do not say it is their fault that they are not educated, but the fact is undeniable that they are grossly ignorant, with very few exceptions, and probably not one in a hundred of them could read and write the ballot that they would be authorized to cast. What says the statesman to the propriety of adding this immense mass of ignorance to the voting population of the Union in its present condition?

It may be said that their votes could be offset by the ballots of the educated and refined ladies of the white race in the same section; but who does not know that the ignorant female voters would be at the polls *en masse*, while the refined and educated, shrinking from public contact on such occasions, would remain at home and attend to their domestic and other important duties, leaving the country too often to the control of those who could afford under the circumstances to take part in the strifes of politics, and to come in contact with the unpleasant surroundings before they could reach the polls. Are we ready to expose the country to the demoralization, and our institutions to the strain, which would be placed upon them for the gratification of a minority of the virtuous and good of our female population at the expense of the mortification of a very large majority of the same sex?

It has been frequently urged with great earnestness by those who advocate woman suffrage that the ballot is necessary to the women to enable them to protect themselves in securing occupations, and to enable them to realize the same compensation for the like labor which is received by men. This argument is plausible, but upon a closer examination it will be found to possess but little real force. The price of labor is and must continue to be governed by the law of supply and demand, and the person who has the most physical strength to labor, and the most pursuits requiring such strength open for employment, will always command the higher prices.

Ladies make excellent teachers in public schools; many of them are every way the equals of their male competitors, and still they secure less wages than males. The reason is obvious. The number of ladies who offer themselves as teachers is much larger than the number of males who are willing to teach. The larger number of females offer to teach because other occupations are not open to them. The smaller number of males offer to teach because other more profitable occupa-

tions are open to most males who are competent to teach. The result is that the competition for positions of teachers to be filled by ladies is so great as to reduce the price; but as males can not be employed at that price, and are necessary in certain places in the schools, those seeking their services have to pay a higher rate for them.

Persons having a larger number of places open to them with fewer competitors command higher wages than those who have a smaller number of places open to them with more competitors. This is the law of society. It is the law of supply and demand, which can not be changed by legislation. Then it follows that the ballot can not enable those who have to compete with the larger number to command the same prices as those who compete with the smaller number in the labor market. As the Legislature has no power to regulate in practice that of which the advocates of woman suffrage complain, the ballot in the hands of females could not aid its regulation.

The ballot can not impart to the female physical strength which she does not possess, nor can it open to her pursuits which she does not have physical ability to engage in; and as long as she lacks the physical strength to compete with men in the different departments of labor, there will be more competition in her department, and she must necessarily receive less wages.

But it is claimed again, that females should have the ballot as a protection against the tyranny of bad husbands. This is also delusive. If the husband is brutal, arbitrary, or tyrannical, and tyrannizes over her at home, the ballot in her hands would be no protection against such injustice, but the husband who compelled her to conform to his wishes in other respects would also compel her to use the ballot, if she possessed it, as he might please to dictate. The ballot would therefore be of no assistance to the wife in such case, nor could it heal family strifes or dissensions. On the contrary, one of the gravest objections to placing the ballot in the hands of the female sex is that it would promote unhappiness and dissensions in the family circle. There should be unity and harmony in the family.

At present the man represents the family in meeting the demands of the law and of society upon the family. So far as the rougher, coarser duties are concerned, the man represents the family, and the individuality of the woman is not brought into prominence; but when the ballot is placed in the hands of woman her individuality is enlarged, and she is expected to answer for herself the demands of the law and of society on her individual account, and not as the weaker member of the family to answer by her husband. This naturally draws her out from the dignified and cultivated refinement of her womanly position, and brings her into a closer contact with the rougher elements of society, which tends to destroy that higher reverence and respect which her refinement and dignity in the relation of wife and mother have always inspired in those who approached her in her honorable and useful retirement.

When she becomes a voter she will be more or less of a politician, and will form political alliances or unite with political parties which will frequently be antagonistic to those to which her husband belongs. This will introduce into the family circle new elements of disagreement and discord which will frequently end in unhappy divisions, if not in separation or divorce. This must frequently occur when she becomes an active politician, identified with a party which is distasteful to her husband. On the other hand, if she unites with her husband in party associations and votes with him on all occasions so as not to disturb the harmony and happiness of the family, then the ballot is of no service, as it simply duplicates the vote of the male on each side of the question and leaves the result the same.

Again, if the family is the unit of society, and the state is composed of an aggregation of families, then it is important to society that there be as many happy families as possible, and it becomes the duty of man and woman alike to unite in the holy relations of matrimony.

As this is the only legal and proper mode of rendering obedience to the early command to multiply and replenish the earth, whatever tends to discourage the holy relation of matrimony is in disobedience of this command, and any change which encourages such disobedience is violative of the Divine law, and can not result in advantage to the state. Before forming this relation it is the duty of young men who have to take upon themselves the responsibilities of providing for and protecting the family to select some profession or pursuit that is most congenial to their tastes, and in which they will be most likely to be successful; but this can not be permitted to the young ladies, or if permitted it can not be practically carried out after matrimony.

As it might frequently happen that the young man had selected one profession or pursuit, and the young lady another, the result would be that after marriage she must drop the profession or pursuit of her choice, and employ herself in the sacred duties of wife and mother at home, and in rearing, educating, and elevating the family, while the husband pursues the profession of his choice.

It may be said, however, that there is a class of young ladies who do not choose to marry, and who select professions or vocations and follow them for a livelihood. This is true, but this class, compared with the number who unite in matrimony with the husbands of their choice, is comparatively very small, and it is the duty of society to encourage

the increase of marriages rather than of celibacy. If the larger number of females select pursuits or professions which require them to decline marriage, society to that extent is deprived of the advantage resulting from the increase of population by marriage.

It is said by those who have examined the question closely that the largest number of divorces is now found in the communities where the advocates of female suffrage are most numerous, and where the individuality of woman as related to her husband, which such a doctrine inculcates, is increased to the greatest extent.

If this be true, it is a strong plea in the interests of the family and of society against granting the petition of the advocates of woman suffrage.

After all, this is a local question, which properly belongs to the different States of the Union, each acting for itself, and to the Territories of the Union, when not acting in conflict with the laws of the United States.

The fact that a State adopts the rule of female suffrage neither increases nor diminishes its power in the Union, as the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled and the number of members in the electoral college appointed by each is determined by its aggregate population and not by the proportion of its voting population, so long as no race or class as defined by the Constitution is excluded from the exercise of the right of suffrage.

Now, Mr. President, I shall make no apology for adding to what I have said some extracts from an able and well-written volume, entitled "Letters from the Chimney Corner," written by a highly cultivated lady of Chicago. This gifted lady has discussed the question with so much clearness and force that I can make no mistake by substituting some of the thoughts taken from her book for anything I might add on this question. While discussing the relations of the sexes, and showing that neither sex is of itself a whole, a unit, and that each requires to be supplemented by the other before its true structural integrity can be achieved, she adds:

Now, everywhere throughout nature, to the male and female ideal, certain distinct powers and properties belong. The lines of demarkation are not always clear, not always straight lines; they are frequently wavering, shadowy, and difficult to follow, yet on the whole whatever physical strength, personal aggressiveness, the intellectual scope and vigor which manage vast material enterprises are emphasized, there the masculine ideal is present. On the other hand, wherever refinement, tenderness, delicacy, sprightliness, spiritual acumen, and force, are to the fore, there the feminine ideal is represented, and these terms will be found nearly enough for all practical purposes to represent the differing endowments of actual men and women. Different powers suggest different activities, and under the division of labor here indicated the control of the state, legislation, the power of the ballot, would seem to fall to the share of man. Nor does this decision carry with it any injustice, any robbery of just or natural right to woman.

In her hands is placed a moral and spiritual power far greater than the power of the ballot. In her married or reproductive state the forming and shaping of human souls in their most plastic period is her destiny. Nor do her labors or her responsibilities end with infancy or childhood. Throughout his entire course, from the cradle to the grave, man is ever under the moral and spiritual influence and control of woman. With this power goes a tremendous responsibility for its true management and use. If woman shall ever rise to the full height of her power and privileges in this direction, she will have enough of the world's work upon her hands without attempting legislation.

It may be argued that the possession of civil power confers dignity, and is of itself a re-enforcement of whatever natural power an individual may possess; but the dignity of womanhood, when it is fully understood and appreciated, needs no such re-enforcement, nor are the peculiar needs of woman such as the law can reach.

Whenever laws are needed for the protection of her legal status and rights, there has been found to be little difficulty in obtaining them by means of the votes of men; but the deeper and more vital needs of woman and of society are those which are outside altogether of the pale of the law, and which can only be reached by the moral forces lodged in the hands of woman herself, acting in an enlarged and general capacity.

For instance, whenever a man or woman has been wronged in marriage the law may indeed step in with a divorce, but does that divorce give back to either party the dream of love, the happy home, the prattle of children, and the sweet outlook for future years which were destroyed by that wrong? It is not a legal power which is needed in this case; it is a moral power which shall prevent the wrong, or, if committed, shall induce penitence, forgiveness, a purer life, and the healing of the wound.

This power has been lodged by the Creator in the hands of woman herself, and if she has not been rightly trained to use it there is no redress for her at the hands of the law. The law alone can never compel men to respect the chastity of woman. They must first recognize its value in themselves by living up to the high level of their duties as maidens, wives, and mothers; they must impress men with the beauty and sacredness of purity, and then whatever laws are necessary and

available for its protection will be easily obtained, with a certainty, also, that they can be enforced, because the moral sentiments of men will be enlisted in their support.

Privileges bring responsibilities, and before women clamor for more work to do, it were better that they should attend more thoughtfully to the duties which lie all about them, in the home and social circle. Until society is cleansed of the moral foulness which infests it, which, as we have seen, lies beyond the reach of civil law, women have no call to go forth into wider fields, claiming to be therein the rightful and natural purifiers. Let them first make the home sweet and pure, and the streams which flow therefrom will sweeten and purify all the rest.

As between the power of the ballot and this moral force exerted by women there can not be an instant's doubt as to the choice. In natural refinement and elevation of character, the ideal woman stands a step above the ideal man. If she descends from this fortunate position to take part in the coarse scramble for material power, what chance will she have as against man's aggressive forces; and what can she possibly gain that she can not win more directly, more effectually, and with far more dignity and glory to herself by the exercise of her own womanly prerogatives? She has, under God, the formation and rearing of men in her own hands.

If they do not turn out in the end to be men who respect woman, who will protect and defend her in the exercise of every one of her God-given rights, it is because she has failed in her duty toward them; has not been taught to comprehend her own power and to use it to its best ends. For women to seek to control men by the power of suffrage is like David essaying the armor of Saul. What woman needs is her own sheepskin sling and her few smooth pebbles from the bed of the brook, and then let her go forth in the name of the Lord God of Hosts, and a victory as sure and decisive as that of the shepherd of Israel awaits her.

Again, in chapter 4, entitled "The Power of the Home," the author says, in substance: It is, perhaps, of minor consequence that women should have felt themselves emancipated from buttons and bread making; but that they should have learned to look in the least degree slightly upon the great duties of women as lovers of husbands, as lovers of children, as the fountain and source of what is highest and purest and holiest, and not less of what is homely and comfortable and satisfying in the home, is a serious misfortune. Women can hardly be said to have lost, perhaps what they have so rarely in any age generally attained, that dignity which knows how to command, united with a sweetness which seems all the while to be complying, the power, supple and strong, which rescues the character of the ideal woman from the charge of weakness, and at the same time exhibits its utmost of grace and fascination.

But that of late years the gift has not been cultivated, has not, in fact, thrown out such natural off-shoots as gave grace and glory to some earlier social epochs, must be evident, it would seem, to any thoughtful observer.

If, instead of trying to grasp more material power, women would pursue those studies and investigations which tend to make them familiar with what science teaches concerning the influence of the mother and the home upon the child; of how completely the Creator in giving the genesis of the human race into the hands of woman has made her not only capable of, but responsible for, the regeneration of the world; if they would reflect that nature by making man the bond slave of his passions has put the lever into the hands of woman by which she can control him, and if they would learn to use these powers, not as bad women do for vile and selfish ends, but as the mothers of the race ought, for pure, holy, and redemptive purposes, then would the sphere of women be enlarged to some purpose; the atmosphere of the home would be purified and vitalized, and the work of redeeming man from his vices would be hopefully begun.

The following thoughts are also from the same source: Is this emancipation of woman, if that is the proper phrase for it, a final end, or only the means to an end? Are women to be as the outcome of it emancipated from their world-old sphere of marriage and motherhood, and control of the moral and spiritual destinies of the race, or are they to be emancipated, in order to the proper fulfillment of these functions? It would seem that most of the advanced women of the day would answer the first of these questions affirmatively. Women, I think it has been authoritatively stated, are to be emancipated in order that they may become fully developed human beings, something broader and stronger, something higher and finer, more delicate, more æsthetic, more generally rarefied and sublimated than the old-fashioned type of womanhood, the wife and the mother.

And the result of the woman movement seems more or less in a line thus far with this theoretic aim. Of advanced women a less proportion are inclined to marry than of the old-fashioned type; of those who do marry a great proportion are restless in marriage bonds or seek release from them, while of those who do remain in married life many bear no children, and few, indeed, become mothers of large families. The woman's vitality is concentrated in the brain and fructifies more in intellectual than in physical forms.

Now, women who do not marry are one of two things; either they belong to a class which we shrink from naming or they become old maids.

An old maid may be in herself a very useful and commendable person and a valuable member of society; many are all this. But she has still this sad drawback, she can not perpetuate herself; and since all history and observation go to prove that the great final end of creation, whatever it may be, can only be achieved through the perpetuity and increasing progress of the race, it follows that unmarried woman is not the most necessary, the indispensable type of woman. If there were no other class of females left upon the earth but the women who do not bear children, then the world would be a failure, creation would be nonplussed.

If, then, the movement for the emancipation of woman has for its final end the making of never so fine a quality, never so sublimated a sort of non-child-bearing women, it is an absurdity upon the face of it.

From the standpoint of the Chimney Corner it appears that too many even of the most gifted and liberal-minded of the leaders in the woman's rights movement have not yet discovered this flaw in their logic. They seek to individualize women, not seeing, apparently, that individualized women, old maids, and individualized men, old bachelors, though they may be useful in certain minor ways, are, after all, to speak with the relentlessness of science, fragmentary and abortive, so far as the great scheme of the universe is concerned, and often become, in addition, seriously detrimental to the right progress of society. The man and woman united in marriage form the unit of the race; they alone rightly wield the self-perpetuating power upon which all human progress depends; without which the race itself must perish, the universe become null.

Reaching this point of the argument, it becomes evident that while the development of the individual man or individual woman is no doubt of great importance, since, as Margaret Fuller has justly said, "there must be units before there can be union," it is chiefly so because of their relation to each other. Their character should be developed with a view to their future union with each other, and not to be independent of it. When the leaders of the woman's movement fully realize this, and shape their course accordingly, they will have made a great advance both in the value of their work and its claim upon public sympathy. Moreover, they will have reached a point from which it will be possible for them to investigate reform and idealize the relations existing between men and women.

Mr. President, it is no part of my purpose in any manner whatever to speak disrespectfully of the large number of intelligent ladies, sometimes called strong-minded, who are constantly going before the public, agitating this question of female suffrage. While some of them may, as is frequently charged, be courting notoriety, I have no doubt they are generally earnestly engaged in a work which, in their opinion, would better their condition and would do no injury to society.

In all this, however, I believe they are mistaken.

I think the mental and physical structure of the sexes, of itself, sufficiently demonstrates the fact that the sterner, more laborious, and more difficult duties of society are to be performed by the male sex; while the more delicate duties of life, which require less physical strength, and the proper training of youth, with the proper discharge of domestic duties, belong to the female sex. Nature has so arranged it that the male sex can not attend properly to the duties assigned by the law of nature to the female sex, and that the female sex can not discharge the more rigorous duties required of the male sex.

This movement is an attempt to reverse the very laws of our being, and to drag woman into an arena for which she is not suited, and to devolve upon her onerous duties which the Creator never intended that she should perform.

While the husband discharges the laborious and fatiguing duties of important official positions, and conducts political campaigns, and discharges the duties connected with the ballot-box, or while he bears arms in time of war, or discharges executive or judicial duties, or the duties of jurymen, requiring close confinement and many times great mental fatigue; or while the husband in a different sphere of life discharges the laborious duties of the plantation, the workshop, or the machine shop, it devolves upon the wife to attend to the duties connected with home life, to care for infant children, and to train carefully and properly those who in the youthful period are further advanced towards maturity.

The woman with the infant at the breast is in no condition to plow on the farm, labor hard in the workshop, discharge the duties of a jurymen, conduct causes as an advocate in court, preside in important cases as a judge, command armies as a general, or bear arms as a private. These duties, and others of like character, belong to the male sex; while the more important duties of home, to which I have already referred, devolve upon the female sex. We can neither reverse the physical nor the moral laws of our nature, and as this movement is an attempt to reverse these laws, and to devolve upon the female sex important and laborious duties for which they are not by nature physically competent, I am not prepared to support this bill.

My opinion is that a very large majority of the American people, yes, a large majority of the female sex, oppose it, and that they act wisely in doing so. I therefore protest against its passage.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I do not feel satisfied when a measure so important to the people of this

country and to humanity is about to be submitted to a vote of the Senate to remain wholly silent.

The pending question is upon the adoption of a joint resolution in the usual form submitting to the legislatures of the several States of the Union for their ratification an additional article as an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which is as follows:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article.

Fortunately for the perpetuity of our institutions and the prosperity of the people, the Federal Constitution contains a provision for its own amendment. The framers of that instrument foresaw that time and experience, the growth of the country and the consequent expansion of the Government, would develop the necessity for changes in it, and they therefore wisely provided in Article V as follows:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress.

Under this provision, at the first session of the First Congress, ten amendments were submitted to the Legislatures of the several States, in due time ratified by the constitutional number of States, and became a part of the Constitution. Since then there have been added to the Constitution by the same process five different articles.

To secure an amendment to the Constitution under this article requires the concurrent action of two-thirds of both branches of Congress and the affirmative action of three-fourths of the States. Of course Congress can refuse to submit a proposed amendment to the Legislatures of the several States, no matter how general the demand for such submission may be, but I am inclined to believe with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], in the proposition submitted by him in a speech he made early in the present session upon the pending resolution, that the question as to whether this resolution shall be submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for ratification does not involve the right or policy of the proposed amendment.

I am also inclined to believe with him that should the demand by the people for the submission by Congress to the Legislatures of the several States of a proposed amendment become general it would be the duty of the Congress to submit such amendment irrespective of the individual views of the members of Congress, and thus give the people through their Legislative Assemblies power to pass upon the question as to whether or not the Constitution should be amended. At all events, for myself, I should not hesitate to vote to submit for ratification by the Legislatures of the several States an amendment to the Constitution although opposed to it if I thought the demand for it justified such a course.

But I shall vote for the pending joint resolution because I am in favor of the proposed amendment. I have been for many years convinced that the demand made by women for the right of suffrage is just, and that of all the distinctions which have been made between citizens in the laws which confer or regulate suffrage the distinction of sex is the least defensible.

I am not going to discuss the question at length at this time. The arguments for and against woman suffrage have been often stated in this Chamber, and are pretty fully set forth in the majority and minority reports of the Senate committee upon the pending joint resolution. The arguments in its favor were fully stated by the senior Senator from New Hampshire in his able speech upon the question before alluded to, and now the objections to it have been forcibly and elaborately presented by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. I could not expect by anything I could say to change a single vote in this body, and the public is already fully informed upon the question, as the arguments in favor of woman suffrage have been voiced in every hamlet in the land with great ability. No question in this country has been more ably discussed than this has been by the women themselves.

I do not think a single objection which is made to woman suffrage is tenable. No one will contend but that women have sufficient capacity to vote intelligently.

Sir, sacred and profane history is full of the records of great deeds by women. They have ruled kingdoms, and, my friend from Georgia to the contrary notwithstanding, they have commanded armies. They have excelled in statecraft, they have shone in literature, and, rising superior to their environments and breaking the shackles with which custom and tyranny have bound them, they have stood side by side with men in the fields of the arts and the sciences.

If it were a fact that woman is intellectually inferior to man, which I do not admit, still that would be no reason why she should not be permitted to participate in the formation and control of the Government to which she owes allegiance. If we are to have as a test for the exercise of the right of suffrage a qualification based upon intelligence, let it be applied to women and to men alike. If it be admitted that suffrage is a right, that is the end of controversy; there can no longer be

any argument made against woman suffrage, because, if it is her right, then, if there were but one poor woman in all the United States demanding the right of suffrage, it would be tyranny to refuse the demand.

But our friends say that suffrage is not a right; that it is a matter of grace only; that it is a privilege which is conferred upon or withheld from individual members of society by society at pleasure. Society as here used means man's government, and the proposition assumes the fact that men have a right to institute and control governments for themselves and for women. I admit that in the governments of the world, past and present, men as a rule have assumed to be the ruling classes; that they have instituted governments from participation in which they have excluded women; that they have made laws for themselves and for women, and as a rule have themselves administered them; but that the provisions conferring or regulating suffrage in the constitutions and laws of governments so constituted determined the question of the right of suffrage can not be maintained.

Let us suppose, if we can, a community separated from all other communities, having no organized government, owing no allegiance to any existing governments, without any knowledge of the character of present or past governments, so that when they come to form a government for themselves they can do so free from the bias or prejudice of custom or education, composed of an equal number of men and women, having equal property rights to be defined and to be protected by law. When such community came to institute a government—and it would have an undoubted right to institute a government for itself, and the instinct of self-preservation would soon lead them to do so—will my friend from Georgia tell me by what right, human or divine, the male portion of that community could exclude the female portion, although equal in number and having equal property rights with the men, from participation in the formation of such government and in the enactment of laws for the government of the community? I understand the Senator, if he should answer, would say that he believes the Author of our existence, the Ruler of the universe, has given different spheres to man and woman. Admit that; and still neither in nature nor in the revealed will of God do I find anything to lead me to believe that the Creator did not intend that a woman should exercise the right of suffrage.

During the consideration by this body at the last session of the bill to admit Washington Territory into the Union, referring to the fact that in that Territory woman had been enfranchised, I briefly submitted my views on this subject, which I ask the Secretary to read, so that it may be incorporated in my remarks.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. President, there is another matter which I consider pertinent to this discussion, and of too much importance to be left entirely unnoticed on this occasion. It is something new in our political history. It is full of hope for the women of this country and of the world, and full of promise for the future of republican institutions. I refer to the fact that in Washington Territory the right of suffrage has been extended to women of proper age, and that the delegates to the constitutional convention to be held under the provisions of this bill, should it become a law, will, under existing laws of the Territory, be elected by its citizens without distinction as to sex, and the constitution to be submitted to the people will be passed upon in like manner.

I do not intend to discuss the question of woman suffrage upon this occasion, and I refer to it mainly for the purpose of directing attention to the advanced position which the people of this Territory have taken upon this question. I do not believe the proposition so often asserted that suffrage is a political privilege only, and not a natural right. It is regulated by the constitution and laws of a State I grant, but it needs no argument, it appears to me, to show that a constitution and laws adopted and enacted by a fragment of the whole body of the people, but binding alike on all, is a usurpation of the powers of government.

Government is but organized society. Whatever its form, it has its origin in the necessities of mankind and is indispensable for the maintenance of civilized society. It is essential to every government that it should represent the supreme power of the State, and be capable of subjecting the will of its individual citizens to its authority. Such a government can only derive its just powers from the consent of the governed, and can be established only under a fundamental law which is self-imposed. Every citizen of suitable age and discretion who is to be subject to such a government has, in my judgment, a natural right to participate in its formation. It is a significant fact that should Congress pass this bill and authorize the people of Washington Territory to frame a State constitution and organize a State government, the fundamental law of the State will be made by all the citizens of the State to be subject to it, and not by one-half of them. And we shall witness the spectacle of a State government founded in accordance with the principles of equality, and have a State at last with a truly republican form of government.

The fathers of the Republic enunciated the doctrine "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It is strange that any one in this enlightened age should be found to contend that this declaration is true only of men, and that a man is endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights not possessed by a woman. The lamented Lincoln immortalized the expression that ours is a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and yet it is far from that. There can be no government by the people where one-half of them are allowed no voice in its organization and control. I regard the struggle going on in this country and elsewhere for the enfranchisement of women as but a continuation of the great struggle for human liberty which has, from the earliest dawn of authentic history, convulsed nations, rent kingdoms, and drenched battlefields with human blood. I look upon the victories which have been achieved in the cause of woman's enfranchisement in Washington Territory and elsewhere as the crowning victories of all which have been won in the long-continued, still-continuing contest between liberty and oppression, and as destined to exert a greater influence upon the human race than any achieved upon the battlefield in ancient or modern times.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, the movement for woman suffrage has passed the stage of ridicule. The pending joint resolution may not pass

during this Congress, but the time is not far distant when in every State of the Union and in every Territory women will be admitted to an equal voice in the government, and that will be done whether the Federal Constitution is amended or not. The first convention demanding suffrage for women was held at Seneca Falls, in the State of New York, in 1848. To-day in three of the Territories of the Union women enjoy full suffrage, in a large number of States and Territories they are entitled to vote at school meetings, and in all the States and Territories there is a growing sentiment in favor of this measure which will soon compel respectful consideration by the law-making power.

No measure in this country involving such radical changes in our institutions and fraught with so great consequences to this country and to humanity has made such progress as the movement for woman suffrage. Denunciation will not much longer answer for arguments by the opponents of this measure. The portrayal of the evils to flow from woman suffrage such as we have heard pictured to-day by the Senator from Georgia, the loss of harmony between husband and wife, and the consequent instability of the marriage relation, the neglect of husband and children by wives and mothers for the performance of their political duties, in short the incapacitating of women for wives and mothers and companions, will not much longer serve to frighten the timid. Proof is better than theory. The experiment has been tried and the predicted evils to flow from it have not followed. On the contrary, if we can believe the almost universal testimony, everywhere where it has been tried it has been followed by the most beneficial results.

In Washington Territory, since woman was enfranchised, there have been two elections. At the first there were 8,368 votes cast by women out of a total vote of 34,000 and over. At the second election, which was held in November last, out of 48,000 votes cast in the Territory, 12,000 votes were cast by women. The opponents of female suffrage are silenced there. The Territorial conventions of both parties have resolved in favor of woman suffrage, and there is not a proposition, so far as I know in all that Territory, to repeal the law conferring suffrage upon woman.

I desire also to inform my friend from Georgia that since women were enfranchised in Washington Territory nature has continued in her wonted courses. The sun rises and sets; there is seed-time and harvest; seasons come and go. The population has increased with the usual regularity and rapidity. Marriages have been quite as frequent, and divorces have been no more so. Women have not lost their influence for good upon society, but men have been elevated and refined. If we are to believe the testimony which comes from lawyers, physicians, ministers of the gospel, merchants, mechanics, farmers, and laboring men, the united testimony of the entire people of the Territory, the results of woman suffrage there have been all that could be desired by its friends. Some of the results in that Territory have been seen in making the polls quiet and orderly, in awaking a new interest in educational questions and in questions of moral reform, in securing the passage of beneficial laws and the proper enforcement of them; and, as I have said before, in elevating men, and that without injury to the women.

Mr. EUSTIS. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator can ask me a question, if he chooses.

Mr. EUSTIS. If it be right and proper to confer the right of suffrage on women, I ask the Senator whether he does not think that women ought to be required to serve on juries?

Mr. DOLPH. I can answer that very readily. It does not necessarily follow that because a woman is permitted to vote and thus have a voice in making the laws by which she is to be governed and by which her property rights are to be determined, she must perform such duty as service upon a jury. But I will inform the Senator that in Washington Territory she does serve upon juries, and with great satisfaction to the judges of the courts and to all parties who desire to see an honest and efficient administration of law.

Mr. EUSTIS. I was aware of the fact that women are required to serve on juries in Washington Territory because they are allowed to vote. I understand that under all State laws these duties are considered correlative. Now, I ask the Senator whether he thinks it is a decent spectacle to take a mother away from her nursing infant and lock her up all night to sit on a jury?

Mr. DOLPH. I intended to say before I reached this point of being interrogated that I not only do not believe that there is a single argument against woman suffrage that is tenable, and I may be prejudiced in the matter, but that there is not a single one that is really worthy of any serious consideration. The Senator from Louisiana is a lawyer, and he knows very well that under such circumstances, a mother with a nursing infant, that fact being made known to the court would be excused; that would be a sufficient excuse. He knows himself, and he has seen it done a hundred times, that for trivial excuses compared to that men have been excused from service on a jury.

Mr. EUSTIS. I will ask the Senator whether he knows that under the laws of Washington Territory that is a legal excuse from serving on a jury?

Mr. DOLPH. I am not prepared to state that it is; but there is no question in the world but that any judge, that fact being made known, would excuse a woman from attendance upon a jury. No special authority would be required. I will state further that I have not learned

that there has been any serious objection on the part of any woman summoned for jury service in that Territory to perform that duty. I have not learned that it has worked to the disadvantage of any family in the Territory; but I do know that the judges of the courts have taken especial pains to commend the women who have been called to serve upon juries for the manner in which they have discharged their duty.

I wish to say further that there is no connection whatever between jury service and the right of suffrage. The question as to who shall perform jury service, the question as to who shall perform military service, the question as to who shall perform civil official duty in a government is certainly a matter to be regulated by the community itself; but the question of the right to participate in the formation of a government which controls the life and the property and the destinies of its citizens, I contend is a question of right that goes back of these mere regulations for the protection of property and the punishment of offenses under the laws. It is a matter of right which it is tyranny to refuse to any citizen demanding it.

Now, Mr. President, I shall close by saying: God speed the day when not only in all the States of the Union and in all the Territories, but everywhere, woman shall stand before the law freed from the last shackle which has been riveted upon her by tyranny and the last disability which has been imposed upon her by ignorance, not only in respect to the right of suffrage, but in every other respect the peer and equal of her brother, man.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator give way to enable the Chair to lay before the Senate some executive communications?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

NICARAGUA SHIP-CANAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of the 21st ultimo, calling for certain correspondence touching the construction of a ship-canal through Nicaragua, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State on the subject, with accompanying papers.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 25, 1887.

NEBRASKA SCHOOL LANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in reply to resolution of January 5, 1887, a report of the Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office as to the grant of school lands by way of indemnity to the State of Nebraska; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

NEW MEXICO LAND CLAIMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting supplementary report of the surveyor-general for New Mexico on the private land claim known as the Petaca grant, No. 15; which was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting supplementary report of the surveyor-general for New Mexico on the private land claim known as Encinas tract, No. 55, José Luis Valdez *et al.*, claimants; which was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. VEST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2288) to incorporate the Atlantic and Pacific Ship-Railway Company, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

REAL ESTATE TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] agrees to indulge me a moment while I make a motion.

The bill (S. 495) changing the name of the Real Estate Title Insurance Company of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was during the last session of Congress referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported adversely, and postponed indefinitely. The friends of the bill desire that that vote be now reconsidered, and that the bill be reinstated on the Calendar and again referred to the committee. I move the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BLAIR. What is the Senator's desire—not to displace the existing order?

Mr. BROWN. Not at all. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] yielded to me a moment to make this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not wish to object to the Senator entering a motion to reconsider, but I do not wish the pending order to be displaced, and I object to anything which would have that consequence.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia can do this by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN. I only want this matter referred back to the committee.

Mr. BLAIR. I reserve the right to object if any debate arises.

Mr. BROWN. I do not desire to displace the pending order. I simply desire the reconsideration of the vote indefinitely postponing the bill, so that it may be referred back to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill referred to was indefinitely postponed? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BROWN. Now I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that motion? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, any measure of legislation which affects popular government based on the will of the people as expressed through their suffrage is not only important but vitally so. If this Government, which is based on the intelligence of the people, shall ever be destroyed it will be by injudicious, immature, or corrupt suffrage. If the ship of state launched by our fathers shall ever be destroyed, it will be by striking the rock of universal, unprepared suffrage. Suffrage once given can never be taken away. Legislatures and conventions may do everything else; they never can do that. When any particular class or portion of the community is once invested with this privilege it is fixed, accomplished, and eternal.

The Senator who last spoke on this question refers to the successful experiment in regard to woman-suffrage in the Territories of Wyoming and Washington. Mr. President, it is not upon the plains of the sparsely-settled Territories of the West that woman suffrage can be tested. Suffrage in the rural districts and sparsely settled regions of this country must from the very nature of things remain pure when corrupt everywhere else. The danger of corrupt suffrage is in the cities, and those masses of population to which civilization tends everywhere in all history. Whilst the country has been pure and patriotic, the cities have been the first cancers to appear upon the body-politic in all ages of the world.

Wyoming Territory! Washington Territory! Where are their large cities? Where are the localities in those Territories where the strain upon popular government must come? The Senator from New Hampshire, who is so conspicuous in this movement, appalled the country some months since by his ghastly array of illiteracy in the Southern States. He proposes that \$77,000,000 of the people's money be taken in order to strike down the great foe to republican government, illiteracy. How was that illiteracy brought upon this country? It was by giving the suffrage to unprepared voters. It is not my purpose to go back into the past and make any partisan or sectional appeal, but it is a fact known to every intelligent man that in one single act the right of suffrage was given without preparation to hundreds of thousands of voters who to-day can scarcely read. That Senator proposes now to double, and more than double, that illiteracy. He proposes to give the negro women of the South this right of suffrage, utterly unprepared as they are for it.

In a convention some two years and a half ago in the city of Louisville an intelligent negro from the South said the negro men could not vote the Democratic ticket because the women would not live with them if they did. The negro men go out in the hotels and upon the railroad cars. They go to the cities and by attrition they wear away the prejudice of race; but the women remain at home, and their emotional natures aggregate and compound the race-prejudice, and when suffrage is given them what must be the result?

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak of the inconveniences, for they are nothing more, of woman suffrage. I trust that as a gentleman I respect the feelings of the ladies and their advocates. I am not here to ridicule. My purpose only is to use legitimate argument as to a movement which commands respectful consideration, if for no other reason than because it comes from women. But it is impossible to divest ourselves of a certain degree of sentiment when considering this question.

I pity the man who can consider any question affecting the influence of woman with the cold, dry logic of business. What man can, without aversion, turn from the blessed memory of that dear old grandmother, or the gentle words and caressing hand of that blessed mother gone to the unknown world, to face in its stead the idea of a female justice of the peace or township constable? For my part I want when I go to my home—when I turn from the arena where man contends with man for what we call the prizes of this paltry world—I want to go back, not to be received in the masculine embrace of some female ward politician, but to the earnest, loving look and touch of a true woman.

I want to go back to the jurisdiction of the wife, the mother; and instead of a lecture upon finance or the tariff, or upon the construction of the Constitution, I want those blessed, loving details of domestic life and domestic love.

I have said I would not speak of the inconveniences to arise from woman suffrage—I care not—whether the mother is called upon to decide as a juryman or jury-woman rights of property or rights of life, whilst her baby is "mewling and puking" in solitary confinement at home. There are other considerations more important, and one of them to my mind is insuperable. I speak now respecting women as a sex. I believe that they are better than men, but I do not believe they are adapted to the political work of this world. I do not believe that the Great Intelligence ever intended them to invade the sphere of work given to men, tearing down and destroying all the best influences for which God has intended them.

The great evil in this country to-day is in emotional suffrage. The great danger to-day is in excitable suffrage. If the voters of this country could think always coolly, and if they could deliberate, if they could go by judgment and not by passion, our institutions would survive forever, eternal as the foundations of the continent itself; but massed together, subject to the excitements of mobs and of these terrible political contests that come upon us from year to year under the autonomy of our Government, what would be the result if suffrage were given to the women of the United States?

Women are essentially emotional. It is no disparagement to them they are so. It is no more insulting to say that women are emotional than to say that they are delicately constructed physically and unfitted to become soldiers or workmen under the sterner, harder pursuits of life.

What we want in this country is to avoid emotional suffrage, and what we need is to put more logic into public affairs and less feeling. There are spheres in which feeling should be paramount. There are kingdoms in which the heart should reign supreme. That kingdom belongs to woman. The realm of sentiment, the realm of love, the realm of the gentler and the holier and kindlier attributes that make the name of wife, mother, and sister next to that of God himself.

I would not, and I say it deliberately, degrade woman by giving her the right of suffrage. I mean the word in its full signification, because I believe that woman as she is to-day, the queen of home and of hearts, is above the political collisions of this world, and should always be kept above them.

Sir, if it be said to us that this is a natural right belonging to women, I deny it. The right of suffrage is one to be determined by expediency and by policy, and given by the State to whom it pleases. It is not a natural right; it is a right that comes from the state.

It is claimed that if the suffrage be given to women it is to protect them. Protect them from whom? The brute that would invade their rights would coerce the suffrage of his wife, or sister, or mother as he would wring from her the hard earnings of her toil to gratify his own beastly appetites and passions.

It is said that the suffrage is to be given to enlarge the sphere of woman's influence. Mr. President, it would destroy her influence. It would take her down from that pedestal where she is to-day, influencing as a mother the minds of her offspring, influencing by her gentle and kindly caress the action of her husband toward the good and pure.

But I rise not to discuss this question, but to discharge a request. I know that when a man attacks this claim for woman suffrage he is sneered at and ridiculed as afraid to meet women in the contests for political honor and supremacy. If so, I oppose to the request of these ladies the arguments of their own sex; but first, I ask the Secretary to read a paper which has been sent to me with a request that I place it before the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, respectfully remonstrate against the further extension of suffrage to women.

H. P. Kidder.	Rev. J. P. Bodfish, chan-	Henry Parkman.
O. W. Peabody.	cellor, Cathedral Holy	W. H. Sayward.
R. M. Morse, jr.	Cross.	Charles A. Cummings.
Charles A. Welch.	Rt. Rev. B. H. Paddock,	Hon. S. C. Cobb.
Augustus Lowell.	bishop of Massachu-	Sidney Bartlett.
Francis Parkman, LL.D.	setts.	John C. Gray.
Thomas Bailey Aldrich.	Rev. Henry M. Dexter.	Louis Brandeis.
Edmund Dwight.	Rev. H. Brooke Herford.	Hon. George G. Crocker.
Charles H. Dalton.	Rev. O. B. Frothingham.	John Bartlett.
Henry Lee.	Rev. Ellis Wendell.	John Fiske.
W. Endicott, jr.	Rev. Geo. F. Staunton.	J. T. G. Nichols, M. D.
Samuel Wells.	Rev. A. H. Heath.	C. E. Vaughan, M. D.
Hon. John Lowell.	Rev. W. H. Dowden.	John Homans, M. D.
William G. Russell.	Rev. J. B. Seabury.	Chauncey Smith.
John C. Ropes.	Rev. C. Woodworth.	Benj. Vaughan.
Robert D. Smith.	Rev. Leonard K. Storrs.	Charles F. Walcott.
George A. Gardner.	Rev. Howard N. Brown.	J. B. Warner.
F. Haven, jr.	Rev. Edward J. Young.	Walter Dean.
W. Powell Mason.	Rev. Andrew P. Peabody.	S. H. Kennard.
B. F. Stevens.	Rev. George Z. Gray.	E. Whitney.
Charles Marsh.	Rev. William Lawrence.	W. P. P. Longfellow.
Charles W. Eliot, presi-	Rev. E. H. Hall.	H. O. Houghton.
dent Harvard Univer-	Rev. Nicholas Hoppin.	J. M. Spelman.
sity.	Rev. David G. Haskins.	J. C. Dodge.
Prof. C. F. Dunbar.	Rev. L. S. Crawford.	E. S. Dixwell.

Prof. J. P. Cook.
 Prof. J. Lovering.
 Prof. W. W. Goodwin.
 Prof. Francis Bowen.
 Prof. Wolcott Gibbs.
 Prof. F. J. Child.
 Prof. John Trowbridge.
 Prof. G. L. Goodale.
 Prof. J. B. Greenough.
 Prof. H. W. Torrey.
 Prof. J. H. Thayer.
 Prof. E. W. Gurney.
 Justin Winsor.
 H. W. Paine.
 Hon. W. E. Russell.
 James C. Fiske.
 George Putnam.
 C. A. Curtis.
 T. Jefferson Coolidge.
 T. K. Lothrop.
 Augustus P. Loring.
 W. F. Draper.
 Francis Draper.
 Francis Brooks.
 Edward Brooks.
 J. Randolph Coolidge.
 J. Elliot Cabot.
 Fred. Law Olmstead.
 Charles S. Sargent.
 C. A. Richardson.
 Charles F. Shinn.
 Edward Bangs.
 J. G. Freeman.
 H. H. Coolidge.
 David Hunt.
 Alfred D. Hurd.
 Edward I. Brown.
 W. G. Saltonstall.
 Thomas Weston, jr.

Rev. J. I. T. Coolidge.
 Rev. Henry A. Hazen.
 Rev. F. H. Hedge.
 Rev. H. A. Parker.
 Rev. Asa Bullard.
 Rev. Alexander McKenzie.
 Rev. J. F. Spaulding.
 Rev. S. K. Lothrop.
 Rev. E. Osborne, S. S. J. E.
 Rev. Leighton Parks.
 Rev. H. W. Foote.
 Rev. Morton Dexter.
 Rev. David H. Brewer.
 Rev. Judson Smith.
 Rev. L. W. Shearman.
 Rev. Charles F. Dole.
 Rev. George M. Boynton.
 Rev. D. W. Waldron.
 Rev. John A. Hamilton.
 Rev. Isaac P. Langworthy.
 Rev. E. K. Alden.
 Rev. E. E. Strong.
 Rev. M. D. Bisbee.
 Rev. Oliver S. Dean.
 Richard M. Hodges, M. D.
 Henry J. Bigelow, M. D.
 Charles D. Homans, M. D.
 George H. Lyman, M. D.
 John Dixwell, M. D.
 R. M. Pulsifer.
 Edward L. Beard.
 Solomon Lincoln.
 G. B. Haskell.
 John Boyle O'Reilly.
 Arlo Bates.
 Horace B. Chandler.
 George O. Shattuck.
 Hon. Alex. H. Rice.
 Henry Cabot Lodge.

L. S. Jones.
 G. W. C. Noble.
 Charles Theodore Russell.
 Clement L. Smith.
 Ezra Farnsworth.
 H. H. Edes.
 Hon. R. R. Bishop.
 H. H. Sprague.
 Charles R. Codman.
 Darwin E. Ware.
 Arthur E. Thayer.
 C. F. Choate.
 Richard H. Dana.
 O. D. Forbes.
 Edward L. Geddings.
 William V. Hutchings.
 John L. Gardner.
 L. M. Sargent.
 H. L. Hallatt.
 E. P. Brown.
 W. A. Tower.
 J. Edwards.
 G. H. Campbell.
 Samuel Carr, jr.
 Francis Peabody, jr.
 Harcourt Amory.
 F. E. Parker.
 A. S. Wheeler.
 Jacob C. Rogers.
 S. G. Snelling.
 C. H. Barker.
 J. H. Walker.
 Forrest E. Barker.
 John D. Washburn.
 Martin Brimmer.
 Fred L. Ames.
 Hon. A. P. Martin.

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me, those names sounded very much like the names of men.

Mr. VEST. They are men's names. I did not say that the petition was signed by ladies. I referred to the papers in my hand, which I shall proceed to lay before the Senate.

I hold in my hand an argument against woman suffrage by a lady very well known in the United States, and well known to the Senators from Massachusetts, a lady whose philanthropy, whose exertions in behalf of the oppressed and poor and afflicted have given her a national reputation. I refer to Mrs. Clara T. Leonard, the wife of a distinguished lawyer, and whose words of themselves will command the attention of the public.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

[Letter from Mrs. Clara T. Leonard.]

The following letter was read by Thornton K. Lothrop, esq., at the hearing before the Legislative committee on woman suffrage, January 29, 1884:

The principal reasons assigned for giving suffrage to women are these: That the right to vote is a natural and inherent right of which women are deprived by the tyranny of men.

That the fact that the majority of women do not wish for the right or privilege to vote is not a reason for depriving the minority of an inborn right.

That women are taxed but not represented, contrary to the principles of free government.

That society would gain by the participation of women in government, because women are purer and more conscientious than men, and especially that the cause of temperance would be promoted by women's votes.

Those women who are averse to female suffrage hold differing opinions on all these points, and are entitled to be heard fairly and without unjust reproach and contempt on the part of "suffragists," so called.

The right to vote is not an inherent right, but, like the right to hold land, is conferred upon individuals by general consent, with certain limitations, and for the general good of all.

It is as true to say that the earth was made for all its inhabitants, and that no man has a right to appropriate a portion of its surface, as to say that all persons have a right to participate in government. Many persons can be found to hold both these opinions. Experience has proved that the general good is promoted by ownership of the soil, with the resultant inducement to its improvement.

Voting is simply a mathematical test of strength. Uncivilized nations strive for mastery by physical combat, thus wasting life and resources. Enlightened societies agree to determine the relative strength of opposing parties by actual count. God has made women weaker than men, incapable of taking part in battles, indisposed to make riot and political disturbance.

The vote which, in the hand of a man, is a "possible bayonet," would not, when thrown by a woman, represent any physical power to enforce her will. If all the women in the State voted in one way, and all the men in the opposite one, the women, even if in the majority, would not carry the day, because the vote would not be an estimate of material strength and the power to enforce the will of the majority. When one considers the strong passions and conflicts excited in elections, it is vain to suppose that the really stronger would yield to the weaker party.

It is no more unjust to deprive women of the ballot than to deprive minors, who outnumber those above the age of majority, and who might well claim, many of them, to be as well able to decide political questions as their elders.

If the majority of women are either not desirous to vote or are strongly opposed to voting, the minority should yield in this, as they are obliged to do in all other public matters. In fact, they will be obliged to yield, so long as the present state of opinion exists among women in general, for legislators will naturally consult the wishes of the women of their own families and neighborhood, and be governed by them. There can be no doubt that in this State, where women are highly respected and have great influence, the ballot would be readily granted to them by men, if they desired it, or generally approved of woman suffrage. Women are taxed, it is true; so are minors, without the ballot; it is untrue, to say that either class is not represented. The thousand ties of relationship and friendship cause the identity of interest between the sexes. What is good in a community for men, is good also for their wives and sisters, daughters and friends. The laws of Massachusetts discriminate much in favor of women, by exempting unmarried women of small estate from taxation; by

allowing women, and not men, to acquire a settlement without paying a tax; by compelling husbands to support their wives, but exempting the wife, even when rich, from supporting an indigent husband; by making men liable for debts of wives, and not vice versa. In the days of the American Revolution, the first cause of complaint was, that a whole people were taxed but not represented.

To-day there is not a single interest of woman which is not shared and defended by men, not a subject in which she takes an intelligent interest in which she cannot exert an influence in the community proportional to her character and ability. It is because the men who govern live not in a remote country, with separate interests, but in the closest relations of family and neighborhood, and bound by the tenderest ties to the other sex, who are fully and well represented by relations, friends, and neighbors in every locality. That women are purer and more conscientious than men, as a sex, is exceedingly doubtful when applied to politics. The faults of the sexes are different, according to their constitution and habits of life. Men are more violent and open in their misdeeds, but any person who knows human nature well and has examined it in its various phases knows that each sex is open to its peculiar temptation and sin; that the human heart is weak and prone to evil without distinction of sex.

It seems certain that, were women admitted to vote and to hold political office, all the intrigue, corruption, and selfishness displayed by men in political life would also be found among women. In the temperance cause we should gain little or nothing by admitting women to vote, for two reasons: first, that experience has proved that the strictest laws can not be enforced if a great number of people determine to drink liquor; secondly, because among women voters we should find in our cities thousands of foreign birth who habitually drink beer and spirits daily without intoxication, and who regard license or prohibitory laws as an infringement of their liberty. It has been said that municipal suffrage for women in England has proved a political success. Even if this is true, it offers no parallel to the condition of things in our own cities. First, because there is in England a property qualification required to vote, which excludes the more ignorant and irresponsible classes, and makes women voters few and generally intelligent; secondly, because England is an old, conservative country, with much emigration and but little immigration.

Here is a constant influx of foreigners: illiterate, without love of our country or interest in, or knowledge of, the history of our liberties, to whom, after a short residence, we give a full share in our government. The result begins to be alarming—enormous taxation, purchasable votes, demagogism,—all these alarm the more thoughtful, and we are not yet sure of the end. It is a wise thought that the possible bayonet or ruder weapon in the hands of our new citizens would be even worse than the ballot, and our safer course is to give the immigrants a stake and interest in the government. But when we learn that on an average one thousand immigrants per week landed at the port of Boston in the past calendar year, is it not well to consider carefully how we double, and more than double, the popular vote, with all its dangers and its ingredients of ignorance and irresponsibility. Last of all, it must be considered that the lives of men and women are essentially different.

One sex lives in public, in constant conflict with the world; the other sex must live chiefly in private and domestic life, or the race will be without homes and gradually die out. If nearly one-half of the male voters of our State forego their duty or privilege, as is the fact, what proportion of women would exercise the suffrage? Probably a very small one. The heaviest vote would be in the cities, as now, and the ignorant and unfit women would be the ready prey of the unscrupulous demagogue. Women do not hold a position inferior to men. In this land they have the softer side of life—the best of everything. There are, of course, exceptions—individuals—whose struggle in life is hard, whose husbands and fathers are tyrants instead of protectors; so there are bad wives, and men ruined and disheartened by selfish, idle women.

The best work that a woman can do for the purifying of politics is by her influence over men, by the wise training of her children, by her intelligent, unselfish counsel to husband, brother, or friend, by a thorough knowledge and discussion of the needs of her community. Many laws on the statute-books of our own and other States have been the work of women. More might be added.

It is the opinion of many of us that woman's power is greater without the ballot or possibility of office-holding for gain. When standing outside of politics she discusses great questions upon their merit. Much has been achieved by women in the anti-slavery cause, the temperance cause, the improvement of public and private charities, the reformation of criminals, all by intelligent discussion and influence upon men. Our legislators have been ready to listen to women and carry out their plans when well framed.

Women can do much useful public service upon boards of education, school committees, and public charities, and are beginning to do such work. It is of vital importance to the integrity of our charitable and educational administration that it be kept out of politics. Is it not well that we should have one sex who have no political ends to serve who can fill responsible positions of public trust? Voting alone can easily be exercised by women without rude contact, but to attain any political power women must affiliate themselves with men; because women will differ on public questions, must attend primary meetings and caucuses, will inevitably hold public office and strive for it; in short, women must enter the political arena. This result will be repulsive to a large portion of the sex, and would tend to make women unfeminine and combative, which would be a detriment to society.

It is well that men after the burden and heat of the day should return to homes where the quiet side of life is presented to them. In these peaceful New England homes of ours, great and noble men have been raised by wise and pious mothers, who instructed them, not in politics, but in those general principles of justice, integrity, and unselfishness which belong to and will insure statesmanship in the men who are true to them. Here is the stronghold of the sex, weakest in body, powerful for good or evil over the stronger one, whom women sway and govern, not by the ballot and by greater numbers, but by those gentle influences designed by the Creator to soften and subdue man's ruder nature.

CLARA T. LEONARD.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Missouri has alluded to me in connection with the name of this lady. Perhaps he will allow me to make an additional statement to that which I furnished him, in order that the statement about her may be complete.

All that the Senator from Missouri has said of the character and worth of Mrs. Leonard is true. I do not know her personally. Her husband is my respected personal friend, a lawyer of high standing and character. All that the Senator has said of her ability is proved better than by any other testimony, by the very able and powerful letter which has just been read. But Mrs. Leonard herself is the strongest refutation of her own argument.

Politics, the political arena, political influence, political action in this country consists, I suppose, in two things: one of them the being intrusted with the administration of public affairs, and second, having the vote counted in determining who shall be public servants and what public measures shall prevail in the commonwealth. Now, this

lady was intrusted for years with one of the most important public functions ever exercised by any human being in the commonwealth of Massachusetts. We have a board, called the board of lunacy and charity, which controls the large charities for which Massachusetts is famous and in many of which she was the first among civilized communities, for the care of the pauper and the insane and the criminal woman, and the friendless and the poor child. It is one of the most important things, except the education of youth, which Massachusetts does.

A little while ago a political campaign in Massachusetts turned upon a charge which her governor made against the people of the commonwealth in regard to the conduct of the great hospital at Tewksbury, where she was charged by her chief executive magistrate with making sale of human bodies, with cruelty to the poor and defenseless; and not only the whole country, but especially the whole people of Massachusetts, were stirred to the very depths of their souls by that accusation. Mrs. Clara T. Leonard, the writer of this letter, came forward and informed the people that she had been one of the board who had managed that institution for years, that she knew all about it through and through, that the accusation was false and a slander; and before her word and her character the charge of that distinguished governor went down and sunk into merited obscurity and ignominy.

Now, the question is whether the lady who can be intrusted with the charge of one of the most important departments of government, and whose judgment in regard to its character or proper administration is to be taken as gospel by the people where her reputation extends, is not fit to be trusted to have her vote counted when the question is who is to be the next person who is to be trusted with that administration. Mrs. Leonard's mistake is not in misunderstanding the nature either of woman or of man, which she understands perfectly; it is in misunderstanding the nature of politics, that is, the political arena; and this lady has been in the political arena for the last ten years of her life, one of the most important and potent forces therein.

It is true, as she says, that the wife and the mother educate the child and the man, and when the great function of the state, as we hold in our State and as is fast being held everywhere, is also the education of the child and the man, how does it degrade that wife and mother, whose important function it is to do this thing, to utter her voice and have her vote counted in regard to the methods and the policies by which that education shall be conducted?

Why, Mr. President, Mrs. Leonard says in that letter that woman, the wife and the maiden and the daughter, has no political ends to serve. If political ends be to desire office for the greed of gain, if political ends be to get an unjust power over other men, if political ends be to get political office by bribery or by mob violence or by voting through the shutter of a beer-house, that is true; but the persons who are in favor of this measure believe that those very things that Mrs. Leonard holds up as the proper ends in the life of women are political ends and nothing else; that the education of the child, that the preservation of the purity of the home, that the care for the insane and the idiot and the blind and the deaf and the ruined and deserted, are not only political ends but are the chief political ends for which this political body, the state, is created; and those who desire the help of women in the administration of the state desire it because of the ability which could write such a letter as that on the wrong side, and because the qualities of heart and brain which God has given to understand this class of political ends better than He has given it to the masculine heart and brain are needed for their administration.

I have no word of disrespect for Mrs. Leonard, but I say that, in spite of herself and her letter, her life and her character are the most abundant and ample refutation of the belief which she erroneously thinks she entertains. Nobody invites these ladies to a contest of bayonets; nobody who believes that government is a matter of mere physical force asks the co-operation of woman in its administration. It is because government is a conflict of such arguments as that letter states on the one side, because the object of government is the object to which this lady's own life is devoted, that the friends of woman suffrage and of this amendment ask that it shall be adopted.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, my great personal respect for the Senator from Massachusetts has given me an interval of enforced silence, and I have only to say that if I should print my desultory remarks I should be compelled to omit his interruption for fear that the amendment would be larger than the original bill. [Laughter.]

I fail to see that anything which has fallen from the distinguished Senator has convicted Mrs. Clara Leonard of inconsistency or has added anything to the argument upon his side of the question. I have never said or intimated that there were women who were not credible witnesses. I have never thought or intimated that there were not women who were competent to administer the affairs of State or even to lead armies. There have been such women, and I believe there will be to the end of time, as there have been effeminate men who have been better adapted to the distaff and the spindle than to the sword or to statesmanship. But these are exceptions in either sex.

If this lady have, as she unquestionably has, the strength of intellect conceded to her by the Senator from Massachusetts and evidenced by her own production, her judgment of woman is worth that of a conti-

nent of men. The best judge of any woman is a woman. The poorest judge of any woman is a man. Let any woman with defect or flaw go amongst a community of men and she will be a successful impostor. Let her go amongst a community of women and in one instant the instinct, the atmosphere circumbient, will tell her story.

Mrs. Leonard gives us the result of her opinion and of her experience as to whether this right of suffrage should be conferred upon her own sex. The Senator from Massachusetts speaks of her evidence in a political campaign in Massachusetts and that her unaided and single evidence crushed down the governor of that great State. I thank the Senator for that statement. If Mrs. Leonard had been an office-holder and a voter not a single township would have believed the truth of what she uttered.

Mr. HOAR. She was an office-holder, and the governor tried to put her out.

Mr. VEST. Ah! but what sort of an office-holder? She held the office delegated to her by God himself, a ministering angel to the sick, the afflicted, and the insane. What man in his senses would take from woman this sphere? What man would close to her the charitable institutions and eleemosynary establishments of the country? That is part of her kingdom; that is part of her undisputed sway and realm. Is that the office to which woman suffragists of this country ask us now to admit them? Is it to be the director of a hospital? Is it to the presidency of a board of visitors of an eleemosynary institution? Oh, no; they want to be Presidents, to be Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, and, God save the mark, ministerial and executive officers, sheriffs, constables, and marshals.

Of course, this lady is found in this board of directors. Where else should a true woman be found? Where else has she always been found but by the fevered brow, the palsied hand, the erring intellect, ay, God bless them, from the cradle to the grave the guide and support of the faltering steps of childhood and the weakening steps of old age!

Oh, no, Mr. President; this will not do. If we are to tear down all the blessed traditions, if we are to desolate our homes and firesides, if we are to unsex our mothers and wives and sisters and turn our blessed temples of domestic peace into ward political-assembly rooms, pass this joint resolution. But for one I thank God that I am so old-fashioned that I would not give one memory of my grandmother or my mother for all the arguments that could be piled, Pelion upon Ossa, in favor of this political monstrosity.

I now propose to read from a pamphlet sent to me by a lady whom I am not able to characterize as a resident of any State, although I believe she resides in the State of Maine. I do not know whether she be wife or mother. She signs this pamphlet as Adeline D. T. Whitney. I have read it twice, and read it to pure and gentle and intellectual women. I say to-day it ought to be in every household in this broad land. It ought to be the domestic gospel of every true, gentle, loving, virtuous woman upon all this continent. There is not one line or syllable in it that is not written in letters of gold. I shall not read it, for my strength does not suffice, nor will the patience of the Senate permit, but from beginning to end it breathes the womanly sentiment which has made pure and great men and gentle and loving women.

I will venture to say, in my great admiration and respect for this woman, whether she be married or single, she ought to be a wife, and ought to be a mother. Such a woman could only have brave and wise men for sons and pure and virtuous women for daughters. Here is her advice to her sex. I am only sorry that every word of it could not be read in the Senate, but I have trespassed too long.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed in your remarks.

Mr. VEST. I shall ask that it be printed. I will undertake, however, to read only a few sentences, not of exceptional superiority to the rest, because every sentence is equal to every other. There is not one impure unintellectual aspiration or thought throughout the whole of it. Would to God that I knew her, that I could thank her on behalf of the society and politics of the United States for this production.

After all—

She says to her own sex—

After all, men work for women; or, if they think they do not, it would leave them but sorry satisfaction to abandon them to such existence as they could arrange without us.

Oh, how true that is; how true!

In blessed homes, or in scattered dissipations of show, amusement, or the worse which these shows and amusements are but terribly akin to, women give purpose to and direct the results of all men's work. If the false standards of living first urge them, until at length the horrible intoxication of the game itself drives them on further and deeper, are we less responsible for the last state of those men than for the first?

Do you say, if good women refused these things and tried for a simpler and truer living, there are plenty of bad ones who would take them anyhow, and supply the motive to deeper and more unmitigated evil? Ah, there come both answer and errand again. Raise the fallen—at least, save the growing womanhood—stop the destruction that rushes accelerating on, before you challenge new difficulty and danger with an indiscriminate franchise. Are not these bad women the very "plenty" that would out-balance you at the polls if you persist in trying the "patch-and-plaster" remedy of suffrage and legislation.

Recognize the fact, the law, that your power, your high commission, is inward, vital, formative and causal. Bring all questions of choice or duty to this test; will it work at the heart of things, among the realities and forces? Try your own life by this; remember that mere external is falsehood and death.

The letter killeth. Give up all that is only of the appearance, or even chiefly so, in conscious delight and motive—in person, surrounding, pursuit. Let your self-presentation, your home-making and adorning, your social effort and interest, your occupation and use of talent, all shape and issue for the things that are essentially and integrally good, and that the world needs to have prevail. Until you can do this, and induce such doing, it is of little use to clamor for mere outward right or to contend that it would be rightly applied.

This whole pamphlet is a magnificent illustration of that stupendous and vital truth that the mission and sphere of woman is in the inward life of man; that she must be the building up and governing power that comes from those better impulses, those inward secrets of the heart and sentiment that govern men to do all that is good and pure and holy and keep them from all that is evil.

Mr. President, the emotions of women govern. What would be the result of woman suffrage if applied to the large cities of this country is a matter of speculation. What women have done in times of turbulence and excitement in large cities in the past we know. Open that terrible page of the French Revolution and the days of terror, when the click of the guillotine and the rush of blood through the streets of Paris demonstrated to what extremities the ferocity of human nature can be driven by political passion. Who led those blood-thirsty mobs? Who shrieked loudest in that hurricane of passion? Woman. Her picture upon the pages of history to-day is indelible. In the city of Paris in those ferocious mobs the controlling agency, nay, not agency, but the controlling and principal power, came from those whom God has intended to be the soft and gentle angels of mercy throughout the world. But I have said more than I intended. I ask that this pamphlet be printed in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Missouri. The Chair hears no objection.

The pamphlet is as follows:

THE LAW OF WOMAN-LIFE.

The external arguments on both sides the modern woman question have been pretty thoroughly presented and well argued. It seems needless to repeat or recombine them; but in one relation they have scarcely been handled with any direct purpose. Justice and expediency have been the points insisted on or contested; these have not gone back far enough; they have not touched the central fact, to set it forth in its force and finality. The fact is original and inherent, behind and at the root of the entire matter, with all its complication and circumstance. We have to ask a question to which it is the answer, and whose answer is that of the whole doubt and dispute.

What is the law of woman-life?

What was she made woman for, and not man?

Shall we look back to that old third chapter of Genesis?

When mankind had taken the knowledge and power of good and evil into their own hands through the mere earthly wisdom of the serpent: when the woman had had her hasty outside way and lead, according to the story, and woe had come of it, what was the sentence? And was it a penance, or a setting right, or a promise, or all three?

The serpent was first dealt with. The narrow policy, the keen cunning, the little, immediate outlook, the expedient motive; all that was impersonated of temporary shift and outward prudence in mortal affairs, regardless, or blind to, the everlasting issues; all, in short, that represented material and temporal interest as a rule and order—and is not man's external administration upon the earth largely forced to be a legislation upon these principles and economies?—was disposed of with the few words, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman."

Was this punishment—as reflected upon the woman—or the power of a grand retrieval for her? Not to man, who had been led, and who would be led again, by the woman, was the commission of holy revenge intrusted; but henceforth, "I will set the woman against thee." Against the very principle and live prompting of evil, or of mere earthly purpose and motive. "Between thy seed and her seed." Your struggle with her shall be in and for the very life of the race. "It," her life brought forth, "shall bruise thy head," thy whole power, and plan, and insidious cunning; "and thou shalt bruise," shalt sting, torment, hinder, and trouble in the way and daily going, "his heel," his footstep. Thou, the subtle and creeping thing of the ground, shalt lurk after and threaten with crookedness and poison the ways of the men-children in their earth-tilling; the woman, the mother, shall turn upon thee for and in them and shall beat thee down!

Unto the woman He said, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception." The burden and the glory are set in one. The pain of the world shall be in thy heart; the trouble, the contradiction of it, shall be against your love and insight. But your pain shall be your power; you shall be the life-bearer; you shall hold the motive; yours shall be the desire, and your husband's the dominion. Therefore shall you bring your aspiration to him, that he may fulfill it for you. "Your desire shall be unto him, and he shall rule."

And unto Adam He said, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife"—yes, and because thou wilt hearken—"thy sorrow shall be in the labor of the earth; the ground shall be cursed;" in all material things shall be cross and trouble, not against you, but "for your sake." "In your sorrow you shall eat of it all the days of your life." Your need and struggle shall be with external things, and with the ruling of them. "For your sake," that you may learn your mastery, inherit your true power, carry out with ease and understanding the desire and need of the race, which woman represents, discerns afar, and pleads to you.

And Adam bowed before the Lord's judgment; we are not told that he answered anything to that; but he turned to his wife, and in that moment "called her name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." Then and there was the division made; and to which, can we say, was the empire given? Both were set in conditions, hemmed in to divine and special work: man, by the stress and sorrow of the ground; woman, by the stress and sorrow of her maternity, and of her spiritual conception, making her truly the "mother of all the living."

At the beginning of human history, or tradition, then, we get the answer to our question: the law of woman-life is central, interior, and from the heart of things; the law of the man's life is circumferential, unfolding, shaping, bearing on and around, outwardly; wheel within wheel is the constitution of human power. It will be an evil day for the world when the nave shall leave its place and contend for that of the felloe. Iron-rimmed for its busy revolution and outward contact is the life and strength of man; but the tempered steel is at the heart and within the soul of the woman, that she may bear the silent pressure of the axle, and quietly and invisibly originate and support the entire onward movement. "The spirit of the living creature is in the wheels," and they can move no otherwise. "When the living creatures went, the wheels went with

them; and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up." That was what Ezekiel saw in his vision.

There can be no going forward without a life and presence and impulse at the center; and in the organization of humanity there is where the place and power of woman have been put. For good or for evil, for the serpent or for the redeeming Christ, she must move, must influence, must achieve beforehand, and at the heart; she must be the mother of the race; she must be the mother of the Messiah. Not woman in her own person, but "one born of woman," is the Saviour. For everything that is formed of the Creator, from the unorganized stone to the thought of righteousness in the heart of the race, there must be a matrix; in the creation and in the recreation of His human child God makes woman and the soul of woman His blessed organ and instrument. When woman clears herself of her own perversions, her self-imposed limitations, returns to her spiritual power and place, and cries, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word," then shall the spirit descend unto her; then shall come the redemption.

Take this for the starting-point; it is the key.

Within, behind, antecedent to all result in action, are the place and office of the woman—by the law of woman-life. And all question of her deed and duty should be brought to this test. Is it of her own, interior, natural relation, putting her at her true advantage, harmonious with the key to which her life is set? I think this suffrage question must settle itself precisely upon this ground-principle, and that all argument should range conclusively around it. Judging so, we should find, I think, that not at the polls, where the last utterance of a people's voice is given—where the results of character, and conscience, and intelligence are shown—is her best and rightful work; on the contrary, that it is useless here, unless first done elsewhere. But where little children learn to think and speak—where men love and listen, and the word is forming—is the office she has to fill, the errand she has to do. The question is, can she do both? Is there need that she should do both? Does not the former and greater include the latter and less?

Hers are indeed the primary meetings: in her nursery, her home, and social circles; with other women, with young men, upon whose tone and character in her maturity her womanhood and motherhood join their beautiful and mighty influence; above all, among young girls—the "little women," to whom the design and commission are descending—is her undisputed power. Purify politics? Purify the sewers? But what if, first, the springs, and reservoirs, and conduits could be watched, guarded, filtered, and then the using be made clean and careful all through the homes; a better system devised and carried out for separating, neutralizing, destroying hurtful refuse? Then the poisonous gases might not be creeping back upon us through our enforced economies, our makeshifts and stop-gaps of outside legislation. For legislation is, after all, but cut-off, curb, and patch; an external, troublesome, partial, uncertain application of hindrance and remedy. What physician will work with lotion and plaster when he can touch, and control, and heal at the very seat of the disease?

It is the beginning of the fulfillment that women have waked to the consciousness that they have not as yet filled their full place in human life and affairs. Only has not the mistake been made of contending with and grappling results, when causes were in their hands? Have they not let go the mainsprings to run after and effectually push with pins the refractory cogs upon the wheel-rims?

Woman always deserts herself when she puts her life and motive and influence in mere outsides. Outsides of fashion and place, outsides of charm and apparel, outsides of work and ambition—she must learn that these are not her true showing; she must go back and put herself where God has called her to be with Himself, at the silent, holy inmost; then we shall feel, if not at once, yet surely soon or some time, a new order beginning. He, the Father of all, gives it to us to be the motherhood. That is the great solving and upraising word; not limited to mere parentage, but the law of woman-life. For good or for evil she mothers the world.

Not all are called to motherhood in the literal sense, but all are called to the great, true motherhood in some of its manifold trusts and obligations. "Noblesse oblige," you can not lay it down. "More are the children of the desolate than of her who hath a husband." All the little children that are born must look to womanhood somewhere for mothering. Do they all get it? All the works and policies of men look back somewhere for a true "desire" toward and by which only they can rule. Is the desire of the woman—of the home, the mother-motive of the world and human living—kept in the integrity and beauty for which it was intrusted to her, that it might move the power of man to noble ends?

Do you ask the governing of the nation? You have the making of the nation. Would you choose your statesmen? First make your statesmen.

Indeed the whole cause on trial may be summarily ended by the proving of an alibi, an elsewhere of demand. Is woman needed at the caucuses, conventions, polls? She is needed, at the same time, elsewhere. Two years of time and strength, of thought and love, from some woman, are essential for every little human being, that he may even begin a life. When you remember that every man is once a little child, born of a woman, trained—or needing training—at a woman's hands; that of the little men, every one of whom takes and shapes his life so, come at length the hand for the helm, the voice for the law, and the arm to enforce law—what do you want more for a woman's opportunity and control?

Which would you choose as a force, an advantage, in settling any question of public moment, or as touching your own private interest through the general management—the right to go upon election day and cast one vote, or a hold beforehand upon the individual ear and attention of each voter now qualified? The ability to present to him your argument, to show him the real point at issue, to convince and persuade him of the right and lasting, instead of the weak and briefly politic way? This initial privilege is in the hands of woman; assuming that she can be brought to feel and act as a unit, which appears to be what is claimed for her in the argument for her regeneration of the outer political world.

But already and separately, if every intelligent, conscientious woman can but reach one man, and influence him from the principle involved—from her interior perception of it, kept pure on purpose from bias and temptation that assail him in the outside mix and jostle—will she not have done her work without the casting of a ballot? And what becomes of "taxation without representation," when, from Eden down, Eve can always plead with Adam, can have the first word instead of the last—if she knows what that first word is, in herself and thence in its power with him—can beguile him to his good instead of to his harm, as indeed she only meant to do in that first ignorant experiment? Would it be any less easy to qualify for and accomplish this than to convince and outnumber in public gathering not only bodies of men but the mass of women that will also have to be confronted and convinced or overborne?

Preconceived opinions, minds made up, men not so easily beguiled to the pure good, you say? Woman quite as apt to make mistakes out of Paradise as in? That only returns us to the primal need and opportunity. Get the man to listen to you before his mind is made up—before his manhood is made up; while it is in the making. That is just the power and place that belong to you, and you must seize and fill. It is your natural right; God gave it to you. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."

We can not do all in one day, and in such a day of the world as this. We plant trees for posterity where forests have been laid waste and the beautiful work of life is to be done over again; we can not expect to see our fruit in souls and in the nation at less cost of faith and time. Take care, then, of the little children: the men children, to make men of them; the women children—oh, yes, even above all—to make ready for future mothering—to snatch from the

evil that works over against pure womanliness. Until you have done this let men fend for themselves in rough outcaves a little longer; except, perhaps, as wise, able women whom the trying transition time calls forth may find fit way and place for effort and protest—there is always room for that, and noble work has been and is being done; but do not rear a new generation of women to expect and desire charges and responsibilities reverse of their own life-law, through whose perfect fulfillment alone may the future clean place be made for all to work in.

Is there excess of female population? Can not all expect the direct rule of a home? Is not this exactly, perhaps, just now, for the more universal remedial mothering that in this age is the thing immediately needed? Let her who has no child seek where she can help the burdened mother of many; how she can best reach with influence, and wisdom, and cherishing, the greatest number—or most efficiently a few—of these dear, helpless, terrible little souls, who are to make, in a few years, a new social condition; a better and higher, happier and safer, or a lower, worse, bitterer, more desperately complicated and distressful one.

"Desire earnestly the best gifts," said Saint Paul, after enumerating the gifts of teaching and prophecy and authority; "and I show you," he goes on, "a yet more excellent way." Charity—not mere alms, or toleration, or general benignity, out of a safe self-provision; but *caritas*—nearness, and caring, and loving,—the very essence of mothering; the way to and hold of the heart of it all, the heart of the life of humanity. "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." That is the first word; it charges womanhood itself, which must be set utterly right before it can take hold to right the world. Here are at once task and mission and rewarding sway.

Woman has got off the track; she must see that first, and replace herself. We are mothering the world still; but we are mothering it, in a fearfully wide measure, all wrong.

Sacrifice is the beginning of all redemption. We must give up. We must even give up the wish and seeming to have a hand in things, that we may work unseen in the elements, and make them fit and healthful; that daily bread and daily life may be sweet again in dear, old, homely ways, and plentiful with all truly blessed opportunities. We are not to organize the world, or to conquer it, or to queen it. We are just to take it again and mother it. If woman would begin that, search out the cradles of life and character—and take care of the whole world of fifty years hence in taking care of them, calling upon men and the state, when needful, to authorize her action and furnish outward means for it—I wonder what might come, as earnest of good, even in this our day, in which we know not our visitation?

And here again come allowance and exception for what women can always do when this world-mothering forces an appeal to the strength and authority of man. Women have never been prevented from doing their real errands in the world, even outside the domestic boundary. They have defended their husbands' castles in the old chivalrous times, when the male chivalry was away at the crusades. They have headed armies when Heaven called them; only Heaven never called all the women at once; but when the king was crowned, the mission done, they have turned back with desire to their sheltered, gentle, unobtrusive life again. There has no business to be a standing army of women; not even a standing political army. Women have navigated and brought home ships when commanders have died or been stricken helpless upon the ocean; they have done true, intelligent, patient work for science, art, religion; and those have done the most who have never stopped to contend first, whether a woman, as such, may do it or not.

Look at what Dorothea Dix has done, single-handed, single-mouthed, in asylums and before legislatures. Women have sat on thrones, and governed kingdoms well, when that was the station in life to which God called them. If Victoria of England has been anything, she has been the mother of her land; she has been queen and protecting genius of its womanhood and homes. And when a woman does these things, as called of God—not talks of them, as to whether she may make claim to do them—she carries a weight from the very sanctity out of which she steps, as woman, that moves men unlike the moving of any other power. Shall she resign the chance of doing really great things, of meeting grand crises, by making herself common in ward-rooms and at street-corners, and abolishing the perfect idea of home by no longer consecrating herself to it?

If individual woman, as has been said, may gain and influence individual man, and so the man-power in affairs—a body of women, purely as such, with cause, and plea, and reason, can always have the ear and attention of bodies of men; but to do this they must come straight from their home sanctities, as representing them—as able to represent them otherwise than men, because of their hearth-priesthood; not as politicians, bred and hardened in the public arenas.

That the family is the heart of the state, and that the state is but the widened family, is the fact which the old vestal consecration, power, and honor set forth and kept in mind.

The voice which has of late been so generally conceded to women in town, decisions as regarding public schools, is an instance of the fittingsness of relegating to them certain interests of which they should know more than men, because—applying the key-test with which we have started—it has direct relation to and springs from their motherhood. But can one help suggesting that if the movement had been to place women, merely and directly, upon the committees, by votes of men who saw that this work might be in great part best done by them; if women had asked and offered for the place without the jostle of the town-meeting, or putting in that wedge for the ballot—the thing might have been as readily done, and the objection, or political precedent, avoided.

It is not the real opportunity, when that arises or shows itself in the line of her life-law, that is to be refused for woman. It is the taking from internal power to add to external complication of machinery and to the friction of strife. Let us just touch upon some of the current arguments concerning these external impositions which one set is demanding and the other entreating against.

If voting is to be the chief power in woman's hands, or even a power of half the moment that is contended for it, it will grow to be the motive and end, the all-absorbing object, with women that it is with men.

The gubernatorial canvass, the presidential year, these will interrupt and clog all home business, suspend decisions, paralyze plans, as they do with men, or else we shall not be much, as thorough politicians, after all. And if we talk of mending all that, of putting politics in their right place, and governing by pure principle instead of party trick, and stumping and electioneering, we go back in effect to the acknowledgment that only in the interior work, and behind politics, can women do better things at all; which, precisely, was to be demonstrated.

Think, simply, of election day for women.

Would it be so invariably easy a thing for a home-keeper to do, at the one opportunity of the year, or the four years, on a particular day, her duty in this matter? It is easy to say that it takes no more time than a hundred other things that some do; but setting apart all the argument that previous time and strength must have been spent in properly qualifying, how many of the hundred other things are done now without interruption, postponement, hindrance, through domestic contingencies? or are there a hundred other things done when the home contingencies are really met by a woman? A woman's life is not like a man's. That a man's life may be—that he may transact his out-door business; keep his hours and appointments; may cast his vote on election day; may represent wife and children in all wherein the community cares for, or might injure him and them—the woman, some woman, must be at the home post, that the home order may go on, from which he derives that command of time, and freedom from hindering necessities, which leave him to his work. And so, as

the old proverb says, while man's work is from sun to sun—made definite, a matter to which he can go forth, and from which he can come in—a woman's work, of keeping the place of the forthgoing and incoming, is never done, from the very nature and ceaseless importance of it.

Must she go to the polls, sick or well, baby or no baby, servant or no servant, strength or no strength, desire or no desire? If she have cook and housemaid they are to go also, and number her two to one, anyway; probably on election day, which they would make a holiday, they would—as at other crises, of birth, sickness, death, house-cleaning, which should occur in no first-class families—come down upon her with their appropriate *coup d'état*, and "leave," making the State-stroke, in this instance, of scoring three votes, two dropped and one lost, for the irrepressible side.

How will it be when Norah, and Maggie, and Katie have not only their mass and confession, their Fourth-of-July and Christmas, their mission-weeks, their social engagements and family plans, and their appointments with their dress-makers, to curtail your claims upon their bargained time and service, but their share in the primary meetings and caucuses, committees, and torch-light processions, and mass meetings? For what shall prevent the excitements, the pleasurable, the runnings hither and thither, that men delight in from following in the train of politics and parties with the common woman? Perhaps it may even be discovered, to the still further detriment of our already painfully hampered and perplexed domestic system, that the pursuit of fun, votes, offices, is more remunerative, as well as gentler womanly—as Micawber might express it—than the cleansing of pots and pans, the weekly wash, or the watching of the roast. Perhaps in that enfranchised day there will be no Kates and Maggies' and the Norahs will know their place no more. Then the enlightened womanhood may have to begin at the foundation and glorify the kitchen again. And good enough for her, in the wide as well as primitive sense of the phrase, and a grand turn in the history that repeats itself toward the old, forgotten, peaceful side of the cycle it may be!

But the argument does not rest upon any such points as these. It rests upon the inside nature of a woman's work; upon the need there is to begin again to-day at the heart of things and make that right; upon the evident fact that this can be done none too soon or earnestly, if the community and the country are not to keep on in the broad way to a threatened destruction; and upon the certainty that it can never be done unless it is done by woman, and with all of woman's might. Not by struggles for new and different place, but by the better, more loving, more intelligent, deep-seeing, and deep-feeling filling of her own place, that none will dispute and none can take from her. We are not where woman was in the old brutal days that are so often quoted; and we shall not, need not, return to that. Christianity has disposed of that sort of argument. We are on a vantage ground for the doing of our real, essential work better than it has been done ever before in the history of the world; and we are madly leaving our work and our vantage together.

The great step made by woman was in the generation preceding this one of restlessness—the restlessness that has come through the first feeling of great power. It was made in the time when women learned physiology, that they might rear and nurse their families and help their neighborhoods understandingly; science, that they might teach and answer little children, and share the joy of knowledge that was spreading swiftly in the earth; political history and economy, that they might listen and talk to their brothers and husbands and sons, and leave the life of the age as the bread in the mixing; business figures, rules, and principles, that they might sympathize, counsel, help, and prudentially work with and honestly strengthen the bread-winners. The good work was begun in the schools where girls were first told, as George B. Emerson used to tell us Boston girls, that we were learning everything he could teach us, in order to be women: wives, mothers, friends, social influencers, in the best and largest way possible. Women grew strong and capable under such instruction and motive. Are their daughters and grand-daughters about to leap the fence, leave their own realm little cared for—or doomed to be—undertake the whole scheme of outside creation, or contest it with the men? Then God help the men! God save the Commonwealth!

We are past the point already where homes are suffering, or liable to suffer, neglect or injury; they are already left unmade. Shall this go on? Between frivolities and ambitions, between social vanities, and shows, and public meddlings and mixings—for where one woman is needed and doing really brave, true work, there are a hundred rushing forth for the mere sake of rushing—is the primitive home, the power of heaven upon earth to slip away from among us? Let us not build ourselves which have no insides, let us not put a face upon things which has no reality behind it. Beware lest we make the confusion that we need the suffrage to help us unmake; lest we tear to pieces that we may patch again. Crazy patchwork that would be, indeed!

Are women's votes required because men will not legislate away evils that they do not heartily wish away? Is government corrupted because men desire shield and opportunity for dishonest speculation; authority and countenance for nefarious combinations? The more need to go to work at the beginning rather than to plunge into the pitch and be defiled; more need to make haste and educate a better generation of men, if it be so we can not, except *et armis*, influence the generation that is. But do you think that if women are in earnest—enough in earnest to give up, as they seem to be to demand—they might not bring their real power to bear even upon these evil things, in their root and inception, and even now? Suppose women would not live in houses, or wear jewels and gowns, that are bought for them out of wicked millions made upon the stock exchange?

Suppose they would stop decorating their dwellings to an agony, crowding them hurriedly with this and that of the last and newest, just because it is last and new, making a show and rivalry of what is not a true-grown beauty of a home at all, but a mere meretriciousness; suppose they would so set to work and change society that displays and feasts, which use up at every separate one a year's comfortable support for a quiet, modest family, should be given up as vulgarities; that people should care for, and be ready for, a true interchange of life and thought, and simple, uncrowded opportunities for these; suppose women would say, "No; I will not blaze at Newport, or run through Europe dropping American eagles or English sovereigns after me like the trail of a comet, or the crumbs that Hop-o-my-thumb let fall from his pocket that the people at home might track the way he had gone; because if I have money, there is better work to be done with it; and I will not have the money that is made by gambling manipulations and cheats."

Do you think this would have no influence? More than that, and further back, and lower down, suppose they should say, every one, "I will not have the new, convenient house, the fresh carpets, the pretty curtains, or even the least, most fitting freshness, until I know the means are earned for me with honest service to the world, and by no lucky turn of even a small speculation." Further back yet, suppose them to declare, "I will not have the home at all, nor my own happiness, unless it can be based and builded on the kind of life-work that helps to make a real prosperity; that really goes to the building and safe-keeping of a whole nation of such homes." Would there be no power in that? Would it not be a kind of woman-suffrage to settle the very initials of all that ever bears upon the public question? And to bring that sort of woman on the stage, and to the front, is there not enough work to do, and enough "higher education" to insist on and secure?

After all, men work for women; or, if they think they do not, it would leave them but sorry satisfaction to abandon them to such existence as they could arrange without us. In blessed homes, or in scattered dissipations of show, amusement, or the worse which these shows and amusements are but terribly akin to, women give purpose to and direct the results of all men's work. If

the false standards of living first urge them, until at length the horrible intoxication of the game itself drives them on further and deeper, are we less responsible for the last state of those men than for the first?

Do you say, if good women refused these things and tried for a simpler and truer living, there are plenty of bad ones who would take them anyhow, and supply the motive to deeper and more unmitigated evil? Ah, there come both answer and errand again. Raise the fallen—at least save the growing womanhood—stop the destruction that rushes accelerating on, before you challenge new difficulty and danger with an indiscriminate franchise. Are not these bad women the very "plenty" that would out-balance you at the polls, if you persist in trying the "patch-and-plaster" remedy of suffrage and legislation?

Recognize the fact, the law, that your power, your high commission, is inward—vital—formative, and casual. Bring all questions of choice or duty to this test, will it work at the heart of things, among the realities and forces? Try your own life by this; remember that mere external is falsehood and death. The letter killeth. Give up all that is only of the appearance—or even chiefly so, in conscious delight and motive—in person, surrounding, pursuit. Let your self-presentation, your home-making and adorning, your social effort and interest, your occupation and use of talent, all shape and issue for the things that are essentially and integrally good, and that the world needs to have prevail. Until you can do this, and induce such doing, it is of little use to clamor for mere outward right, or to contend that it would be rightly applied.

Work as you will, and widely as you can, for schools, in associations, in everything whose end is to teach, enlighten, enlarge women, and so the world. Help and protect the industries of women; but keep those industries within the guiding law of woman-life. Do not throw down barriers that take down safeguards with them; that make threatening breaches in the very social structure. If women must serve in shops, demand and care for it that it shall be in a less mixed, a more shielded way than now. The great caravansaries of trade are perilous by their throng, publicity, and weariness. There used to be women's shops; choice places, where a woman's care and taste had ruled before the counters were spread; where women could quietly purchase things that were sure to be beautiful or of good service; there were not the tumult and ransacking that kill both shop-girl and shopper now.

This is one instance, and but one, of the rescuing that ought to be attempted. There ought at least to be distinct women's departments, presided over by women of good, motherly tone and character, in the places of business which women so frequent, and where the thoughtful are aware of much that makes them tremble. And surely a great many of the girls and women who choose shop-work, because they like its excitement, ought rather to be in homes, rendering womanly service, and preparing to serve in homes of their own—leaving their present places to young men who might perhaps begin so to earn the homes to offer them. Will not this apply all the way up, into the arts and the professions even? There must needs be exceptional women perhaps; there are, and will be, time and errand and place for them; but Heaven forbid that they should all become exceptional.

Once more, work for these things that are behind, and underlie; believing that woman's place is behind and within, not of repression, but of power; and that if she do not fill this place it will be empty; there will be no main spring. Meanwhile she will get her rights as she rises to them, and her defenses where she needs them; everything that helps, defends, uplifts the woman uplifts man and the whole fabric, and man has begun to find it out. If he "will give the suffrage if women want it," as is said, why shall he not as well give them the things that they want suffrage for and that they are capable of representing? Believe me, this work, and the representation which grows out of it, can no longer be done if we attempt the handling of political machinery—the making of platforms, the judging of candidates, the measuring and disputation of party plans and issues, and all the tortuous following up of public and personal political history.

Do you say, men have their individual work in the world, and all this beside and of it, and that therefore we may? Exactly here comes in again the law of the interior. Their work is "of it"—falls in the way. They rub against it as they go along. Men meet each other in the business thoroughfares, at the offices and the street corners; we are in the dear depths of home. We are with the little ones, of whom is not this kingdom, but the kingdom of heaven, which we, through them, may help to come. This is just where we must abandon our work, if we attempt the doing of theirs. And here is where our prestige will desert us, whenever great cause calls us to speak from out our seclusions, and show men, from our insights and our place, the occasion and desire that look unto their rule. They will not listen then; they will remand us to the ballot-box.

"Inside politics" is a good word. That is just where woman ought to be, as she ought to be inside everything, insisting upon and implanting the truth and right that are to conquer. And she can not be inside and outside both. She can not do the mothering and the home-making, the watching and ministry, the earning and maintaining hold and privilege and motive influence behind and through the acts of men—and all the world-wide execution of act beside. Therefore, we say, do not give up the substance which you might seize, for the shadow which you could not hold fast if you were to seem to grasp it. Work on at the foundations. Insist on truth and right; put them into all your own life, taking all the beam out of your own eye before demanding—well, we will say the mote, for generosity's sake, and for the holy authority of the word—out of the brother's eyes.

Establish pure, honest, lovely things—things of good report—in the nurseries, the schools, the social circles where you reign, and the outside world and issue will take form and heed for themselves. The nation, of which the family is the root, will be made, and built, and saved accordingly. Every seed hath its own body. The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent-head of evil, and shall rise triumphant to become the ennobled, recreated commonwealth. Then shall pour forth the double psalm that thrills through the glorious final chorus of Schumann's Faust—men and women answering in antiphons—

"The indescribable,
Here it is done;
The ever-womanly
Beckons us on!"

Then shall Mary—the fulfilled, ennobled womanhood—sing her Magnificat; standing to receive from the Lord, and to give the living word to the nations:

"My soul doth magnify the Lord,
And my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour.
For He hath looked upon the low estate of His handmaiden;
For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.
For He that is mighty hath done to me great things;
And holy is His name.
And His mercy is unto generations and generations."

The coming new version of the Old Testament gives us, we are told, among other more perfect renderings, this one, which fitly utters charge and promise:

"The Lord gave the word;
Great was the company
Of those
That published it."

"The Lord giveth the word;
And the women that bring
Glad tidings
Are a great host."

ADELINE D. T. WHITNEY.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to say but a word. Early in the session I had the opportunity of addressing the Senate upon the general merits of the question. I said then all that I cared to say; but I wish to remind the Senate before the vote is taken that the question to be decided is not whether upon the whole the suffrage should be extended to women, but whether in the proper arena for the amendment of the Constitution ordained by the the Constitution itself one-third of the American people shall have the opportunity to be heard in the discussion of such a proposed amendment—whether they shall have the opportunity of the exercise of the first right of republican government and of the American and of any free citizen, the submission to the popular tribunal, which has alone the power to decide the question whether on the whole, upon a comparison of the arguments pro and con bearing one way and the other upon this great subject, the American people will extend the suffrage to those who are now deprived of it.

That is the real question for the Senate to consider. It is not whether the Senate would, itself, extend the suffrage to women, but whether those men who believe that women should have the suffrage shall be heard, so that there may be a decision and an end made of this great subject, which has now been under discussion more than a quarter of a century, and to-day for the first time even in the legislative body which is to submit the proposition to the country for consideration has there been a prospect of reaching a vote.

I appeal to Senators not to decide this question upon the arguments which have been offered here to-day for or against the merits of the proposition. I appeal to them to decide this question upon that other principle to which I have adverted, whether one-third of the American people shall be permitted to go into the arena of public discussion of the States, among the people of the States, and before the Legislatures of the States, and be heard upon the issue, shall the general Constitution be so amended as to extend this right of suffrage? If, with this opportunity, those who believe in woman suffrage fail, they must be content; for I agree with the Senators upon the opposite side of the Chamber and with all who hold that if the suffrage is to be extended at all, it must be extended by the operation of existing law. I believe it to be an innate right; yet an innate right must be exercised only by the consent of the controlling forces of the State. That is all that woman asks. That is all that any one asks who believes in this right belonging to her sex.

As bearing simply upon the question whether there is a demand by a respectable number of people to be heard on this issue, I desire to read one or two documents in my possession. I offer in this connection, in addition to the innumerable petitions which have been placed before the Senate and before the other House, the petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. I take it that no Senator will raise the question whether this organization be or be not composed of the very *élite* of the women of America. At least two hundred thousand of the Christian women of this country are represented in this organization. It is national in its character and scope; it is international, and it exists in every State and in every Territory of the Union. By their officers, Miss Frances E. Willard, the president; Mrs. Caroline B. Buell, corresponding secretary; Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, recording secretary; Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, assistant recording secretary; Miss Esther Pugh, treasurer; Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace, superintendent of department of franchise, and Mrs. Henrietta B. Wall, secretary of department of franchise, they bring this petition to the Senate. It has been indorsed by the action of the body at large. They say:

Believing that governments can be just only when deriving their powers from the consent of the governed, and that in a government professing to be a government of the people, all the people of a mature age should have a voice, and that all class-legislation and unjust discrimination against the rights and privileges of any citizen is fraught with danger to the republic, and inasmuch as the ballot in popular governments is a most potent element in all moral and social reforms:

We, therefore, on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Christian women engaged in philanthropic effort, pray you to use your influence, and vote for the passage of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting the disfranchisement of any citizen on the ground of sex.

I have also just received, in addition to other matter before the Senate, the petition of the Indianapolis Suffrage Association, or of that department of the Women's Christian Temperance Union which has the control of the discussion and management of the operations of the union with reference to the suffrage. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it. The letter transmitting the petition is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 12, 1886.

DEAR SIR: I have sent the inclosed petitions and arguments to every member on the Committee on Woman Suffrage, hoping if they are read they may have some influence in securing a favorable report for the passage of a sixteenth amendment, giving the ballot to women.

Will you urge upon the members of the committee the importance of their perusal?

Respectfully,

MRS. Z. G. WALLACE,
Sup't Dep't for Franchise of N. W. C. T. U.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR.

I will add in this connection a letter lately received by myself, written by a lady who may not be so distinguished in the annals of the country, yet, at the same time, she has attained to such a position in

the society where she lives that she holds the office of postmaster by the sanction of the Government, and has held it for many years. She seems, as other ladies have seemed, to possess the capacity to perform the duties of this governmental office, so far as I know, to universal satisfaction. At all events, it is the truth that no woman, so far as I have ever heard, holding the office of postmaster, and no woman who has ever held the position of clerk under the Government, or who has ever discharged in State or in Nation any executive or administrative function, has as yet been a defaulter, or been guilty of any misconduct or malversation in office, or contributed anything by her own conduct to the disgrace of the appointing or creating official power. This woman says:

NEW LONDON, WIS., January 18, 1887.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: Thank you for the address you sent; also for your kindness in remembering us poor mortals who can scarcely get a hearing in such an august body as the Senate of these United States, though I have reason to believe we furnished the men to fill those seats.

There is something supremely ridiculous in the attitude of a man who tells you women are angelic in their nature; that it is his veneration for the high and lofty position they occupy which hopes to keep them forever from the dirty vortex of politics, and then to see him glower at her because she wishes politics were not so dirty, and believes the mother element, by all that makes humanity to her doubly sacred, is just what is needed for its purification.

We have become tired of hearing and reiterating the same old theories and are pleased that you branched out in a new direction, and your argument contains so much which is new and fresh.

We do care for this inestimable boon which one-half the people of this Republic have seized, and are claiming that God gave it to them and are working very zealously to help God keep it for them. (We will remember the Joshua who leads us out of bondage.)

I used to think the Prohibition party would be our Moses, but that has only gone so far as to say, "You boost us upon a high and mighty pedestal, and when we see our way clear to pull you after us we will venture to do so; but you can not expect it while we run any risk of becoming unpopular thereby."

Liberty stands a goddess upon the very dome of our Capitol, Liberty's lamp shines far out into the darkness, a beacon to the oppressed, a dazzling ray of hope to serf and bondsmen of other climes, yet here a sword unforbidden is piercing the heart of the mother whose son believes God has made us to differ so that he can go astray and return. But, alas, he does not return.

Help us to stand upon the same political footing with our brother; this will open both his and our eyes and compel him to stand upon the same moral footing with us. Only this can usher in millenium's dawn.

This letter is signed by Hannah E. Patchin, postmaster at New London, Wis.

As bearing upon the extent of this agitation, I have many other letters of the same character and numerous arguments by women upon this subject, but I can not ask the attention of the Senate to them, for what I most of all want is a vote. I desire a record upon this question. However, I ought to read this letter, which is dated Salina, Kans., December 13, 1886. The writer is Mrs. Laura M. Johns. She is connected with the suffrage movement in that State, and as bearing upon the extent of this movement and as illustrative not only of the condition of the question in Kansas, but very largely throughout the country, perhaps, especially throughout the northern part of the country, I read this and leave others of like character, as they are, because we have not the time:

I am deeply interested in the fate of the now pending resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, conferring upon women the exercise of the suffrage. The right is theirs now.

I see, in speaking to that resolution on December 8 in the Senate, that you refer to Miss Anthony's experiences in the October campaign in Kansas as evidence in part of the growth of interest in this movement, and of sentiment favorable to it, and I am writing now just to tell you about it.

When I planned and arranged for those eleven conventions in eleven fine cities of this State, I thought I knew that the people of Kansas felt a strong interest in the question of woman suffrage; but when with Miss Anthony and others I saw immense audiences of Kansas people receive the gospel of equal suffrage with enthusiasm, saw them sitting uncomfortably crowded, or standing to listen for hours to arguments in favor of suffrage for women; saw the organization of strong and ably officered local, county, and district associations of the best and "brainiest" men and women in our first cities for the perpetuation of woman suffrage teachings; saw people of the highest social, professional, and business position give time, money and influence, to this cause; saw Miss Anthony's life work honored and her fêted and most highly commended, I concluded that I had before known but half of the interest and favorable sentiment in Kansas on this question. These meetings were very largely attended, and by all classes, and by people of all shades of religious and political belief. The representative people of the labor party were there, ministers, lawyers, all professions, and all trades.

No audiences could have been more thoroughly representative of the people; and as we held one (and more) convention in each Congressional district in the State, we certainly had, from the votes of those audiences in eleven cities, a truthful expression of the feeling of the people of the State of Kansas on this question. Many of the friends of the cause here are very willing to risk our fate to the popular vote.

In our conventions Miss Anthony was in the habit of putting the following questions to vote:

"Are you in favor of equal suffrage for women?"

"Do you desire that your Senators, INGALLS and PLUMB, and your seven Congressmen shall vote for the sixteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution?" and

"Do you desire your Legislature to extend municipal suffrage to women?"

In response there always came a rousing "yes," except when the vote was a rising one, and then the house rose in a solid body. Miss Anthony's call for the negative vote was answered by silence.

Petitions for municipal suffrage in Kansas are rolling up enormously. People sign them now who refused to do so last year. I tell you it is catching. Many people here are disgusted with our asking for such a modicum as municipal suffrage, and say they would rather sign a petition asking for the submission of an amendment to our State constitution giving us State suffrage. We have speakers now at work all over the State, their audiences and reception are enthusiastic, and their most radical utterances in favor of woman are the most kindly received and gain them the most applause.

And further to the same effect. I shall offer nothing more of that kind, but I have come in possession of some data bearing upon the question of the intellect of woman. The real objection seems to me to be that she does not know enough to vote; that it is the ignorant ballot that is dangerous; but that is a subject which of course I have no time to go into. However, I have some data collected very recently, and at my request, by a most intelligent gentleman of the State of Maine. Either of the Senators from that State will bear witness as to the high character of this gentleman, Mr. Jordan. He sent the data to me a few days ago. They show the relative standing of the two sexes in the high schools in the State of Maine where they are being educated together, and in one of the colleges of that State:

High school No. 1.—Average rank on scale of 100.—1882: boys 88.7, girls 91; 1883: boys 88.2, girls 91.3; 1884: boys 88.8, girls 91.9 (of the graduating class 7 girls and 1 boy were the eight highest in rank for the four years' course); 1885: boys 88.6, girls 91.4 (eight highest in rank for four years' course, 4 boys and 4 girls); 1886: boys 88.2, girls 91 (eight highest in rank for four years' course, 7 girls and 1 boy).

High school No. 2.—Average rank on scale of 100.—1886: boys 90, girls 93 (six highest in rank for four years' course, 6 girls).

College.—Average rank for fall term of the junior year on the scale of 40.—1882: boys 37.75, girls 37.93; 1883: boys 38.03, girls 38.70; 1884: boys 38.18, girls 38.59; 1885: boys 38.33, girls 38.13.

With only this last exception the average of the girls and young ladies in the high schools and at this institution of liberal training is substantially higher than that of the boys. I simply give that fact in passing, and there leave the matter.

I desire in closing simply to call for the reading of the joint resolution. I could say nothing to quicken the sense of the Senate on the importance of the question about to be taken. It concerns one-half of our countrymen, one-half of the citizens of the United States, but it is more than that, Mr. President. This question is radical, and it concerns the condition of the whole human race. I believe that in the agitation of this question lies the fate of republican government, and in that of republican government lies the fate of mankind. I ask for the reading of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. It has been read. Does the Senator desire to have it read again?

Mr. BLAIR. Has it been read this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. BLAIR. That is all then. Now, I wish to have printed in the RECORD, by reason of the printed matter that has gone into the RECORD upon the other side, the arguments of Miss Anthony and her associates before the Senate committee, which is out of print as a document. These arguments are very terse and brief. I think it only just that woman, who is most interested, should be heard, at least under the circumstances when she has herself been heard on the other side through printed matter. It will not be burdensome to the RECORD, and I ask that this be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the suggestion. The document will be printed in the RECORD.

The document is as follows:

ARGUMENTS BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE, UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 7, 1884.

By a committee of the Sixteenth Annual Washington Convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, in favor of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that shall protect the right of women citizens to vote in the several States of the Union.

Order of proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN (Senator COCKRELL). We have allotted the time to be divided as the speakers may desire among themselves. We are now ready to hear the ladies.

Miss SUSAN B. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the select committee: This is the sixteenth time that we have come before Congress in person, and the nineteenth annually by petitions. Ever since the war, from the winter of 1865-'66, we have regularly sent up petitions asking for the national protection of the citizen's right to vote when the citizen happens to be a woman. We are here again for the same purpose. I do not propose to speak now, but to introduce the other speakers, and at the close perhaps will state to the committee the reasons why we come to Congress. The other speakers will give their thought from the standpoint of their respective States. I will first introduce to the committee Mrs. Harriet R. Shattuck, of Boston, Mass.

REMARKS BY MRS. HARRIET R. SHATTUCK.

Mrs. SHATTUCK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: It seems as if it were almost unnecessary for us to come here at this meeting, because I feel that all we have to say and all we have to claim is known to you, and we can not add anything to what has been said in the past sixteen years.

But I should like to say one thing, and that is, that in my work it has seemed that if we could convince everybody of the motives of the suffragists we would go far toward removing prejudices. I know that those motives are very much misunderstood. Persons think of us as ambitious women, who are desirous for fame, and who merely come forward to make speeches and get before the public, or else they think that we are unfortunate beings with no homes, or unhappy wives, who are getting our livelihood in this sort of way. If we could convince every man who has a vote in this Republic that this is not the case, I believe we could go far toward removing the prejudice against us. If we could make them see that we are working here merely because we know that the cause is right, and we feel that we must work for it, that there is a power outside of ourselves which impels us onward, which says to us: go forward and speak to the people and try to bring them up to a sense of their duty and of our right. This is the belief that I have in regard to our position on this question. It is a matter of duty with us, and that is all.

In Massachusetts I represent a very much larger number of women than is supposed. It has always been said that very few women wish to vote. Believing that this objection, although it has nothing to do with the rights of the cause,

ought to be met, the association of which I am president inaugurated last year a sort of canvass, which I believe never had been attempted before, whereby we obtained the proportion of women in favor and opposed to suffrage in different localities of our State. We took four localities in the city of Boston, two in smaller cities, and two in the country districts, and one also of school teachers in nine schools of one town. Those school teachers were unanimously in favor of suffrage, and in the nine localities we found that the proportion of women in favor was very large as against those opposed. The total of women canvassed was 814. Those in favor were 405; those opposed, 44; indifferent, 166; refused to sign, 160; not seen, 39. This, you see, is a very large proportion in favor. Those indifferent, and those who were not seen, were not included, because we claim that nobody can yet say that they are opposed or in favor until they declare themselves; but the 405 in favor against the 44 opposed were as 9 to 1. These canvasses were made by women who were of perfect respectability and responsibility, and they swore before a justice of the peace as to the truth of their statements.

So we have in Massachusetts this reliable canvass of the number of women in favor as to those opposed, and we find that it is 9 to 1.

These women, then, are the class whom I represent here, and they are women who can not come here themselves. Very few women in the country can come here and do this work, or do the work in their States, because they are in their homes attending to their duties, but none the less are they believers in this cause. We would not any more than any man in the country ask a woman to leave her home duties to go into this work, but a few of us are so situated that we can do it, and we come here and we go to the State Legislatures representing all the women of the country in this work.

What we ask is, not that we may have the ballot to obtain any particular thing, although we know that better things will come about from it, but merely because it is our right, and as a matter of justice we claim it as human beings and as citizens, and as moral, responsible, and spiritual beings, whose voice ought to be heard in the Government, and who ought to take hand with men and help the world to become better.

Gentlemen, you have kept women just a little step below you. It is only a short step. You shower down favors upon us it is true, still we remain below you, the recipients of favors without the right to take what is our own. We ask that this shall be changed; that you shall take us by the hand and lift us up to the same political level with you, where we shall have rights with you, and stand equal with you before the law.

REMARKS BY MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL.

MISS ANTHONY. I will now introduce to the committee Mrs. May Wright Sewall, of Indianapolis, who is the chairman of our executive committee.

Mrs. SEWALL. Gentlemen of the committee: Gentlemen, I believe, differ somewhat in their political opinions. It will not then be surprising, I suppose, that I should differ somewhat from my friend in regard to the knowledge that you probably possess upon our question. I do not believe that you know all that we know about the women of this country, for I believe that if you did know even all that I know, and my knowledge is much more limited than that of many of my sisters, long ago the sixteenth amendment, for which we ask, would have been passed through your influence.

I remember that when I was here two years ago and had the honor of appearing before the committee, who granted us, on that occasion, what you are so kind and courteous to grant on this occasion, an opportunity to speak before you, I told you that I represented at least seventy thousand women who had asked for the ballot in my State, and I tried then to remind the members of the committee that had seventy thousand Indiana men asked for any measure from the Congress that then occupied this Capitol, that measure would have secured the most deliberate consideration from their hands, and in all probability, its passage by the Congress. Of that there can be no doubt.

I do not wish to exaggerate my constituency, but during the last two years, and since I had the honor of addressing the committee, the work of woman suffrage has progressed very rapidly in my State. The number of women who have found themselves in circumstances to work openly, and whose spirit has been drawn into it, has largely increased, and as the workers have multiplied the results have increased. While we have not taken the careful canvass that has been so wisely and judiciously taken in Massachusetts, so that I can present to you the exact number of women who would to-day appeal for suffrage, I know that I can, far within the bounds of possible truth, state that while I represented seventy thousand women in my State two years ago, who desired the adoption of the sixteenth amendment, I represent to-day twice that number.

Should any one come up from Indiana, a pivotal State as it has been long called in national elections, saying that he represented the wish of one hundred and forty thousand Indiana men, gentlemen, would you scorn his appeal? Would you treat it lightly? Not at all. You know that it would receive the most careful consideration. You know that it would receive not merely respectful consideration, but immediate and prompt and just action upon your part.

I have been told since I have reached Washington that of all women in the country Indiana women have the least to complain of, and the least reason for coming to the United States Capitol with their petitions and the statement of their needs, because we have received from our own Legislature such amendments and amelioration of the old unjust laws. In one sense it is true that we are the recipients in our own State of many civil rights and of a very large degree of civil equality. It is true that as respects property rights, and as respects industrial rights, the women of my own State may perhaps be the envy of all other women in the land, but, gentlemen, you have always told men that the greater their rights and the more numerous their privileges the greater their responsibilities. That is equally true of woman, and simply because our property rights are enlarged, because our industrial field is enlarged, because we have more women who are producers in the industrial world, recognized as such, who own property in their own names, and consequently pay taxes upon that property, and thereby have greater financial and larger social, as well as industrial and business interests at stake in our own commonwealth, and in the manner in which the administration of national affairs is conducted—because of all these privileges we the more need the power which shall emphasize our influence upon political action.

You know that industrial and property rights are in the hands of the law-makers and the executors of the laws. Therefore, because of our advanced position in that matter, we the more need the recognition of our political equality. I say the recognition of our political equality, because I believe the equality already exists. I believe it waits simply for your recognition; that were the Constitution now justly construed, and the word "citizens," as used in your Constitution, justly applied it would include us, the women of this country. So I ask for the recognition of an equality that we already possess.

Further, because of what we have we ask for more. Because of the duties that we are commanded to do, we ask for more. My friend has said, and it is true in some respects, that men have always kept us just a little below them where they could shower upon us favors, and they have always done that generously. So they have, but, gentlemen, has your sex been more generous in its favors to women than women have been generous toward your sex in their favors? Neither one can do without the other; neither can dispense with the service of the other; neither can dispense with the reverence of the other, with the aid of the other in domestic life, in social life. The men of this nation are rapidly finding that they can not dispense with the service of women in business life.

I know that they are also feeling the need of what they call the moral support of women in their public life, and in their political life.

I always feel that it is not for women alone that I appeal. As men have long represented me, or assumed to do so, and as the men of my own family always have done so justly and most chivalrously, I feel that in my appeal for political recognition I represent them; that I represent my husband and my brother and the interest of the sex to which they belong, for you, gentlemen, by lifting the women of the nation into political equality would simply place us where we could lift you where you never yet have stood, upon a moral equality with us. Gentlemen, that is true. You know it as well as I. I do not speak to you as individuals; I speak to you as the representatives of your sex, as I stand here the representative of mine; and never until we are your equals politically will the moral standard for men be what it now is for women, and it is none too high. Let it grow the more elevated by our growth in spirituality, by every aspiration which we receive from the God whence we draw our life and whence we draw our impulses of life. Let our standard remain where it is and be more elevated. Yours must come up to match it, and never will it until we are your equals politically. So it is for men, as well as for women, that I make my appeal.

I know that there are some gentlemen upon this committee who, when we were here two years ago, had something to say about the rights of the States and of their disinclination to interfere with the rights of the States in this matter. I have great sympathy with the gentlemen from the South, who, I hope, do not forget that they are representing the women of the South in their work here at the national capital. Already some Northern States are making rapid strides towards the enfranchisement of their women. The men of some of the Northern States see that they can no longer accomplish the purposes politically which they desire to accomplish without the aid of the women of their respective States. Washington is the third Territory that has added women to its voting force, and consequently to its political power at the national capital as well as its own capital. Oregon will undoubtedly, as her representative will tell you to-day, soon add its women to its voting force. The men who believe that each State must be left to do this for itself will soon find that the balance of power between the North and South is destroyed, unless the women of the South are brought forward to add to the political force of the South as the women of the North are being brought forward to add to the political force of the North.

This should not be acted upon as a partisan measure. We do not appeal to you as Republicans or as Democrats. We have among us Republicans and Democrats; we have our party affiliations. We, of course, were reared with our brothers under the political belief and faith of our fathers, and probably as much influenced by that rearing as our brothers were. We shall go to strengthen both the political parties, neither one nor the other the more, probably. So that it is not as a partisan measure; it is as a just measure, which is our due, not because of what we are, gentlemen, but because of what you are, and because of what we are through you, of what you shall be through us; of what we, men and women, both are by virtue of our heritage and our one Father, our one mother eternal, the spirit created and progressive, that has thus far sustained us, and that will carry us and you forward to the action which we demand of you to take, and to the results which we anticipate will attend upon that action.

REMARKS BY MRS. HELEN M. GOUGAR.

MISS ANTHONY. I think I will call upon the other representative of the State of Indiana to speak now, Mrs. Helen M. Gougar, of Lafayette, Ind.

Mrs. GOUGAR. Gentlemen, we are here on behalf of the women citizens of this Republic, asking for political freedom. I maintain that there is no political question paramount to that of woman suffrage before the people of America to-day. Political parties would fain have us believe that tariff is the great question of the hour. Political parties know better. It is an insult to the intelligence of the present hour to say that when one-half of the citizens of this Republic are denied a direct voice in making the laws under which they shall live, that tariff, or that the civil rights of the negro, or any other question that can be brought up, is equal to the one of giving political freedom to women. So I come to ask you, as representative men, making laws to govern the women the same as the men of this country (and there is not a law that you make in the United States Congress in which woman has not an equal interest with man), to take the word "male" out of the constitutions of the United States and the several States, as you have taken the word "white" out, and give to us women a voice in the laws under which we live.

You ask me why I am inclined to be practical in my view of this question. In the first place, speaking from my own standpoint, I ask you to let me have a voice in the laws under which I shall live because the older empires of the earth are sending in upon our American shores a population drawing very largely from the asylums, yes, from the penitentiaries, the jails, and the poor-houses of the Old World. They are emptying those men upon our shores, and within a few months they are intrusted with the ballot, the law-making power in this Republic, and they and their representatives are seated in official and legislative positions. I, as an American-born woman, to-day enter my protest at being compelled to live under laws made by this class of men very largely, and myself being rendered utterly incapable of the protection that can only come from the ballot. While I would not have you take this right or privilege from those men whom we invite to our shores, I do ask you, in the face of this immense foreign immigration, to enfranchise the tax-paying, intelligent, moral, native-born women of America.

MISS ANTHONY. And foreign women, too.

Mrs. GOUGAR. Miss Anthony suggests an amendment, and I endorse it most heartily, and foreign women too, because if we let a foreign man vote I say let the foreign woman vote. I am in favor of universal suffrage.

Gentlemen, I ask this as a matter of justice; I ask it because it is an insult to the intelligence of the present to draw the sex line upon any right whatever. I know there are many objections urged, and I am sure that you have considered this question; but I only make the demand from the standpoint, not of sex, but of humanity.

As a Northern woman, as a woman from Indiana, I know that we have the intelligent, thinking, cultured, pure, patriotic men and women with us. We have the women who are engaged in philanthropic enterprises. We have in our own State the signatures of over 5,000 of the school teachers asking for woman's ballot. I ask you if the United States Government does not need the voice of those 5,000 educated school teachers as much as it needs the voice of the 240 male criminals who are, on an average, sent out of the penitentiary of Indiana every year, who go to the ballot-box upon every question whatever, and make laws under which those school teachers must live, and under which the mothers of our State must keep their homes and rear their children?

On behalf of the mothers of this country I demand that their hands shall be loosened before the ballot-box, and that they shall have the privilege of throwing the mother heart into the laws that shall follow their sons not only to the age of majority that only has been made legal, but is never recognized, and so I ask you to let the mothers carry their influence in protecting laws around the footsteps of those boys, even after their hair has turned gray and they have seats in the United States Congress. I ask you to give them the power to throw protecting laws around those boys to the very confines of eternity. This can be done in no indirect way; it can not be done by the silent influence; it can not be done by prayer. While I do not underestimate the power of prayer, I

say give me my ballot on election day that shall send pure men, good men, intelligent men, statesmen, instead of the modern politician, into our legislative halls. I would rather have that ballot on election day than the prayers of all the disfranchised women in the universe.

So I ask you to loosen our hands. I ask you to let us join with you in developing this science of human government. What is politics after all but the science of government? We are interested in these questions, and we are investigating them already. We have our opinions. Recently an able man has said that we have been grandly developed physically and mentally, but as a nation we are a political infant. So we are, gentlemen; we are to-day in America politically simply an infant. Why is it? It is because we have not recognized God's family plan in government—man and woman together. He created the male and female, and gave them dominion together. We have dominion in every other interest in society, and why shall we not stand shoulder to shoulder and have dominion in the science in government, in making the laws under which we shall live?

We are taxed to support this Government—this immense Capitol building is built largely from the industries of the tax-paying women of this country—and yet we are denied the slightest voice in distributing our taxes. Our forefathers did not object to taxation, but they did object to taxation without representation, and we, as thinking, industrious, active American women, object to taxation without representation. We are willing to contribute our share to the support of this Government, as we always have done, but we have a right to ask for our little yes and no in the form of the ballot so that we shall have a direct influence in distributing the taxes.

Gentlemen, I am amenable to the gallows and the penitentiary, and it is no more than right that I shall have a voice in framing the laws under which I shall be rewarded or punished. Am I asking too much of you as representative men of this great Government when I ask you to let me have a voice in making the laws under which I shall be rewarded or punished? It is written in the law of every State in this Union that a person in the courts shall have a jury of his peers, yet so long as the word "male" stands as it does in the Constitutions of the United States and the States no woman in any State of this Union can have a jury of her peers. I protest in the name of justice against going into the court-room and being compelled to run the gauntlet of the gutter and of the saloon—yes, even of the police court and of the jail—as we are compelled to do to select a male jury to try the interests of women, whether relating to life, property, or reputation. So long as the word "male" is in our constitutions just so long we can not have a jury of our peers in any State in the Union.

I ask that the women shall have the right of the ballot that they may go into our legislative halls and there provide for the prevention rather than the cure of crime. I ask you on behalf of the twelve hundred children under twelve years of age who are in the poor-houses of Indiana, of the sixteen hundred in the poor-houses of Illinois, and on that average in every State in the Union, that you shall take the word "male" out of the constitutions and allow the women of this country to sit in legislative halls and provide homes for and look after the little waifs of society. There are hundreds of moral questions to-day requiring the assistance of the moral element of womanhood to help make the laws under which we shall live.

Gentlemen, the political party that lives in the future must fight the moral battles of humanity. The day of blood is passed; the day of brain and heart is upon us; and I ask you to let the moral constituency that resides in woman's nature be represented. Let me say right here that I do not believe that there is morality in sex, but the social customs have been such that woman has been held to a higher standard. May the day hasten when the social custom shall hold man to as high a moral standard as it to-day holds woman.

This is the condition of things. The political party that presumes to fight the moral battles of the future must have the women in its ranks. We are non-partisan, as has been well said by my friend from Indiana [Mrs. Sewall.] We come Democrats, Republicans, and Greenbackers, and I expect if there were a half dozen other political parties some of us would belong to them. We ask this beneficent action upon your part because we believe that the intelligence and the justice of the hour is demanding it. We do not want a political party action. We want you to keep this question out of the canvass. We ask you in the name of justice and humanity alone, and not on the part of party.

I hold in my hand a petition sent from one district in the State of Illinois with the request that I bear it to you. Out of three hundred electors the names of two hundred stand in this petition that I shall leave in your hands. In this list stand not the wife-whippers, not the drunkards, not the dissolute, but every minister in that town, every editor in that town, every professional man in that town, every banker, and every prominent business man in that town of three hundred electors. I believe that petitions could be rolled up in this way in every town in the Northern and in many of the Southern States. I leave this petition with you for your consideration.

Upon no question whatever has such a large number of petitions been sent as upon this demand for woman suffrage. You have the petitions in your hands, and I ask you in the name of justice and humanity not to let this Congress adjourn without action.

You ask us if we are impatient. Yes; we are impatient. Some of us may die, and I want our grand old standard-bearer, Susan B. Anthony, whose name will go down to history beside that of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Wendell Phillips—I want that woman to go to heaven a free angel from this Republic. The power lies in your hands to make us all free. May the blessing of God be upon the hearts of every one of you, gentlemen; may the scales of prejudice fall from your eyes, and may you, representing the Senate of the United States, have the grand honor of telegraphing to us, to the millions of waiting women from one end of this country to the other, that the sixteenth amendment has been submitted to the ratification of the several legislatures of our States striking the word "male" out of the constitutions; and that this shall be, as we promise it to be, a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

REMARKS BY MRS. ABIGAIL SCOTT DUNIWAY.

Miss ANTHONY, I now, gentlemen of the committee, introduce to you Mrs. Abigail Scott Duniway, from the extreme Northwest; and before she speaks I wish to say that she has been the one canvasser in the great State of Oregon and Washington Territory, and that it is to Mrs. Duniway that the women of Washington Territory are more indebted than to all other influences for their enfranchisement.

Mrs. DUNIWAY. Gentlemen of the committee, do you think it possible that an agitation like this can go on and on forever without a victory? Do you not see that the golden moment has come for this grand committee to achieve immortality upon the grandest idea that has ever stirred the heart-beats of American citizens, and will you not in the magnanimity of noble purposes rise to meet the situation and accede to our demand, which in your hearts you must know is just?

I do not come before you, gentlemen, with the expectation to instruct you in regard to the laws of our country. The women around us are law-abiding women. They are the mothers, many of them, of true and noble men, the wives, many of them, of grand, free husbands, who are listening, watching, waiting eagerly for successful tidings of this great experiment.

There never was a grander theory of government than that of these United States. Never were grander principles enunciated upon any platform, never so grand before and never can be grander again, than the declaration that "all men," including of course all women, since women are amenable to the

laws, "are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Gentlemen, are we allowed the opportunity of consent? These women who are here from Maine to Oregon, from the Straits of Fuca to the reefs of Florida, who in their representative capacity have come up here so often, augmented in their numbers year by year, looking with eyes of hope and hearts of faith, but oftentimes with hopes deferred, upon the final solution of this great problem, which it is so much in your hands to hasten in its solution—these women are in earnest. My State is far away beyond the confines of the Rocky Mountains, away over beside the singing Pacific sea, but the spirit of liberty is among us there, and the public heart has been stirred. The hearts of our men have been moved to listen to our demands, and in Washington Territory, as one speaker has informed you, women to-day are endowed with full and free enfranchisement, and the rejoicing throughout that Territory is universal.

In Oregon men have also listened to our demand, and the Legislature has in two successive sessions agreed upon a proposition to amend our State constitution, a proposition which will be submitted for ratification to our voters at the coming June election. It is simply a proposition declaring that the right of suffrage shall not hereafter be prohibited in the State of Oregon on account of sex. Your action in the Senate of the United States will greatly determine the action of the voters of Oregon on our, or rather on their, election day, for we stand before the public in the anomaly of petitioners upon a great question in which we, in its final decision, are allowed no voice, and we can only stand with expectant hearts and almost bated breath awaiting the action of men who are to make this decision.

We have great hope for our victory, because the men of the broad, free West are grand, and chivalrous, and free. They have gone across the mighty continent with free steps; they have raised the standard of a new Pacific empire; they have imbibed the spirit of liberty with their very breath, and they have listened to us far in advance of many of the men of the older States who have not had their opportunity among the grand free wilds of nature for expansion.

So all of our leaders are with us to-day. You may go to either member of the Senate of the United States from Oregon, and while I can not speak so positively for the senior member, as he came over here some years ago before the public were so well educated as now, I can and do proudly vouch for the late Senator-elect DOLPH, who now has a seat upon the floor of the Senate, who is heart and soul and hand and purse in sympathy with this great movement for the enfranchisement of the women of Oregon. I would also be unjust to our worthy representative in the lower house, Hon. M. C. George, did I not proudly speak his name in this great connection. Men of this class are with us, and without regard to party affiliations we know that they are upon our side. Our governor, our associate supreme judge for the district of the Pacific, all of these men, are leading in the grand free way that characterizes the men of the West in assisting in this work. But we have—alas, that I should be compelled to say it—a great many men who pay no heed whatever to this question. Men will be entitled to a voice in this decision who are not, like members of Congress, the picked men of the nation or the State, but men, many of whom can not read, who will have an opportunity to decide this question as far as their ballots can go. These are they to whom the enlightened, educated motherhood of the State of Oregon must look largely for the decision.

This brings me to the grand point of our coming to Congress. Some of you say to us, "Why not leave this matter for settlement in the different States?" When we leave it for settlement in the different States we leave it just as I have told you, because of the constitutional provisions of our organic law we can not do otherwise; but if the question were to be settled by the Legislature of Oregon alone it would be settled now; and I, as a representative of that State only, would have no need of coming here; it would be settled just as it has been settled in Washington Territory; but when we come here to Congress it is the great nation asking you to take such legislative action in submitting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall recognize the equality of these women who are here; these women who have come here from all parts of the country, whose constituents are looking on while we are here before you. As we reflect that our feeblest words uttered before this committee will go to the confines of this nation and be cabled across the great Atlantic and around the globe, we realize that more and more prominently our cause is growing into public favor, and the time is just upon us when some decision must be made.

Gentlemen of the committee, will you not recognize the importance of the movement? Who among you will be our standard-bearer? Who among you will achieve immortality by standing up in these halls in which we are forbidden to speak, and in the magnanimity of your own free wills and noble hearts champion the woman's cause and make us before the law, as we of right ought now to be, free and independent?

REMARKS BY MRS. CAROLINE GILKEY ROGERS.

Miss ANTHONY. I now call upon Mrs. Caroline Gilkey Rogers, of Lansingburg, N. Y., to address the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in our efforts to secure the right of citizenship we appeal only to your sense of justice and love of fair dealing.

We ask for the ballot because it is the symbol of equality. There is no other recognized symbol of equality in this country. We ask for the ballot that we may be equal to man before the law. We urge a twofold right—our right to the Republic, the Republic's right to us. We believe the interests of the country are identical with the interests of all its citizens, including women, and that the Government can no longer afford to shut women out from the affairs of the State and nation, and wise men are beginning to know that they are needed in the Government; that they are needed where our laws are made as well as where they are violated.

Many admit the justice of our claim, but will say, Is it safe? Is it expedient? It is always safe to do right; is always expedient to be just. Justice can never bring evil in its train.

The question is asked how and what would the women do in the State and nation? We do not pledge ourselves to anything. I claim that we can not have a better government than that of the people. The present Government is of only a part of the people. We have not yet entered upon the system of higher civilization, because the Government is of man only. If we had been marching along with you all this time I trust we should have reached a higher plane of civilization.

We believe that all the virtue of the world can take care of all the evil, and all the intelligence can take care of all the ignorance. Let us have all the virtue confront all the vice.

There is no need to do battle in this matter. In all kindness and gentleness we urge our claims. There is no need to declare war upon men, for the best of men in this country are with us heart and soul.

It is a common remark that unless some new element is infused into our political life our nation is doomed to destruction. What more fitting element than the noble type of American womanhood, who have taught our Presidents, Senators, and Congressmen the rudiments of all they know.

Think of all the foreigners and all our own native-born ignorant men who can not write their own names or read the Declaration of Independence making laws for such women as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. Think of jurors drawn from these ranks to watch and try young girls for crimes often committed against them when the male criminal goes free. Think of a single one of these votes on election day outweighing all the women in the country

Is it not humiliating for me to sit, a political cipher, and see the colored man in my employ, to whom I have taught the alphabet, go out on election day and say by his vote what shall be done with my tax money. How would you like it?

When we think of the wives trampled on by husbands whom the law has taught them to regard as inferior beings, and of the mothers whose children are torn from their arms by the direct behest of the law at the bidding of a dead or living father, when we think of these things, our hearts ache with pity and indignation.

If mothers could only realize how the laws which they have no voice in making and no power to change affect them at every point, how they enter every door, whether palace or hovel, touch, limit, and bind, every article and inmate from the smallest child up, no woman, however shrinking and delicate, can escape it, they would get beyond the meaningless cry, "I have all the rights I want." Do these women know that in most States in the Union the shameful fact that no woman has any legal rights to her own child, except it is born out of wedlock! In these States there is not a line of positive law to protect the mother; the father is the legal protector and guardian of the children.

Under the laws of most of the States to-day a husband may by his last will bequeath his child away from his mother, so that she might, if the guardian chose, never see it again.

The husband may have been a very bad man, and in a moment of anger made the will. The guardian he has appointed may turn out a malicious man, and take pleasure in tormenting the mother, or he may bring up the children in a way that the mother thinks ruinous to them, and she has no redress in law. Why do not all the fortunate mothers in the land cry out against such a law? Why do not all women say, "Inasmuch as the law has done this wrong unto the least of these my sisters it has done it unto me." It is true that men are almost always better than their laws, but while a bad law remains on the statute-books it gives to an unscrupulous man a right to be as bad as the law.

It is often said to us when all the women ask for the ballot it will be granted. Did all the married women petition the Legislatures of their States to secure to them the right to hold in their own name the property that belonged to them? To secure to the poor forsaken wife the right to her earnings?

All the women did not ask for these rights, but all accepted them with joy and gladness when they were obtained, and so it will be with the franchise. But woman's right to self-government does not depend upon the numbers that demand it, but upon precisely the same principles that man claims it for himself.

Where did man get the authority that he now claims to govern one-half of humanity, from what power the right to place woman, his helpmeet in life, in an inferior position? Came it from nature? Nature made woman his superior when she made her his mother—his equal when she fitted her to hold the sacred position of wife. Did women meet in council and voluntarily give up all their claim to be their own law-makers?

The power of the strong over the weak makes man the master. Yes, then, and then only, does he gain the authority.

It is all very well to say "convert the women." While we most heartily wish they could all feel as we do, yet when it comes to the decision of this great question they are mere ciphers, for if this question is settled by the States it will be left to the voters, not to the women to decide. Or if suffrage comes to women through a sixteenth amendment of the national Constitution, it will be decided by Legislatures elected by men. In neither case will women have an opportunity of passing upon the question. So reason tells us we must devote our best efforts to converting those to whom we must look for the removal of our disabilities, which now prevent our exercising the right of suffrage.

The arguments in favor of the enfranchisement of women are truths strong and unanswerable, and as old as the free institutions of our Government. The principle of "taxation without representation is tyranny" applies to women as well as men, and is as true to-day as it was a hundred years ago.

Our demand for the ballot is the great onward step of the century, and not, as some claim, the idiosyncrasies of a few unbalanced minds.

Every argument that has been urged against this question of woman's suffrage has been urged against every reform. Yet the reforms have fought their way onward and become a part of the glorious history of humanity.

So it will be with suffrage. "You can stop the crowing of the cock, but you can not stop the dawn of the morning." And now, gentlemen, you are responsible, not for the laws you find on the statute books, but for those you leave there.

REMARKS BY MRS. MARY SEYMOUR HOWELL.

Miss ANTHONY. I now introduce to the committee Mrs. Mary Seymour Howell, the president of the Albany, N. Y., State society.

Mrs. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: Miss Anthony gives me five minutes. I shall have to talk very rapidly. I ask you for the ballot because of the very first principle that is often repeated to you, that "taxation without representation is tyranny." I come from the city of Albany, where many of my sisters are taxed for millions of dollars. There are three or four women in the city of Albany who are worth their millions, and yet they have no voice in the laws that govern and control them. One of our great State senators has said that you can not argue five minutes against woman suffrage without repudiating every principle that this great Republic is founded upon.

I ask you also for the ballot for the large class of women who are not taxed. They need it more than the women who are taxed. I have found in every work that I have conducted that because I am a woman I am not paid for that work as a man is paid for similar work.

You have heard, and perhaps some of you are thinking—I hope not—that women should be at home. I wish to say to you that there are millions of women in the United States who have no homes. There are millions of women who are trying to earn their bread and hold their purity sacred. For that class of women I appeal to you. In the city of Albany there are hundreds of women in our factories making the shirts that you can buy for \$1.50 and \$2, and all those women are paid for making the shirts 4 cents apiece. There are in the State of New York 18,000 teachers. When I was a teacher and taught with gentlemen in our academies, I received about one-fourth of the pay because I happened to be a woman. I consider it an insult that forever burns in my soul, that I am to be handed a mere pittance in comparison with what man receives for same quality of work. When I was sent out by our superintendent of public instruction to hold conventions of teachers, as I have often done in our State of New York, and when I did one-third more work than the men teachers so sent out, but because I was a woman and had not the ballot, I was only paid about half as much as the man; and saying that once to our superintendent of public instruction in Albany, he said, "Mrs. Howell, just as soon as you get the ballot and have a political influence in the work you will have the same pay as a man."

We ask for the ballot for that great army of fallen women who walk our streets and who break up our homes and ruin our husbands and our dear boys. We ask it for those women. The ballot will lift them up. Hundreds and thousands of women give up their purity for the sake of starving children and families. There is many a woman who goes to a life of degradation and pollution shedding burning tears over her 4-cent shirt.

We ask for the ballot for the good of the race. Huxley says, "admitting for the sake of argument that woman is the weaker, mentally and physically, for that reason she should have the ballot and should have every help that the

world can give her." When you debar from your councils and legislative halls the purity, the spirituality, and the love of woman then those legislative halls and those councils are apt to become coarse and brutal. God gave us to you to help you in this little journey to a better land, and by our love and our intellect to help to make our country pure and noble, and if you would have statesmen you must have stateswomen to bear them.

I ask you also for the ballot that I may decide what I am. I stand before you, but I do not know to-day whether I am legally a "person" according to the law. It has been decided in some States that we are not "persons." In the State of New York, in one village, it was decided that women are not inhabitants. So I should like to know whether I am a person, whether I am an inhabitant, and above all I ask you for the ballot that I may become a citizen of this great Republic.

Gentlemen, you see before you this great convention of women from the Atlantic slopes to the Pacific Ocean, from the North to the South. We are in dead earnest. A reform never goes backward. This is a question that is before the American nation. Will you do your duty and give us our liberty, or will you leave it for braver hearts to do what must be done? For, like our forefathers, we will ask until we have gained it.

Ever the world goes round and round;

Ever the truth comes uppermost; and ever is justice done.

REMARKS BY MRS. LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE.

Miss ANTHONY. I now have the pleasure of introducing to the committee Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake, of New York. New York is a great State, and therefore it has three representatives here to-day.

Mrs. BLAKE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: A recent writer in an English magazine, in speaking of the great advantage which to-day flows to the laboring classes of that nation from having received the right of suffrage, made the statement that disfranchised classes are oppressed, not because there is any desire whatever to do injustice to them, but because they are forgotten. We have year after year and session after session of our legislatures and of our Congresses proved the correctness of this statement. While we have nothing to complain of in the courtesy which we receive in private life, still when we see masses of men assembled together for political action, whether it be of the nation or of the State, we find that the women are totally forgotten.

In the limited time that is mine I can not go into any lengthy exposition upon this point. I will simply call your attention to the total forgetfulness of the Congress of the United States to the debt owed to the women of this nation during the war. You have passed a pension bill upon which there has been much comment throughout the nation, and yet, when an old army nurse applies for a pension, a woman who is broken down by her devotion to the nation in hospitals and upon the battle-field, she is met at the door of the Pension Bureau by this statement, "the Government has made no appropriation for the services of women in the war." One of these women is an old nurse whom some of you may remember, Mother Bickerdyke, who went out onto many a battle-field when she was in the prime of life, twenty years ago, and at the risk of her life lifted men, who were wounded, in her arms, and carried them to a place of safety. She is an old woman now, and where is she? What reward has the nation bestowed to her faithful services? The nation has a pension for every man who has served this nation, even down to the boy recruit who was out but three months; but Mother Bickerdyke, though her health has never been good since her service then, is earning her living at the wash-tub, a monument to the ingratitude of a Republic as great as was that when Belshazzar begged in the streets of Rome.

I bring up this illustration alone out of innumerable others that are possible, to try to impress upon your minds that we are forgotten. It is not from any unkindness on your part. Who would think for one moment, looking upon the kindly faces of this committee, that any man on it would do an injustice to women, especially if she were old and feeble? But because we have no right to vote, as I said, our interests are overlooked and forgotten.

It is often said that we have too many voters; that the aggregate of vice and ignorance among us should not be increased by giving women the right of suffrage. I wish to remind you of the fact that in the enormous immigration that pours to our shores every year, numbering somewhere in the neighborhood of half a million, there come twice as many men as women. The figures for the last year were two hundred and twenty-three thousand men, and one hundred and thirteen thousand women.

What does this mean? It means a steady influx of this foreign element; it means a constant preponderance of the masculine over the feminine; and it means also, of course, a preponderance of the voting power of the foreigners as compared to the native born. To those who fear that our American institutions are threatened by this gigantic inroad of foreigners I commend the reflection that the best safeguard against any such preponderance of foreign nations or of foreign influence is to put the ballot in the hands of the American-born women, and of all other women also, so that if the foreign-born man overbalances us in numbers we shall be always in a preponderance on the side of the liberty which is secured by our institutions.

It is because, as many of my predecessors have said, of the different elements represented by the two sexes, that we are asking for this liberty. When I was recently in the capitol of my own State of New York, I was reminded there of the difference of temperament between the sexes by seeing how children act when coming to the doors of the capitol, which have been constructed so that they are very hard to open. Whether that is because they want to keep us women out or not I am not able to say; but for some reason the doors are so constructed that it is nearly impossible to open them. I saw a number of little girls coming in through those doors—every child held the door for those who were to follow. A number of little boys followed just after, and every boy rushed through and let the door shut in the face of the one who was coming behind him. That is a good illustration of the different qualities of the sexes. Those boys were not unkind, they simply represented that onward push which is one of the grandest characteristics of your sex; and the little girls, on the other hand, represented that gentleness and thoughtfulness of others which is eminently a characteristic of women.

This woman element is needed in every branch of the Government. Look at the wholesale destruction of the forests throughout our nation, which has gone on until it brings direct destruction to the land on the lines of the great rivers of the West, and threatens us even in New York with destroying at once the beauty and usefulness of our far-famed Hudson. If women were in the Government do you not think they would protect the economic interests of the nation? They are the born and trained economists of the world, and when you call them to your assistance you will find an element that has not heretofore been felt with the weight which it deserves.

As we walk through the Capitol we are struck with the significance of the symbolism on every side; we view the adornments in the beautiful room, and we find here everywhere emblematically woman's figure. Here is woman representing even war, and there are women representing grace and loveliness and the fullness of the harvest; and, above all, they are extending their protecting arms over the little children. Gentlemen, I leave you under this symbolism, hoping that you will see in it the type of a coming day when we shall have women and men united together in the national councils in this great building.

REMARKS BY DR. CLEMENCE S. LOZIER.

Miss ANTHONY. I meant to have said, as I introduced Mrs. Blake, that sitting

on the sofa is Dr. Clemence S. Lozier, who declines to speak, but I want her to stand up, because she represents New York city.

Dr. LOZIER. I thank you. I am very happy to be here, but I am not a fluent speaker. I feel in my heart that I know what justice means; that I know what mercy means, and in all my rounds of duty in my profession I am happy to extend not only food but shelter to many poor ones. The need of the ballot for working-girls and those who pay no taxes is not understood. The Saviour said, seeing the poor widow cast her two mites, which make a farthing, into the public treasury, "This poor widow hath cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury." I see this among the poor working-girls of the city of New York; sick, in a little garret bedroom, perhaps, and although needing medical care and needing food, they will say to me, "above all things else, if I could only pay the rent." The rent of their little rooms goes into the coffers of their landlords and pays taxes. The poor women of the city of New York and everywhere are the grandest upholders of this Government. I believe they pay indirectly more taxes than the monopoly kings of our country. It is for them that I want the ballot.

REMARKS BY MRS. ELIZABETH BOYNTON HARBERT.

Miss ANTHONY. I now introduce to the committee Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, of Illinois, and before Mrs. Harbert speaks I wish to say that for the last six years she has edited a department of the Chicago Inter-Ocean called the "Women's Kingdom."

Mrs. HARBERT. Mr. Chairman and honorable gentlemen of the committee, after the eloquent rhetoric to which you have listened I merely come in these five minutes with a plain statement of facts. Some friends have said, "Here is the same company of women that year after year besiege you with their petitions." We are here to-day in a representative capacity. From the great State of Illinois I come, representing 200,000 men and women of that State who have recorded their written petitions for woman's ballot, 90,000 of these being citizens under the law—male voters; those 90,000 having signed petitions for the right of women to vote on the temperance question; 90,000 women also signed those petitions; 50,000 men and women signed the petitions for the school vote, and nearly 60,000 more have signed petitions that the right of suffrage might be accorded to women.

This growth of public sentiment has been occasioned by the needs of the children and the working-women of that great State. I come here to ask you to make a niche in the statesmanship and legislation of the nation for the domestic interests of the people. You recognize that the masculine thought is more often turned to the material and political interests of the nation. I claim that the mother thought, the woman element needed, is to supplement the concurrent statesmanship of American men on political and industrial affairs with the domestic legislation of the nation.

There are good men and women who believe that women should use their influence merely through their social sphere. I believe both of the great parties are represented by us. You remember that a few weeks ago when there came across the country the news of the decision of the Supreme Court as regards the negro race the politicians sprang to the platform, and our editors hastened to their sanctuaries, to proclaim to the people that that did not interfere with the civil rights of the negro; that only their social rights were affected, and that the civil rights of man, those rights worth dying for, were not affected. Gentlemen, we who are trying to help the men in our municipal governments, who are trying to save the children from our poor-houses, begin to realize that whatever is good and essential for the liberty of the black man is good for the white woman and for all women. We are here to claim that whatever liberty has done for you it should be allowed to do for us. Take a single glance through the past; recognize the position of American manhood before the world to-day, and whatever liberty has done for you, liberty will surely do for the mothers of the race.

MRS. SARAH E. WALL.

Miss ANTHONY. Gentlemen of the committee, here is another woman I wish to show you, Sarah E. Wall, of Worcester, Mass., who, for the last twenty-five years, has resisted the tax-gatherer when he came around. I want you to look at her. She looks very harmless, but she will not pay a dollar of tax. She says when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will give her the right of representation she will pay her taxes. I do not know exactly how it is now, but the assessor has left her name off the tax-list, and passed her by rather than have a lawsuit with her.

REMARKS BY MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

Miss ANTHONY. I wish I could state the avocations and professions of the various women who have spoken in our convention during the last three days. I do not wish to speak disparagingly in regard to the men in Congress, but I doubt if a man on the floor of either House could have made a better speech than some of those which have been made by women during this convention. Twenty-six States and Territories are represented with live women, traveling all the way from Kansas, Arkansas, Oregon, and Washington Territory. It does seem to me that after all these years of coming up to this Capitol an impression should be made upon the minds of legislators that we are never to be silenced until we gain the demand. We have never had in the whole thirty years of our agitation so many States represented in any convention as we have had this year.

This fact shows the growth of public sentiment. Mrs. Duniway is here all the way from Oregon, and you say, when Mrs. Duniway is doing so well up there, and is so hopeful of carrying the State of Oregon, why do not you all rest satisfied with that plan of gaining the suffrage? My answer is that I do not wish to see the women of the thirty-eight States of this Union compelled to leave their homes and canvass each State, school district by school district. It is asking too much of a moneyless class of people, disfranchised by the constitution of every State in the Union. The joint earnings of the marriage copartnership in all the States belong legally to the husband. If the wife goes outside the home to work, the law in most of the States permits her to own and control the money thus earned. We have not a single State in the Union where the wife's earnings inside the marriage copartnership are owned by her. Therefore, to ask the vast majority of women who are thus situated, without an independent dollar of their own, to make a canvass of the States is asking too much.

Mrs. GOUGAR. Why did they not ask the negro to do that?

Miss ANTHONY. Of course the negro was not asked to go begging the white man from school district to school district to get his ballot. If it was known that we could be driven to the ballot-box like a flock of sheep, and all vote for one party, there would be a bid made for us; but that is not done, because we can not promise you any such thing; because we stand before you and honestly tell you that the women of this nation are educated equally with the men, and that they, too, have political opinions. There is not a woman on our platform, there is scarcely a woman in this city of Washington, whether the wife of a Senator or a Congressman—I do not believe you can find a score of women in the whole nation—who have not opinions on the pending Presidential election. We all have opinions; we all have parties. Some of us like one party and one candidate and some another.

Therefore we can not promise you that women will vote as a unit when they are enfranchised. Suppose the Democrats shall put a woman-suffrage plank in their platform in their Presidential convention, and nominate an open and avowed friend of woman suffrage to stand upon that platform; we can not pledge you that all the women of this nation will work for the success of that party, nor can I pledge you that they will all vote for the Republican party if it should be the one to take the lead in their enfranchisement. Our women will not toe a mark anywhere; they will think and act for themselves, and when they are

enfranchised they will divide upon all political questions, as do intelligent, educated men.

I have tried the experiment of canvassing four States prior to Oregon, and in each State with the best canvass that it was possible for us to make we obtained a vote of one-third. One man out of every three men voted for the enfranchisement of the women of their households, while two voted against it. But we are proud to say that our splendid minority is always composed of the very best men of the State, and I think Senator PALMER will agree with me that the forty thousand men of Michigan who voted for the enfranchisement of the women of his State were really the picked men in intelligence, in culture, in morals, in standing, and in every direction.

It is too much to say that the majority of the voters in any State are superior, educated, and capable, or that they investigate every question thoroughly, and cast the ballot thereon intelligently. We all know that the majority of the voters of any State are not of that stamp. The vast masses of the people, the laboring classes, have all they can do in their struggle to get food and shelter for their families. They have very little time or opportunity to study great questions of constitutional law.

Because of this impossibility for women to canvass the States over and over to educate the rank and file of the voters we come to you to ask you to make it possible for the Legislatures of the thirty-eight States to settle the question, where we shall have a few representative men assembled before whom we can make our appeals and arguments.

This method of settling the question by the Legislatures is just as much in the line of States' rights as is that of the popular vote. The one question before you is, will you insist that a majority of the individual voters of every State must be converted before its women shall have the right to vote, or will you allow the matter to be settled by the representative men in the Legislatures of the several States? You need not fear that we shall get suffrage too quickly if Congress shall submit the proposition, for even then we shall have a hard time in going from Legislature to Legislature to secure the two-thirds votes of three-fourths of the States necessary to ratify the amendment. It may take twenty years after Congress has taken the initiative step to make action by the State Legislatures possible.

I pray you, gentlemen, that you will make your report to the Senate speedily. I know you are ready to make a favorable one. Some of our speakers may not have known this as well as I. I ask you to make a report and to bring it to a discussion and a vote on the floor of the Senate.

You ask me if we want to press this question to a vote provided there is not a majority to carry it. I say yes, because we want the reflex influence of the discussion and of the opinions of Senators to go back into the States to help us to educate the people of the States.

Senator LAPHAM. It would require a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate to submit the amendment to the State Legislatures for ratification.

Miss ANTHONY. I know that it requires a two-thirds vote of both Houses. But still, I repeat, even if you can not get the two-thirds vote, we ask you to report the bill and bring it to a discussion and a vote at the earliest day possible. We feel that this question should be brought before Congress at every session. We ask this little attention from Congressmen whose salaries are paid from the taxes; women do their share for the support of this great Government. We think we are entitled to two or three days of each session of Congress in both the Senate and House. Therefore I ask of you to help us to a discussion in the Senate this session. There is no reason why the Senate, composed of seventy-six of the most intelligent and liberty-loving men of the nation, shall not pass the resolution by a two-thirds vote. I really believe it will do so if the friends on this committee and on the floor of the Senate will champion the measure as earnestly as if it were to benefit themselves instead of their mothers and sisters.

Gentlemen, I thank you for this hearing granted, and I hope the telegraph wires will soon tell us that your report is presented, and that a discussion is inaugurated on the floor of the Senate.

ARGUMENTS OF THE WOMAN-SUFFRAGE DELEGATES BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, JANUARY 23, 1880.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES SENATE, Friday, January 23, 1880.

The committee assembled at half-past 10 o'clock a. m.

Present: Mr. Thurman, chairman; Mr. McDonald, Mr. Bayard, Mr. Davis, of Illinois; Mr. Edmunds.

Also Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace, of Indiana; Mrs. Elizabeth L. Saxon, of Louisiana; Mrs. Mary A. Stewart, of Delaware; Mrs. Lucinda B. Chandler, of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Julia Smith Parker, of Glastonbury, Conn.; Mrs. Nancy R. Allen, of Iowa; Miss Susan B. Anthony, of New York; Mrs. Sara A. Spencer, of the city of Washington, and others, delegates to the twelfth Washington convention of the National Woman-Suffrage Association, held January 21 and 22, 1880.

The CHAIRMAN. Several members of the committee are unable to be here. Mr. Lamar is detained at his home in Mississippi by sickness; Mr. Carpenter is confined to his room by sickness. Mr. Conkling has been unwell; I do not know how he is this morning; and Mr. Garland is chairman of the Committee on Territories, which has a meeting this morning that he could not omit to attend. I do not think we are likely to have any more members of the committee than are here now, and we will hear you, ladies.

REMARKS BY MRS. ZERELDA G. WALLACE, OF INDIANA.

Mrs. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is scarcely necessary to recite that there is not an effect without a cause. Therefore it would be well for the statesmen of this nation to ask themselves the question, what has brought the women from all parts of this nation to the capital at this time; the wives and mothers, and sisters; the home-loving, law-abiding women? What has been the strong motive that has taken us away from the quiet and comfort of our own homes and brought us before you to-day? As an answer partly to that question, I will read an extract from a speech made by one of Indiana's statesmen, and probably if I tell you his name his sentiments may have some weight with you. He found out by experience and gave us the benefit of his experience, and it is what we are rapidly learning:

"You can go to meetings; you can vote resolutions; you can attend great demonstrations on the street; but, after all, the only occasion where the American citizen expresses his acts, his opinion, and his power is at the ballot-box; and that little ballot that he drops in there is the written sentiment of the times, and it is the power that he has as a citizen of this great Republic."

That is the reason why we are here; that is the reason why we want to vote. We are no seditious women, clamoring for any peculiar rights, but we are patient women. It is not the woman question that brings us before you to-day; it is the human question that underlies this movement among the women of this nation; it is for God, and home, and native land. We love and appreciate our country; we value the institutions of our country. We realize that we owe great obligations to the men of this nation for what they have done. We realize that to their strength we owe the subjugation of all the material forces of the universe which give us comfort and luxury in our homes. We realize that to their brains we owe the machinery that gives us leisure for intellectual culture and achievement. We realize that it is to their education we owe the opening of our colleges and the establishment of our public schools, which give us these great and glorious privileges.

This movement is the legitimate result of this development, of this enlightenment, and of the suffering that woman has undergone in the ages past. We find ourselves hedged in at every effort we make as mothers for the amelioration of society, as philanthropists, as Christians.

A short time ago I went before the Legislature of Indiana with a petition signed by 25,000 women, the best women in the State. I appeal to the memory of Judge McDonald to substantiate the truth of what I say. Judge McDonald knows that I am a home-loving, law-abiding, tax-paying woman of Indiana, and have been for 50 years. When I went before our Legislature and found that 100 of the vilest men in our State, merely by the possession of the ballot, had more influence with the law-makers of our land than the wives and mothers of the nation, it was a revelation that was perfectly startling.

You must admit that in popular government the ballot is the most potent means of all moral and social reforms. As members of society, as those who are deeply interested in the promotion of good morals, of virtue, and of the proper protection of men from the consequences of their own vices, and of the protection of women, too, we are deeply interested in all the social problems with which you have grappled so long unsuccessfully. We do not intend to depreciate your efforts, but you have attempted to do an impossible thing. You have attempted to represent the whole by one-half; and we come to you to-day for a recognition of the fact that humanity is not a unit; that it is a unity; and because we are one-half that go to make up that grand unity we come before you to-day and ask you to recognize our rights as citizens of this Republic.

We know that many of us lay ourselves liable to contumely and ridicule. We have to meet sneers; but we are determined that in the defense of right we will ignore everything but what we feel to be our duty.

We do not come here as agitators, or aimless, dissatisfied, unhappy women by any means; but we come as human beings, recognizing our responsibility to God for the advantages that have come to us in the development of the ages. We wish to discharge that responsibility faithfully, effectually, and conscientiously, and we can not do it under our form of government, hedged in as we are by the lack of a power which is such a mighty engine in our form of government for every means of work.

I say to you, then, we come as one-half of the great whole. There is an essential difference in the sexes. Mr. Parkman labored very hard to prove what no one would deny—that there is an essential difference in the sexes, and it is because of that very differentiation, the union of which in home, the recognition of which in society, brings the greatest happiness, the recognition of which in the church brings the greatest power and influence for good, and the recognition of which in the Government would enable us finally, as near as it is possible for humanity, to perfect our form of government. Probably we can never have a perfect form of government, but the nearer we approximate to the divine the nearer will we attain to perfection; and the divine government recognizes neither caste, class, sex, nor nationality. The nearer we approach to that divine ideal the nearer we will come to realizing our hopes of finally securing at least the most perfect form of human government that it is possible for us to secure.

I do not wish to trespass upon your time, but I have felt that this movement is not understood by a great majority of people. They think that we are unhappy, that we are dissatisfied, that we are restive. That is not the case. When we look over the statistics of our State and find that 60 per cent. of all the crime is the result of drunkenness; when we find that 60 per cent. of the orphan children that fill our pauper homes are the children of drunken parents; when we find that after a certain age the daughters of those fathers who were made paupers and drunkards by the approbation and sanction and under the seal of the Government, go to supply our houses of prostitution, and when we find that the sons of these fathers go to fill up our jails and our penitentiaries, and that the sober, law-abiding men, the pains-taking, economical, and many of them widowed wives of this nation have to pay taxes and bear the expenses incurred by such legislation, do you wonder, gentlemen, that we at least want to try our hand and see what we can do?

We may not be able to bring about that Utopian form of government which we all desire, but we can at least make an effort. Under our form of government the ballot is our right; it is just and proper. When you debate about the expediency of any matter you have no right to say that it is inexpedient to do right. Do right and leave the result to God. You will have to decide between one of two things: either you have no claim under our form of Constitution for the privileges which you enjoy, or you will have to say that we are neither citizens nor persons.

Realizing this fact, and the deep interest that we take in the successful issue of this experiment that humanity is making for self-government, and realizing the fact that the ballot never can be given to us under more favorable circumstances, and believing that here on this continent is to be wrought out the great problem of man's ability to govern himself—and when I say man I use the word in the generic sense—that humanity here is to work out the great problems of self-government and development, and recognizing, as I said a few minutes ago, that we are one-half of the great whole, we feel that we ought to be heard when we come before you and make the plea that we make to-day.

REMARKS BY MRS. JULIA SMITH PARKER, OF GLASTONBURY, CONN.

Mrs. PARKER. Gentlemen: You may be surprised, and not so much surprised as I am, to see a woman of over four-score years of age appear before you at this time. She came into the world and reached years of maturity and discretion before any person in this room was born. She now comes before you to plead that she can vote and have all the privileges that men have. She has suffered so much individually that she thought when she was young she had no right to speak before the men; but still she had courage to get an education equal to that of any man at the college, and she had to suffer a great deal on that account. She went to New Haven to school, and it was noised that she had studied the languages. It was such an astonishing thing for girls at that time to have the advantages of education that I had absolutely to go to cotillion parties to let people see that I had common sense. [Laughter.]

She has suffered; she had to pay money. She has had to pay \$200 a year in taxes without the least privilege of knowing what becomes of it. She does not know but that it goes to support grog-shops. She knows nothing about it. She has had to suffer her cows to be sold at the sign-post six times. She suffered her meadow land to be sold, worth \$2,000, for a tax of less than \$50. If she could vote as the men do she would not have suffered this insult; and so much would not have been said against her as has been said if men did not have the whole power. I was told that they had the power to take any thing that I owned if I would not exert myself to pay the money. I felt that I ought to have some little voice in determining what should be done with what I paid. I felt that I ought to own my own property; that it ought not to be in these men's hands; and I now come to plead that I may have the same privileges before the law that men have. I have seen what a difference there is, when I have had my cows sold, by having a voter to take my part.

I have come from an obscure town (I can not say that it is obscure exactly) on the banks of the Connecticut, where I was born. I was brought up on a farm. I never had an idea that it could be possible that I should ever come all the way to Washington to speak before those who had not come into existence when I was born. Now, I plead that there may be a sixteenth amendment, and that women may be allowed the privilege of owning their own property. That is what I have taken pains to accomplish. I have suffered so much myself that I felt it might have some effect to plead before this honorable committee. I thank you, gentlemen, for hearing me so kindly.

REMARKS BY MRS. ELIZABETH L. SAXON, OF LOUISIANA.

Mrs. SAXON. Gentleman, I almost feel that after Mrs. Wallace's plea there is scarcely a necessity for me to say anything; she echoed my own feelings so entirely. I come from the extreme South, she from the West. In this delegation, and in the convention which has just been held in this city, women have come together who never met before. People have asked me why I came.

I care nothing for suffrage so far as to stand beside men, or rush to the polls, or take any privilege outside of my home, only, as Mrs. Wallace says, for humanity. Years ago, when a little child, I lost my mother, and I was brought up by a man. If I have not a man's brain I had at least a man's instruction. He taught me that to work in the cause of reform for women was just as great as to work in the cause of reform for men. But in every effort I made in the cause of reform I was combated in one direction or another. I never took part with the suffragists. I never realized the importance of their cause until we were beaten back on every side in the work of reform. If we attempted to put women in charge of prisons, believing that wherever woman sins and suffers women should be there to teach, help, and guide, every place was in the hands of men. If we made an effort to get women on the school boards we were combated and could do nothing. Every place seemed to be changed, when there were good men in those places, by changes of politics; and the mothers of the land, having had to prostrate themselves as beggars, if not in fact, really in sentiment and feeling, have become at last almost desperate.

In the State of Texas I had a niece living whose father was an inmate of a lunatic asylum. She exerted as wide an influence in the State of Texas as any woman there. I allude to Miss Mollie Moore, who was the ward of Mr. Cushing. I give this illustration as a reason why Southern women are taking part in this movement. Mr. Wallace had charge of that lunatic asylum for years. He was a good, honorable, able man. Every one was endeared to him; every one appreciated him; the State appreciated him as superintendent of this asylum.

When a political change was made and Governor Robinson came in, Dr. Wallace was ousted for political purposes. It almost broke the hearts of some of the women who had sons, daughters, or husbands there. They determined at once to try to seek some redress and have him reinstated. It was impossible. He was out, and what could we do? I do not know that we could reach a case like that; but such cases have stirred the women of the whole land, for the reason that when they try to do good, or want to help in the cause of humanity, they are combated so bitterly and persistently.

I leave it to older and abler women, who have labored in this cause so long, to prove whether it is or is not constitutional to give the ballot to women.

A gentleman said to me a few days ago, "These women want to marry." I am married; I am a mother; and in our home the sons and brothers are all standing like a wall of steel at my back. I have cast aside every prejudice of the past. They lie like rotted hulks behind me.

After the fever of 1878, when our constitutional convention was going to convene, I broke the agony and grief of my own heart, for one of my children died, and took part in the suffrage movement in Louisiana, with the wife of Chief Justice Merriek, Mrs. Sarah A. Dorsey, and Mrs. Harriet Keatinge, of New York, the niece of Mr. Lozier. These three ladies aided me faithfully and ably. When they found we would be received, I went before the convention. I went to Lieutenant-Governor Wiltz, and asked him if he would present or consider a petition which I wished to bring before the convention. He read the petition. One clause of our State law is that no woman can sign a will. We will have that question decided before the meeting of the next Legislature. Some ladies donated property to an asylum. They wrote the will and signed it themselves, and it was null and void, because the signers were women. They not knowing the law, believed that they were human beings, and signed it. That clause, perhaps, will be wiped out. Many gentlemen signed the petition on that account. I took the paper around myself. Governor Wiltz, then lieutenant-governor, told me he would present the petition. He was elected president of the convention. I presented my first petition, signed by the best names in the city of New Orleans and in the State.

I had the names of seven of the most prominent physicians there, leading with the name of Dr. Logan, and many men, seeing the name of Dr. Samuel Logan, also signed it. I went to all the different physicians and ministers. Three prominent ministers signed it for moral purposes alone. When Mrs. Dorsey was on her dying bed the last time she ever signed her name was to a letter to go before that convention. No one believed she would die. Mrs. Merriek and myself went before the convention. I was invited before the committee on the judiciary. I made an impression favorable enough there to be invited before the convention with these ladies. I addressed the convention. We made the petition then that we make here; that we, the mothers of the land, are barred on every side in the cause of reform. I have strived hard in the work of reform for women. I pledged my father on his dying bed that I would never cease that work until woman stood with man equal before the law, so far as my efforts could accomplish it. Finding myself baffled in that work, I could only take the course which we have adopted, and urge the proposition of the sixteenth amendment.

I beg of you, gentlemen, to consider this question apart from the manner in which it was formerly considered. We, as the women of the nation, as the mothers, as the wives, have a right to be heard, it seems to me, before the nation. We represent precisely the position of the colonies when they plead, and in the words of Patrick Henry, they were "spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne." We have been jeered and laughed at and ridiculed; but this question has passed out of the region of ridicule.

The moral force inheres in woman and in man alike, and unless we use all the moral power of the Government we certainly can not exist as a Government.

We talk of centralization, we talk of division; we have the seeds of decay in our Government, and unless right soon we use the moral force and bring it forward in all its strength and bearing, we certainly cannot exist as a happy nation. We do not exist as a happy nation now. This clamor for woman's suffrage, for woman's rights, for equal representation, is extending all over the land.

I plead because my work has been combated in the cause of reform everywhere that I have tried to accomplish anything. The children that fill the houses of prostitution are not of foreign blood and race. They come from sweet American homes, and for every woman that went down some mother's heart broke. I plead by the power of the ballot to be allowed to help reform women and benefit mankind.

REMARKS OF MRS. MARY A. STEWART, OF DELAWARE.

Mrs. STEWART. I come from a small State, but one that is represented in this Congress, I consider, by some of the ablest men in the land. Our State, though small, has heretofore possessed and to-day possesses brains. Our sons have no more right to brains than our daughters, yet we are tied down by every chain that could bind the Georgian slave before the war. Aye, we are worse slaves, because the Georgian slave could go to the sale block and there be sold. The woman of Delaware must submit to her chains, as there is no sale for her; she is of no account.

Woman from all time has occupied the highest positions in the world. She is just as competent to-day as she was hundreds of years ago. We are taxed without representation; there is no mistake about that. The colonies screamed that to England; Parliament screamed back, "Be still; long live the king, and we will help you." Did the colonies submit? They did not. Will the women

of this country submit? They will not. Mark me, we are the sisters of those fighting Revolutionary men; we are the daughters of the fathers who sang back to England that they would not submit. Then, if the same blood courses in our veins that courses in yours, dare you expect us to submit?

The white men of this country have thrown out upon us, the women, a race inferior, you must admit, to your daughters, and yet that race has the ballot, and why? He has a right to it; he earned and paid for it with his blood. Whose blood paid for yours? Not your blood; it was the blood of your forefathers; and were they not our forefathers? Does a man earn a hundred thousand dollars and lie down and die, saying, "It is all my boys'?" Not a bit of it. He dies saying, "Let my children, be they cripples, be they idiots, be they boys, or be they girls, inherit all my property alike." Then let us inherit the sweet boon of the ballot alike.

When our fathers were driving the great ship of state we were willing to ride as deck or cabin passengers, just as we felt disposed; we had nothing to say; but to-day the boys are about to run the ship aground, and it is high time that the mothers should be asking, "What do you mean to do?" It is high time that the mothers should be demanding what they should long since have had.

In our own little State the laws have been very much modified in regard to women. My father was the first man to blot out the old English law allowing the eldest son the right of inheritance to the real estate. He took the first step, and like all those who take first steps in improvement and reform he received a mountain of curses from the oldest male heirs; but it did not matter to him.

Since 1868 I have, by my own individual efforts, by the use of hard-earned money, gone to our Legislature time after time and have had this law and that law passed for the benefit of the women; and the same little ship of state has sailed on. To-day our men are just as well satisfied with the laws of our State for the benefit of women in force as they were years ago. In our State a woman has a right to make a will. In our State she can hold bonds and mortgages as her own. In our State she has a right to her own property. She can not sell it, though, if it is real estate, simply because the moment she marries her husband has a life-time right. The woman does not grumble at that; but still when he dies owning real estate, she gets only the rental value of one-third, which is called the widow's dower. Now I think the man ought to have the rental value of one-third of the woman's maiden property or real estate, and it ought to be called the widower's dower. It would be just as fair for one as for the other. All that I want is equality.

The women of our State, as I said before, are taxed without representation. The tax-gatherer comes every year and demands taxes. For twenty years have I paid tax under protest, and if I live twenty years longer I shall pay it under protest every time. The tax-gatherer came to my place not long since. "Well," said I, "good morning, sir." Said he, "Good morning." He smiled and said, "I have come bothering you." Said I, "I know your face well. You have come to get a right nice little woman's tongue-lashing." Said he, "I suppose so, but if you will just pay your tax I will leave." I paid the tax, "But," said I, "remember I pay it under protest, and if I ever pay another tax I intend to have the protest written and make the tax-gatherer sign it before I pay the tax, and if he will not sign that protest then I shall not pay the tax, and there will be a fight at once." Said he, "Why do you keep all the time protesting against paying this small tax?" Said I, "Why do you pay your tax?" "Well," said he, "I would not pay it if I did not vote." Said I, "That is the very reason why I do not want to pay it. I can not vote and I do not want to pay it." Now the women have no right when election day comes around. Who stay at home from the election? The women and the black and white men who have been to the whipping-post. Nice company to put your wives and daughters in.

It is said that the women do not want to vote. Here is an array of women. Every woman sitting here wants to vote, and must be debarred the privilege of voting because some luxurious woman, rolling around in her carriage and pair in her little downy nest that some good, benevolent man has provided for her, does not want to vote?

There was a society that existed up in the State of New York called the Covenanters that never voted. A man who belonged to that sect or society, a man whiter-haired than any of you, said to me, "I never voted. I never intended to vote. I never felt that I could conscientiously support a Government that had its Constitution blotted and blackened with the word 'slave,' and I never did vote until after the abolition of slavery." Now, were all you men disfranchised because that class or sect up in New York would not vote? Did you all pay your taxes and stay at home and refrain from voting because the Covenanters did not vote? Not a bit of it. You went to the election and told them to stay at home if they wanted to, but that you, as citizens, were going to take care of yourselves. That was right. We, as citizens, want to take care of ourselves.

One more thought and I will be through. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments give the right of suffrage to women, so far as I know, although you learned men perhaps see a little differently. I see through the glass dimly; you may see through it after it is polished up. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, in my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many smart men in the country, and smart women, too, give the right to women to vote without any "ifs" or "ands" about it, and the United States protects us in it; but there are a few who construe the law to suit themselves, and say that those amendments do not mean that, because the Congress that passed the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments did not mean to do that. Well, the Congress that passed them were mean enough for anything if they did not mean to do that. Let the wise Congress of to-day take the eighth chapter and the fourth verse of the Psalms, which says, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" and amend it by adding, "What is woman, that they never thought of her?"

REMARKS BY MRS. LUCINDA B. CHANDLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mrs. CHANDLER. Gentlemen, it will be conceded that the progress of civilization, all that lifts humanity above a groveling, sensual, depraved state, is marked by the position, intelligence, and culture of women. Perhaps you think that American women have no rightful claim to present; but American women and mothers do claim that they should have the power to protect their children, not only at the hearthstone, but to supervise their education. It is neither presuming nor unwomanly for the mothers and women of the land to claim that they are competent and best fitted, and that it rightfully belongs to them to take part in the management and control of the schools, and the instruction, both intellectual and moral, of their children, and that in penal, eleemosynary, or reformatory institutions women should have positions as inspectors of prisons, physicians, directors, and superintendents.

I have here a brief report from an association which sent me as a delegate to the National Woman Suffrage Convention, in which it is stated that women in Pennsylvania can be elected as directors on school boards or superintendents of schools, but can not help to elect those officers. It must very readily occur to your minds that when women take such interest in the schools as mothers must needs take they must feel many a wish to control the election of the officers, superintendents, and managers of the schools. The ladies here from New York city could, if they had time, give you much testimony in regard to the management of schools in New York city, and the need there of woman's love and woman's power in the schools and on the school boards. I am also authorized by the association which sent me here to report that the woman-suffragists and some other woman organizations of the city of Philadelphia have condemned in resolution the action of the governor a year ago, I think, in vetoing a bill which passed largely both houses of the Legislature to appoint

women inspectors of prisons. On such questions woman feels the need of the ballot.

The mothers of this land, having breathed the air of freedom and received the benefits of education, have come to see the necessity of better conditions to fulfill their divinely appointed and universally recognized office. The mothers of this land claim that they have a right to assist in making the laws which control the social relations. We are under the laws inherited from barbarism. They are not the conditions suited to the best exercise of the office of woman, and the women desire the ballot to purge society of the vices that are sure to disintegrate the home, the State, the nation.

I shall not occupy your time further this morning. I only present briefly the mother's claim, as it is so universally conceded. We now have in our schools a very large majority of women teachers, and it seems to me no one can but recognize the fact that mothers, through their experience in the family, mothers who are at all competent and fit to fulfill their position as mothers in the family, are best fitted to understand the needs and at least should have an equal voice in directing the management of the schools, and also the management of penal and reformatory institutions.

I was in hopes that Mrs. Wallace would give you the testimony she gave us in the convention of the wonderful, amazing good that was accomplished in a reformatory institution where an incorrigible woman was taken from the men's prison and became not only very tractable, but very helpful in an institution under the influence and management of women. That reformatory institution is managed wholly by women. There is not a man, Mrs. Wallace says, in the building, except the engineer who controls the fire department. Under a management wholly by women, the institution is a very great success. We feel sure that in many ways the influence and power that the mothers bring would tend to convert many conditions that are now tending to destruction through vices, would tend to elevate us morally, purify us, bring us still higher in the standard of humanity, and make us what we ought to be, a holy as well as a happy nation.

REMARKS BY MRS. SARA A. SPENCER, OF WASHINGTON.

Mrs. SPENCER. Miss Susan B. Anthony was chosen to present the constitutional argument in our case before the committee. Unless there is more important business for the individual members of the committee than the protection of one-half of our population, I trust that the limit fixed for our hearing will be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Anthony is entitled to an hour.

Mrs. SPENCER. Good. Miss Anthony is from the United States; the whole United States claim her.

Mrs. ALLEN. I have made arrangements with Miss Anthony to say all that I feel it necessary for me to say at this time.

Mrs. SPENCER. I have been so informed.

REMARKS BY MRS. NANCY R. ALLEN, OF IOWA.

Mrs. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee: I am not a State representative, but I am a representative of a large class of women, citizens of Iowa, who are heavy tax-payers. That is a subject which we are very seriously contemplating at this time. There is now a petition being circulated throughout our State, to be presented to the Legislature, praying that women be exempted from taxation until they have some voice in the management of local affairs of the State. You may ask, "Do not your husbands protect you? Are not all the men protecting you?" We answer that our husbands are grand, noble men, who are willing to do all they can for us, but there are many who have no husbands, and who own a great deal of property in the State of Iowa. Particularly in great moral reforms the women there feel the need of the ballot. By presenting long petitions to the Legislature they have succeeded in having better temperance laws enacted, but the men have failed to elect officials who will enforce those laws. Consequently they have become as dead letters upon the statute-books.

I would refer again to taxes. I have a list showing that in my city three women pay more taxes than all the city officials included. Those women are good temperance women. Our city council is composed almost entirely of saloon men and those who visit saloons and brewery men. There are some good men, but the good men being in the minority, the voices of these women are but little regarded. All these officials are paid, and we have to help support them. All that we ask is an equality of rights. As Sumner said, "Equality of rights is the first of rights." If we can only be equal with man under the law it is all that we ask. We do not propose to relinquish our domestic circles; in fact, they are too dear to us for that; they are dear to us as life itself, but we do ask that we may be permitted to be represented. Equality of taxation without representation is tyranny.

REMARKS BY MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY, OF NEW YORK.

Miss ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Mrs. Spencer said that I would make an argument. I do not propose to do so, because I take it for granted that the members of this committee understand that we have all the argument on our side, and such an argument would be simply a series of platitudes and maxims of government. The theory of this Government from the beginning has been perfect equality to all the people. That is shown by every one of the fundamental principles, which I need not stop to repeat. Such being the theory, the application would be, of course, that all persons not having forfeited their right of representation in the Government should be possessed of it at the age of twenty-one. But instead of adopting a practice in conformity with the theory of our Government, we began first by saying that all men of property were the people of the nation upon whom the Constitution conferred equality of rights. The next step was that all white men were the people to whom should be practically applied the fundamental theories. There we halt to-day and stand at a deadlock, so far as the application of our theory may go. We women have been standing before the American republic for thirty years, asking the men to take yet one step further and extend the practical application of the theory of equality of rights to all the people to the other half of the people—the women. That is all that I stand here to-day to attempt to demand.

Of course, I take it for granted that the committee are in sympathy at least with the reports of the Judiciary Committees presented both in the Senate and the House. I remember that after the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments Senator EDMUNDS reported on the petition of the ten thousand foreign-born citizens of Rhode Island who were denied equality of rights in Rhode Island simply because of their foreign birth; and in that report held that the amendments were enacted and attached to the Constitution simply for men of color, and therefore that their provisions could not be so construed as to bring within their purview the men of foreign birth in Rhode Island. Then the House Committee on the Judiciary, with Judge Bingham, of Ohio, at its head, made a similar report upon our petitions, holding that because those amendments were made essentially with the black men in view, therefore their provisions could not be extended to the women citizens of this country or to any class except men citizens of color.

I voted in the State of New York in 1872 under the construction of those amendments, which we felt to be the true one, that all persons born in the United States, or any State thereof, and under the jurisdiction of the United States, were citizens, and entitled to equality of rights, and that no State could deprive them of their equality of rights. I found three young men, inspectors of election, who were simple enough to read the Constitution and understand it in accordance with what was the letter and what should have been its spirit. Then,

as you will remember, I was prosecuted by the officers of the Federal court, and the cause was carried through the different courts in the State of New York, in the northern district, and at last I was brought to trial at Canandaigua.

When Mr. Justice Hunt was brought from the supreme bench to sit upon that trial, he wrested my case from the hands of the jury altogether, after having listened three days to testimony, and brought in a verdict himself of guilty, denying to my counsel even the poor privilege of having the jury polled. Through all that trial when I, as a citizen of the United States, as a citizen of the State of New York and city of Rochester, as a person who had done something at least that might have entitled her to a voice in speaking for herself and for her class, in all that trial I not only was denied my right to testify as to whether I voted or not, but there was not one single woman's voice to be heard nor to be considered, except as witnesses, save when it came to the judge asking, "Has the prisoner anything to say why sentence shall not be pronounced?" Neither as judge, nor as attorney, nor as jury was I allowed any person who could be legitimately called my peer to speak for me.

Then, as you will remember, Mr. Justice Hunt not only pronounced the verdict of guilty, but a sentence of \$100 fine and costs of prosecution. I said to him, "May it please your honor, I do not propose to pay it," and I never have paid it, and I never shall. I asked your honorable bodies of Congress the next year—in 1874—to pass a resolution to remit that fine. Both Houses refused it; the committees reported against it; though through Benjamin F. Butler, in the House, and a member of your committee, and Matthew H. Carpenter, in the Senate, there were plenty of precedents brought forward to show that in the cases of multitudes of men fines had been remitted. I state this merely to show the need of woman to speak for herself, to be as judge, to be as juror.

Mr. Justice Hunt in his opinion stated that suffrage was a fundamental right, and therefore a right that belonged to the State. It seemed to me that was just as much of a retroversion of the theory of what is right in our Government as there could possibly be. Then, after the decision in my case came that of Mrs. Minor, of Missouri. She prosecuted the officers there for denying her the right to vote. She carried her case up to your Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court answered her the same way; that the amendments were made for black men; that their provisions could not protect women; that the Constitution of the United States has no voters of its own.

Mrs. SPENCER. And you remember Judge Carter's decision in my case. Miss ANTHONY. Mr. Carter said that women are citizens and may be qualified, &c., but that it requires some sort of legislation to give them the right to vote.

The Congress of the United States notwithstanding, and the Supreme Court of the United States notwithstanding, with all deference and respect, I differ with them all, and know that I am right and that they are wrong. The Constitution of the United States as it protects me. If I could get a practical application of the Constitution it would protect me and all women in the enjoyment of perfect equality of rights everywhere under the shadow of the American flag.

I do not come to you to petition for special legislation, or for any more amendments to the Constitution, because I think they are unnecessary, but because you say there is not in the Constitution enough to protect me. Therefore I ask that you, true to your own theory and assertion, should go forward to make more constitution.

Let me remind you that in the case of all other classes of citizens under the shadow of our flag you have been true to the theory that taxation and representation are inseparable. Indians not taxed are not counted in the basis of representation, and are not allowed to vote; but the minute that your Indians are counted in the basis of representation and are allowed to vote they are taxed; never before. In my State of New York, and in nearly all the States, the members of the State militia, hundreds and thousands of men, are exempted from taxation on property; in my State to the value of \$800, and in most of the States to a value in that neighborhood. While such a member of the militia lives, receives his salary, and is able to earn money, he is exempted; but when he dies the assessor puts his widow's name down upon the assessor's list, and the tax-collector never fails to call upon the widow and make her pay the full tax upon her property. In most of the States clergymen are exempted. In my State of New York they are exempted on property to the value of \$1,500. As long as the clergyman lives and receives his fat salary, or his lean one, as the case may be, he is exempted on that amount of property; but when the breath leaves the body of the clergyman, and the widow is left without any income, or without any means of support, the State comes in and taxes the widow.

So it is with regard to all black men. In the State of New York up to the day of the passage of the fifteenth amendment, black men who were willing to remain without reporting themselves worth as much as \$250, and thereby to remain without exercising the right to vote, never had their names put on the assessor's list; they were passed by, while, if the poorest colored woman owned 50 feet of real estate, a little cabin anywhere, that colored woman's name was always on the assessor's list, and she was compelled to pay her tax. While Frederick Douglass lived in my State he was never allowed to vote until he could show himself worth the requisite \$250; and when he did vote in New York, he voted not because he was a man, not because he was a citizen of the United States, nor yet because he was a citizen of the State, but simply because he was worth the requisite amount of money. In Connecticut both black men and black women were exempted from taxation prior to the adoption of the fifteenth amendment.

The law was amended in 1848, by which black men were thus exempted, and black women followed the same rule in that State. That, I believe, is the only State where black women were exempted from taxation under the law. When the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were attached to the Constitution they carried to the black man of Connecticut the boon of the ballot as well as the burden of taxation, whereas they carried to the black woman of Connecticut the burden of taxation, but no ballot by which to protect her property. I know a colored woman in New Haven, Conn., worth \$50,000, and she never paid a penny of taxation until the ratification of the fifteenth amendment. From that day on she is compelled to pay a heavy tax on that amount of property.

Mrs. SPENCER. Is it because she is a citizen? Please explain.

Miss ANTHONY. Because she is black.

Mrs. SPENCER. Is it because the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments made women citizens?

Miss ANTHONY. Certainly; because it declared the black people citizens.

Gentlemen, you have before you various propositions of amendment to the Federal Constitution. One is for the election of President by the vote of the people direct. Of course women are not people.

Senator EDMUNDS. Angels.

Miss ANTHONY. Yes; angels up in heaven or else devils down there.

Senator EDMUNDS. I have never known any of that kind.

Miss ANTHONY. I wish you, gentlemen, would look down there and see the myriads that are there. We want to help them and lift them up. That is exactly the trouble with you, gentlemen; you are forever looking at you own wives, your own mothers, your own sisters, and your own daughters, and they are well cared for and protected; but only look down to the struggling masses of women who have no one to protect them, neither husband, father, brother, son, with no mortal in all the land to protect them. If you would look down there the question would be solved; but the difficulty is that you think only of those who are doing well. We are not speaking for ourselves, but for those who can not speak for themselves. We are speaking for the doomed as much as you, Senator EDMUNDS, used to speak for the doomed on the plantations of the South.

Amendments have been proposed to put God in the Constitution and to keep

God out of the Constitution. All sorts of propositions to amend the Constitution have been made; but I ask that you allow no other amendment to be called the sixteenth but that which shall put into the hands of one-half of the entire people of the nation the right to express their opinions as to how the Constitution shall be amended henceforth. Women have the right to say whether we shall have God in the Constitution as well as men. Women have a right to say whether we shall have a national law or an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the importation or manufacture of alcoholic liquors. We have a right to have our opinions counted on every possible question concerning the public welfare.

You ask us why we do not get this right to vote first in the school districts, and on school questions, or the questions of liquor license. It has been shown very clearly why we need something more than that. You have good enough laws to-day in every State in this Union for the suppression of what are termed the social vices; for the suppression of the grog-shops, the gambling houses, the brothels, the obscene shows. There is plenty of legislation in every State in this Union for their suppression if it could be executed. Why is the Government, why are the States and the cities, unable to execute those laws? Simply because there is a large balance of power in every city that does not want those laws executed. Consequently both parties must alike cater to that balance of political power. The party that puts a plank in its platform that the laws against the grog-shops and all the other sinks of iniquity must be executed, is the party that will not get this balance of power to vote for it, and, consequently, the party that can not get into power.

What we ask of you is that you will make of the women of the cities a balance of political power, so that when a mayor, a member of the common council, a supervisor, a justice of the peace, a district attorney, a judge on the bench even, shall go before the people of that city as a candidate for the suffrages of the people he shall not only be compelled to look to the men who frequent the grog-shops, the brothels, and the gambling houses, who will vote for him if he is not in favor of executing the law, but that he shall have to look to the mothers, the sisters, the wives, the daughters of those deluded men to see what they will do if he does not execute the law.

We want to make of ourselves a balance of political power. What we need is the power to execute the laws. We have got laws enough. Let me give you one little fact in regard to my own city of Rochester. You all know how that wonderful whip called the temperance crusade roused the whisky ring. It caused the whisky force to concentrate itself more strongly at the ballot-box than ever before, so that when the report of the elections in the spring of 1874 went over the country the result was that the whisky ring was triumphant, and that the whisky ticket was elected more largely than ever before. Senator Thurman will remember how it was in his own State of Ohio. Everybody knows that if my friends, Mrs. ex-Governor Wallace, Mrs. Allen, and all the women of the great West could have gone to the ballot-box at those municipal elections and voted for candidates, no such result would have occurred; while you refused by the laws of the State to the women the right to have their opinions counted, every rum-seller, every drunkard, every pauper even from the poor-house, and every criminal outside of the State's prison came out on election day to express his opinion and have it counted.

The next result of that political event was that the ring demanded new legislation to protect the whisky traffic everywhere. In my city the women did not crusade the streets, but they said they would help the men to execute the law. They held meetings, sent out committees, and had testimony secured against every man who had violated the law, and when the board of excise held its meeting those women assembled, three or four hundred, in the church one morning, and marched in a solid body to the common council chamber where the board of excise was sitting. As one rum-seller after another brought in his petition for a renewal of license who had violated the law, those women presented the testimony against him. The law of the State of New York is that no man shall have a renewal who has violated the law. But in not one case did that board refuse to grant a renewal of license because of the testimony which those women presented, and at the close of the sitting it was found that twelve hundred more licenses had been granted than ever before in the history of the State. Then the defeated women said they would have those men punished according to law.

Again they retained an attorney and appointed committees to investigate all over the city. They got the proper officer to prosecute every rum-seller. I was at their meeting. One woman reported that the officer in every city refused to prosecute the liquor dealer who had violated the law. Why? Because if he should do so he would lose the votes of all the employees of certain shops on that street, if another he would lose the votes of the railroad employees, and if another he would lose the German vote, if another the Irish vote, and so on. I said to those women what I say to you, and what I know to be true to-day, that if the women of the city of Rochester had held the power of the ballot in their hands they would have been a great political balance of power.

The last report was from District Attorney Raines. The women complained of a certain lager-beer-garden keeper. Said the district attorney, "Ladies, you are right, this man is violating the law, everybody knows it, but if I should prosecute him I would lose the entire German vote." Said I, "Ladies, do you not see that if the women of the city of Rochester had the right to vote District Attorney Raines would have been compelled to have stopped and counted, weighed and measured. He would have said, 'If I prosecute that lager-beer German I shall lose the 5,000 German votes of this city, but if I fail to prosecute him and execute the laws I shall lose the votes of 20,000 women.'"

Do you not see, gentlemen, that so long as you put this power of the ballot in the hands of every possible man, rich, poor, drunk, sober, educated, ignorant, outside of the State's prison, to make and unmake, not only every law and law-maker, but every office holder who has to do with the executing of the law, and take the power from the hands of the women of the nation, the mothers, you put the long arm of the lever, as we call it in mechanics, in the hands of the whisky power and make it utterly impossible for regulation of sobriety to be maintained in our community? The first step towards social regulation and good society in towns, cities, and villages is the ballot in the hands of the mothers of those places. I appeal to you especially in this matter. I do not know what you think about the proper sphere of women.

It matters little what any of us think about it. We shall each and every individual find our own proper sphere if we are left to act in freedom; but my opinion is that when the whole arena of politics and government is thrown open to women they will endeavor to do very much as they do in their homes; that the men will look after the greenback theory or the hard-money theory, that you will look after free-trade or tariff, and the women will do the home housekeeping of the government, which is to take care of the moral government and the social regulation of our home department.

It seems to me that we have the power of government outside to shape and control circumstances, but that the inside power, the government housekeeping, is powerless, and is compelled to accept whatever conditions or circumstances shall be granted.

Therefore I do not ask for liquor suffrage alone, nor for school suffrage alone, because that would amount to nothing. We must be able to have a voice in the election not only of every law-maker, but of every one who has to do either with the making or the executing of the laws.

Then you ask why we do not get suffrage by the popular-vote method, State by State? I answer, because there is no reason why I, for instance, should desire the women of one State of this nation to vote any more than the women of another State. I have no more interest as regards the women of New York than I have as regards the women of Indiana, Iowa, or any of the States rep-

resented by the women who have come up here. The reason why I do not wish to get this right by what you call the popular-vote method, the State vote, is because I believe there is a United States citizenship. I believe that this is a nation, and to be a citizen of this nation should be a guaranty to every citizen of the right to a voice in the Government, and should give to me my right to express my opinion. You deny to me my liberty, my freedom, if you say that I shall have no voice whatever in making, shaping, or controlling the conditions of society in which I live. I differ from Judge Hunt, and I hope I am respectful when I say that I think he made a very funny mistake when he said that fundamental rights belong to the States and only surface rights to the National Government. I hope you will agree with me that the fundamental right of citizenship, the right to voice in the Government, is a national right.

The National Government may concede to the States the right to decide by a majority as to what banks they shall have, what laws they shall enact with regard to insurance, with regard to property, and any other question; but I insist upon it that the National Government should not leave it a question with the States that a majority in any State may disfranchise the minority under any circumstances whatsoever. The franchise to you men is not secure. You hold it to-day, to be sure, by the common consent of white men, but if at any time, on your principle of government, the majority of any of the States should choose to amend the State constitution so as to disfranchise this or that portion of the white men by making this or that condition, by all the decisions of the Supreme Court and by the legislation thus far there is nothing to hinder them.

Therefore the women demand a sixteenth amendment to bring to women the right to vote, or if you please to confer upon women their right to vote, to protect them in it, and to secure men in their right, because you are not secure.

I would let the States act upon almost every other question by majorities, except the power to say whether my opinion shall be counted. I insist upon it that no State shall decide that question.

Then the popular-vote method is an impracticable thing. We tried to get negro suffrage by the popular vote, as you will remember. Senator Thurman will remember that in Ohio the Republicans submitted the question in 1867, and with all the prestige of the national Republican party and of the State party, when every influence that could be brought by the power and the patronage of the party in power was brought to bear, yet negro suffrage ran behind the regular Republican ticket 40,000.

It was tried in Kansas, it was tried in New York, and everywhere that it was submitted the question was voted down overwhelmingly. Just so we tried to get women suffrage by the popular-vote method in Kansas in 1867, in Michigan in 1874, in Colorado in 1877, and in each case the result was precisely the same, the ratio of the vote standing one-third for women suffrage and two-thirds against women suffrage. If we were to canvass State after State we should get no better vote than that. Why? Because the question of the enfranchisement of women is a question of government, a question of philosophy, of understanding, of great fundamental principle, and the masses of the hard-working people of this nation, men and women, do not think upon principles. They can only think on the one eternal struggle wherewithal to be fed, to be clothed, and to be sheltered. Therefore I ask you not to compel us to have this question settled by what you term the popular-vote method.

Let me illustrate by Colorado, the most recent State, in the election of 1877. I am happy to say to you that I have canvassed three States for this question. If Senator Chandler were alive, or if Senator Ferry were in this room, they would remember that I followed in their train in Michigan, with larger audiences than either of those Senators throughout the whole canvass. I want to say, too, that although those Senators may have believed in woman suffrage, they did not say much about it. They did not help us much. The Greenback movement was quite popular in Michigan at that time. The Republicans and Greenbackers made a most humble bow to the grangers, but woman suffrage did not get much help. In Colorado, at the close of the canvass, 6,666 men voted "Yes." Now I am going to describe the men who voted "Yes." They were native-born white men, temperance men, cultivated, broad, generous, just men, men who think. On the other hand, 18,007 voted "No."

Now I am going to describe that class of voters. In the southern part of that State there are Mexicans, who speak the Spanish language. They put their wheat in circles on the ground with the heads out, and drive a mule around to thrash it. The vast population of Colorado is made up of that class of people. I was sent out to speak in a voting precinct having 200 voters; 150 of those voters were Mexican greasers, 40 of them foreign-born citizens, and just 10 of them were born in this country; and I was supposed to be competent to convert those men to let me have as much right in this Government as they had, when, unfortunately, the great majority of them could not understand a word that I said. Fifty or sixty Mexican greasers stood against the wall with their hats down over their faces. The Germans put seats in a lager-beer saloon, and would not attend unless I made a speech there; so I had a small audience.

Mrs. ARCHIBALD. There is one circumstance that I should like to relate. In the county of Las Animas, a county where there is a large population of Mexicans, and where they always have a large majority over the native population, they do not know our language at all. Consequently a number of tickets must be printed for those people in Spanish. The gentleman in our little town of Trinidad who had the charge of the printing of those tickets, being adverse to us, had every ticket printed against woman suffrage. The samples that were sent to us from Denver were "for" or "against," but the tickets that were printed only had the word "against" on them, so that our friends had to scratch their tickets, and all those Mexican people who could not understand this trick and did not know the facts of the case, voted against woman suffrage; so that we lost a great many votes. This was man's generosity.

Miss ANTHONY. Special legislation for the benefit of woman! I will admit you that on the floor of the constitutional convention was a representative Mexican, intelligent, cultivated, chairman of the committee on suffrage, who signed the petition, and was the first to speak in favor of woman suffrage. Then they have in Denver about four hundred negroes. Governor Routt said to me, "The four hundred Denver negroes are going to vote solid for woman suffrage." I said, "I do not know much about the Denver negroes, but I know certainly what all negroes were educated in, and slavery never educated master or negro into a comprehension of the great principles of human freedom of our nation; it is not possible, and I do not believe they are going to vote for us." Just ten of those Denver negroes voted for woman suffrage. Then, in all the mines of Colorado the vast majority of the wage laborers, as you know, are foreigners.

There may be intelligent foreigners in this country, and I know there are, who are in favor of the enfranchisement of woman, but that one does not happen to be Carl Schurz, I am ashamed to say. And I want to say to you of Carl Schurz, that side by side with that man on the battlefield of Germany was Madame Anneke, as noble a woman as ever trod the American soil. She rode by the side of her husband, who was an officer, on the battlefield; she slept in battlefield tents, and she fled from Germany to this country, for her life and property, side by side with Carl Schurz. Now, what is it for Carl Schurz, stepping up to the very door of the Presidency and looking back to Madame Anneke, who fought for liberty as well as he, to say, "You be subject in this Republic; I will be sovereign." If it is an insult for Carl Schurz to say that to a foreign-born woman, what is it for him to say it to Mrs. Ex-Governor Wallace, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott—to the native-born, educated, tax-paying women of this Republic? I can forgive an ignorant foreigner; I can forgive an ignorant negro; but I can not forgive Carl Schurz.

Right in the file of the foreigners opposed to woman suffrage, educated under monarchical governments that do not comprehend our principles, whom I have seen traveling through the prairies of Iowa or the prairies of Minnesota, are the

Bohemians, Swedes, Norwegians, Germans, Irishmen, Mennonites; I have seen them riding on those magnificent loads of wheat with those magnificent Saxon horses, shining like glass on a sunny morning, every one of them going to vote "no" against woman suffrage. You can not convert them; it is impossible. Now and then there is a whisky manufacturer, drunkard, inebriate, libertine, and what we call a fast man, and a colored man, broad and generous enough to be willing to let women vote, to let his mother have her opinion counted as to whether there shall be license or no license, but the rank and file of all classes who wish to enjoy full license in what are termed the petty vices of men are pitted solid against the enfranchisement of women.

Then, in addition to all these, there are, as you know, a few religious bigots left in the world who really believe that somehow or other if women are allowed to vote St. Paul would feel badly about it. I do not know but that some of the gentlemen present belong to that class. [Laughter.] So, when you put those best men of the nation, having religion about everything except on this one question, whose prejudices control them, with all this vast mass of ignorant, uneducated, degraded population in this country, you make an overwhelming and insurmountable majority against the enfranchisement of women.

It is because of this fact that I ask you not to remand us back to the States, but to submit to the States the proposition of a sixteenth amendment. The popular-vote method is not only of itself an impossibility, but it is too humiliating a process to compel the women of this nation to submit to any longer.

I am going to give you an illustration, not because I have any disrespect for the person, because on many other questions he was really a good deal better than a good many other men who had not so bad a name in this nation. When, under the old régime, John Morrissey, of my State, the king of gamblers, was a Representative on the floor of Congress, it was humiliating enough for Lucretia Mott, for Elizabeth Cady Stanton, for all of us to come down here to Washington and beg at the feet of John Morrissey that he would let intelligent, native-born women vote, and let us have as much right in this Government and in the government of the city of New York as he had. When John Morrissey was a member of the New York State Legislature it would have been humiliating enough for us to go to the New York State Legislature and pray of John Morrissey to vote to ratify the sixteenth amendment, giving to us a right to vote; but if instead of a sixteenth amendment you tell us to go back to the popular-vote method, the old-time method, and go down into John Morrissey's seventh Congressional district in the city of New York, and there, in the sloughs and slums of that great Sodom, in the grog-shops, the gambling-houses, and the brothels, beg at the feet of each individual fustian of his constituency to give the noble, educated, native-born, tax-paying women of the State of New York as much right as he has, that would be too bitter a pill for a native-born woman to swallow any longer.

I beg you, gentlemen, to save us from the mortification and the humiliation of appealing to the rabble. We already have on our side the vast majority of the better educated—the best classes of men. You will remember that Senator Christiancy, of Michigan, two years ago, said on the floor of the Senate that of the 40,000 men who voted for woman suffrage in Michigan it was said that there was not a drunkard, not a libertine, not a gambler, not a depraved, low man among them. Is not that something that tells for us, and for our right? It is the fact, in every State of the Union, that we have the intelligent lawyers and the most liberal ministers of all the sects, not excepting the Roman Catholics. A Roman Catholic priest preached a sermon the other day, in which he said, "God grant that there were a thousand Susan B. Anthonys in this city to vote and work for temperance." When a Catholic priest says that there is a great moral necessity pressing down upon this nation demanding the enfranchisement of women, I ask you that you shall not drive us back to beg our rights at the feet of the most ignorant and depraved men of the nation, but that you, the representative men of the nation, will hold the question in the hollow of your hands. We ask you to lift this question out of the hands of the rabble.

You who are here upon the floor of Congress in both Houses are the picked men of the nation. You may say what you please about John Morrissey, the gambler, &c.; he was head and shoulders above the rank and file of his constituency. The world may gabble ever so much about members of Congress being corrupt and being bought and sold; they are as a rule head and shoulders above the great majority who compose their State governments. There is no doubt about it. Therefore I ask of you, as representative men, as men who think, as men who study, as men who philosophize, as men who know that you will not drive us back to the States any more, but that you will carry out this method of procedure which has been practiced from the beginning of the Government; that is, that you will put a prohibitory amendment in the Constitution and submit the proposition to the several State legislatures. The amendment which has been presented before you reads:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship, and the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of sex, or for any reason not equally applicable to all citizens of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

In this way we would get the right of suffrage just as much by what you call the consent of the States, or the States' rights method, as by any other method. The only point is that it is a decision by the representative men of the States instead of by the rank and file of the ignorant men of the States. If you would submit this proposition for a sixteenth amendment, by a two-thirds vote of the two Houses to the several legislatures, and the several legislatures ratify it, that would be just as much by the consent of the States as if Tom, Dick, and Harry voted "yes" or "no." Is it not Senator? I want to talk to Democrats as well as Republicans, to show that it is a State's rights method.

Senator EDMUNDS. Does anybody propose any other, in case it is done at all by the nation?

Miss ANTHONY. Not by the nation, but they are continually driving us back to get it from the States, State by State. That is the point I want to make. We do not want you to drive us back to the States. We want you men to take this question out of the hands of the rabble of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you?

Miss ANTHONY. Yes, sir; I wish you would.

The CHAIRMAN. You have reflected on this subject a great deal. You think there is a majority, as I understand, even in the State of New York, against woman suffrage?

Miss ANTHONY. Yes, sir; overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. How, then, would you get Legislatures elected to ratify such a constitutional amendment?

Miss ANTHONY. That brings me exactly to the point.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the point I wish to hear you upon.

Miss ANTHONY. Because the members of the State Legislatures are intelligent men and can vote and enact laws embodying great principles of the government without in anywise endangering their positions with their constituencies. A constituency composed of ignorant men would vote solid against us because they have never thought on the question. Every man or woman who believes in the enfranchisement of women is educated out of every idea that he or she was born into. We were all born into the idea that the proper sphere of women is subjection, and it takes education and thought and culture to lift us out of it. Therefore when men go to the ballot-box they all vote "no," unless they have actual argument on it. I will illustrate. We have six Legislatures in the nation, for instance, that have extended the right to vote on school questions to

the women, and not a single member of the State Legislature has ever lost his office or forfeited the respect or confidence of his constituents as a representative because he voted to give women the right to vote on school questions. It is a question that the unthinking masses never have thought upon. They do not care about it one way or the other, only they have an instinctive feeling that because women never did vote therefore it is wrong that they ever should vote.

Mrs. SPENCER. Do make the point that the Congress of the United States leads the Legislatures of the States and educates them.

Miss ANTHONY. When you, representative men, carry this matter to Legislatures, State by State, they will ratify it. My point is that you can safely do this. Senator Thurman, of Ohio, would not lose a single vote in Ohio in voting in favor of the enfranchisement of women. Senator EDMUNDS would not lose a single Republican vote in the State of Vermont if he puts himself on our side, which, I think, he will do. It is not a political question. We are no political power that can make or break either party to-day. Consequently each man is left independent to express his own moral and intellectual convictions on the matter without endangering himself politically.

Senator EDMUNDS. I think, Miss Anthony, you ought to put it on rather higher, I will not say stronger, ground. If you can convince us that it is right we would not stop to see how it affected us politically.

Miss ANTHONY. I was coming to that. I was going to say to all of you men in office here to-day that if you can not go forward and carry out either your Democratic or your Republican or your Greenback theories, for instance, on the finance, there is no great political power that is going to take you away from these halls and prevent you from doing all those other things which you want to do, and you can act out your own moral and intellectual convictions on this without let or hindrance.

Senator EDMUNDS. Without any danger to the public interests, you mean.

Miss ANTHONY. Without any danger to the public interests. I did not mean to make a bad insinuation, Senator.

I want to give you another reason why we appeal to you. In these three States where the question has been submitted and voted down we can not get another Legislature to resubmit it, because they say the people have expressed their opinion and decided no, and therefore nobody with any political sense would resubmit the question. It is therefore impossible in any one of those States. We have tried hard in Kansas for ten years to get the question resubmitted; the vote of that State seems to be taken as a finality. We ask you to lift the sixteenth amendment out of the arena of the public mass into the arena of thinking legislative brains, the brains of the nation, under the law and the Constitution. Not only do we ask it for that purpose, but when you will have by a two-thirds vote submitted the proposition to the several Legislatures, you have put the pin down and it never can go back. No subsequent Congress can revoke that submission of the proposition; there will be so much gained; it can not slide back. Then we will go to New York or to Pennsylvania, and urge upon the Legislatures the ratification of that amendment. They may refuse; they may vote it down the first time. Then we will go to the next Legislature, and the next Legislature, and plead and plead, from year to year, if it takes ten years. It is an open question to every Legislature until we can get one that will ratify it, and when that Legislature has once voted and ratified it no subsequent legislation can revoke their ratification.

Thus, you perceive, Senators, that every step we would gain by this sixteenth amendment process is fast and not to be done over again. That is why I appeal to you especially. As I have shown you in the respective States, if we fail to educate the people of a whole State—and in Michigan it was only six months, and in Colorado less than six months—the State Legislatures say that is the end of it. I appeal to you, therefore, to adopt the course that we suggest.

Gentlemen of the committee, if there is a question that you want to ask me before I make my final appeal, I should like to have you put it now; any question as to constitutional law or your right to go forward. Of course you do not deny to us that this amendment will be right in the line of all the amendments heretofore. The eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth amendments are all in line prohibiting the States from doing something which they heretofore thought they had a right to do. Now we ask you to prohibit the States from denying to women their rights.

I want to show you in closing that of the great acts of justice done during the war and since the war the first one was a great military necessity. We never got one inch of headway in putting down the rebellion until the purpose of this great nation was declared that slavery should be abolished. Then, as if by magic, we went forward and put down the rebellion. At the close of the rebellion the nation stood again at a perfect deadlock. The Republican party was trembling in the balance, because it feared that it could not hold its position until it should have secured by legislation to the Government what it had gained at the point of the sword, and when the nation declared its purpose to enfranchise the negro it was a political necessity. I do not want to take too much vainglory out of the heads of Republicans, but nevertheless it is a great national fact that neither of those great acts of beneficence to the negro race was done because of any high, overshadowing moral conviction on the part of any considerable minority even of the people of this nation, but simply because of a military necessity slavery was abolished, and simply because of a political necessity black men were enfranchised.

The blackest Republican State you had voted down negro suffrage, and that was Kansas in 1867; Michigan voted it down in 1867; Ohio voted it down in 1867. Iowa was the only State that ever voted negro suffrage by a majority of the citizens to which the question was submitted, and they had not more than seventy-five negroes in the whole State; so it was not a very practical question. Therefore, it may be fairly said, I think, that it was a military necessity that compelled one of those acts of justice, and a political necessity that compelled the other.

It seems to me that from the first word uttered by our dear friend, Mrs. ex-Governor Wallace, of Indiana, all the way down, we have been presenting to you the fact that there is a great moral necessity pressing upon this nation to-day, that you shall go forward and attach a sixteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution which shall put in the hands of the women of this nation the power to help make, shape, and control the social conditions of society everywhere. I appeal to you from that standpoint that you shall submit this proposition.

There is one other point to which I want to call your attention. The Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator EDMUNDS chairman, reported that the United States could do nothing to protect women in the right to vote under the amendments. Now I want to give you a few points where the United States interferes to take away the right to vote from women where the State has given it to them. In Wyoming, for instance, by a Democratic legislature, the women were enfranchised. They were not only allowed to vote but to sit upon juries, the same as men. Those of you who read the reports giving the results of that action have not forgotten that the first result of women sitting upon juries was that wherever there was a violation of the whisky law they brought in verdicts accordingly for the execution of the law; and you will remember, too, that the first man who ever had a verdict of guilty for murder in the first degree in that Territory was tried by a jury made up largely of women. Always up to that day every jury had brought in a verdict of shot in self-defense, although the person shot down may have been entirely unarmed. Then, in cities like Cheyenne and Laramie, persons entered complaints against keepers of houses of ill-fame.

Women were on the jury, and the result was in every case that before the juries could bring in a bill of indictment the women had taken the train and

left the town. Why do you hear no more of women sitting on juries in that Territory? Simply because the United States marshal, who is appointed by the President to go to Wyoming, refuses to put the names of women into the box from which the jury is drawn. There the United States Government interferes to take the right away.

A DELEGATE. I should like to state that Governor Hoyt, of Wyoming, who was the governor who signed the act giving to women this right, informed me that the right had been restored, and that his sister, who resides there, recently served on a jury.

Miss ANTHONY. I am glad to hear it. It is two years since I was there, but I was told that that was the case. In Utah the women were given the right to vote, but a year and a half ago their Legislative Assembly found that although they had the right to vote the Territorial law provided that only male voters should hold office. The Legislative Assembly of Utah passed a bill providing that women should be eligible to all the offices of the Territory. The school offices, superintendents of schools, were the offices in particular to which the women wanted to be elected. Governor Emory, appointed by the President of the United States, vetoed that bill. Thus the full operations of enfranchisement conferred by two of the Territories has been stopped by Federal interference.

You ask why I come here instead of going to the State Legislatures. You say that whenever the Legislatures extend the right of suffrage to us by the constitutions of their States we can get it. Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Colorado, Kansas, Oregon, all these States, have had the school suffrage extended by legislative enactment. If the question had been submitted to the rank and file of the people of Boston, with 66,000 men paying nothing but the poll-tax, they would have undoubtedly voted against letting women have the right to vote for members of the school board; but their intelligent representatives on the floor of the Legislature voted in favor of the extension of the school suffrage to the women. The first result in Boston has been the election of quite a number of women to the school board. In Minnesota, in the little town of Rochester, the school board declared its purpose to cut the women teachers' wages down. It did not propose to touch the principal, who was a man, but they proposed to cut all the women down from \$50 to \$35. One woman put her bonnet on and went over the entire town and said, "We have got a right to vote for this school board, and let us do so." They all turned out and voted, and not a single \$35 man was re-elected, but all those who were in favor of paying \$50.

It seems to be a sort of charity to let a woman teach school. You say here that if a woman has a father, mother, or brother, or anybody to support her, she can not have a place in the Departments. In the city of Rochester they can not let a married woman teach school because she has got a husband, and it is supposed he ought to support her. The women are working in the Departments, as everywhere else, for half price, and the only pretext, you tell us, for keeping women there is because the Government can economize by employing women for less money. The other day when I saw a newspaper item stating that the Government proposed to compensate Miss Josephine Meeker for all her bravery, heroism, and terrible sufferings by giving her a place in the Interior Department, it made my blood boil to the ends of my fingers and toes. To give that girl a chance to work in the Department; to do just as much work as a man, and pay her half as much, was a charity. That was a beneficence on the part of this grand Government to her. We want the ballot for bread. When we do equal work we want equal wages.

Mrs. SAXON. California, in her recent convention, prohibits the Legislature hereafter from enacting any law for woman's suffrage, does it not?

Miss ANTHONY. I do not know. I have not seen the new constitution.

Mrs. SAXON. It does. The convention inserted a provision in the constitution that the Legislature could not act upon the subject at all.

Miss ANTHONY. Everywhere that we have gone, Senators, to ask our right at the hands of any legislative or political body, we have been the subjects of ridicule. For instance, I went before the great national Democratic convention in New York, in 1868, as a delegate from the New York Woman Suffrage Association, to ask that great party, now that it wanted to come to the front again, to put a genuine Jeffersonian plank in its platform, pledging the ballot to all citizens, women as well as men, should it come into power. You may remember how Mr. Seymour ordered my petition to be read, after looking at it in the most scrutinizing manner, when it was referred to the committee on resolutions, where it has slept the sleep of death from that day to this. But before the close of the convention a body of ignorant workmen sent in a petition clamoring for greenbacks, and you remember that the Democratic party bought those men by putting a solid greenback plank in the platform.

Everybody supposed they would nominate Pendleton, or some other man of pronounced views, but instead of doing that they nominated Horatio Seymour, who stood on the fence, politically speaking. My friends, Mrs. Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and women who have brains and education, women who are tax-payers, went there and petitioned for the practical application of the fundamental principles of our Government to one-half of the people. Those most ignorant workmen, the vast mass of them foreigners, went there, and petitioned that that great political party should favor greenbacks. Why did they treat those workmen with respect, and put a greenback plank in their platform, and only table us, and ignore us? Simply because the workmen represented the power of the ballot. They could make or unmake the great Democratic party at that election. The women were powerless. We could be ridiculed and ignored with impunity, and so we were laughed at, and put on the table.

Then the Republicans went to Chicago, and they did just the same thing. They said the Government bonds must be paid in precisely the currency specified by the Congressional enactment, and Tallcyand himself could not have devised how not to say anything better than the Republicans did at Chicago on that question. Then they nominated a man who had not any financial opinions whatever, and who was not known, except for his military record, and they went into the campaign. Both those parties had this petition from us.

I met a woman in Grand Rapids, Mich., a short time ago. She came to me one morning and told me about the obscene shows licensed in that city, and said that she thought of memorializing the Legislature. I said, "Do; you can not do anything else; you are helpless, but you can petition. Of course they will laugh at you." Notwithstanding, I drew up a petition and she circulated it. Twelve hundred of the best citizens signed that petition, and the lady carried it to the Legislature. Just as Mrs. Wallace took her petition in the Indiana Legislature. They read it, laughed at it, and laid it on the table; and at the close of the session, by a unanimous vote, they retired in a solid body to witness the obscene show themselves. After witnessing it, they not only allowed the license to continue for that year, but they have licensed it every year from that day to this, against all the protests of the petitioners. [Laughter.]

Senator EDMUNDS. Do not think we are wanting in respect to you and the ladies here because you say something that makes us laugh.

Miss ANTHONY. You are not laughing at me; you are treating me respectfully, because you are hearing my argument; you are not asleep, not one of you, and I am delighted.

Now, I am going to tell you one other fact. Seven thousand of the best citizens of Illinois petitioned the Legislature of 1877 to give them the poor privilege of voting on the license question. A gentleman presented their petition; the ladies were in the lobbies around the room. A gentleman made a motion that the president of the State association of the Christian Temperance Union be allowed to address the Legislature regarding the petition of the memorialists, when a gentleman sprang to his feet, and said it was well enough for the honorable gentleman to present the petition, and have it received and laid on the table, but "for a gentleman to rise in his seat and propose that the valuable

time of the honorable gentlemen of the Illinois Legislature should be consumed in discussing the nonsense of those women is going a little too far. I move that the sergeant-at-arms be ordered to clear the hall of the house of representatives of the mob; referring to those Christian women. Now, they had had the lobbyists of the whisky ring in that Legislature for years and years, not only around it at respectful distances, but inside the bar, and nobody ever made a motion to clear the halls of the whisky mob there. It only takes Christian women to make a mob.

Mrs. SAXON. We were treated extremely respectfully in Louisiana. It showed plainly the temper of the convention when the present governor admitted that woman suffrage was a fact bound to come. They gave us the privilege of having women on the school boards, but then the officers are appointed by men who are politicians.

Miss ANTHONY. I want to read a few words that come from good authority, for black men at least. I find here a little extract that I copied years ago from the Anti-Slavery Standard of 1870. As you know, Wendell Phillips was the editor of that paper at that time:

"A man with the ballot in his hand is the master of the situation. He defines all his other rights; what is not already given him he takes."

That is exactly what we want, Senators. The rights you have not already given us; we want to get in such a position that we can take them.

"The ballot makes every class sovereign over its own fate. Corruption may steal from a man his independence; capital may starve, and intrigue fetter him, at times; but against all these, his vote, intelligently and honestly cast, is, in the long run, his full protection. If, in the struggle, his fort surrenders, it is only because it is betrayed from within. No power ever permanently wronged a voting class without its own consent."

Senators, I want to ask of you that you will, by the law and parliamentary rules of your committee, allow us to agitate this question by publishing this report and the report which you shall make upon our petitions, as I hope you will make a report. If your committee is so pressed with business that it can not possibly consider and report upon this question, I wish some of you would make a motion on the floor of the Senate that a special committee be appointed to take the whole question of the enfranchisement of women into consideration, and that that committee shall have nothing else to do. This off-year of politics, when there is nothing to do but to try how not to do it (politically, I mean, I am not speaking personally), is the best time you can have to consider the question of woman suffrage, and I ask you to use your influence with the Senate to have it specially attended to this year. Do not make us come here thirty years longer. It is twelve years since the first time I came before a Senate committee. I said then to Charles Sumner, if I could make the honorable Senator from Massachusetts believe that I feel the degradation and the humiliation of disfranchisement precisely as he would if his fellows had adjudged him incompetent from any cause whatever from having his opinion counted at the ballot-box we should have our right to vote in the twinkling of an eye.

REMARKS BY MRS. SARA A. SPENCER, OF WASHINGTON.

Mrs. SPENCER. Congress printed 10,000 copies of its proceedings concerning the memorial services of a dead man, Professor Henry. It cost me three months of hard work to have 3,000 copies of our arguments last year before the Committee on Privileges and Elections printed for 10,000,000 living women. I ask that the committee will have printed 10,000 copies of this report.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee have no power to order the printing. That can only be done by the order of the Senate. A resolution can be offered to that effect in the Senate. I have only to say, ladies, that you will admit that we have listened to you with great attention, and I can certainly say with very great interest. What you have said will be duly and earnestly considered by the committee.

Mrs. WALLACE. I wish to make just one remark in reference to what Senator Thurman said as to the popular vote being against woman suffrage. The popular vote is against it, but not the popular voice. Owing to the temperance agitation in the last six years the growth of the suffrage sentiment among the wives and mothers of this nation has largely increased.

Mrs. SPENCER. In behalf of the women of the United States, permit me to thank the Senate Judiciary Committee for their respectful, courteous, and close attention.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not propose to make a speech at this late hour of the day; it would be cruel to the Senate; and I had not expected that this measure would be here this afternoon. I was absent on a public duty and came in just at the close of the speech of my honorable friend from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I wish, however, to say one word in regard to what seemed to be the burden of his speech.

He says that the women who ask this change in our political organization are not simply seeking to be put upon school boards and upon boards of health and charity and upon all the large number of duties of a political nature for which he must confess they are fit, but he says they will want to be President of the United States, and want to be Senators, and want to be marshals and sheriffs, and that seems to him supremely ridiculous. Now I do not understand that that is the proposition. What they want to do and to be is to be eligible to such public duty as a majority of their fellow-citizens may think they are fitted for. The majority of public duties in this country do not require robust, physical health, or exposure to what is base or unhealthy; and when those duties are imposed upon anybody they will be imposed only upon such persons as are fit for them. But they want that if the majority of the American people think a woman like Queen Victoria, or Queen Elizabeth, or Queen Isabella of Spain, or Maria Theresa of Hungary (the four most brilliant sovereigns of any sex in modern history with only two or three exceptions), the fittest person to be President of the United States, they may be permitted to exercise their choice accordingly.

Old men are eligible to office, old men are allowed to vote, but we do not send old men to war, or make constables or watchmen or overseers of State prisons of old men; and it is utterly idle to suppose that the fitness to vote or the fitness to hold office has anything to do with the physical strength or with the particular mental qualities in regard to which the sexes differ from each other.

Mr. President, my honorable friend spoke of the French revolution and the horrors in which the women of Paris took part, and from that he would argue that American wives and mothers and sisters are not fit for the calm and temperate management of our American republican life. His argument would require him by the same logic to agree that republicanism itself is not fit for human society. The argument is the argument against popular government whether by man or woman,

and the Senator only applies to this new phase of the claim of equal rights what his predecessors would argue against the rights we now have applied to us.

But the Senator thought it was unspeakably absurd that a woman with her sentiment and emotional nature and liability to be moved by passion and feeling should hold the office of Senator. Why, Mr. President, the Senator's own speech is a refutation of its own argument. Everybody knows that my honorable friend from Missouri is one of the most brilliant men in this country. He is a logician, he is an orator, he is a man of large experience, he is a lawyer entrusted with large interests; yet when he was called upon to put forth this great effort of his this afternoon and to argue this question which he thinks so clear, what did he do? He furnished the gush and the emotion and the eloquence, but when he came to any argument he had to call upon two women, Mrs. Leonard and Mrs. Whitney to supply all that. [Laughter.] If Mrs. Leonard and Mrs. Whitney have to make the argument in the Senate of the United States for the brilliant and distinguished Senator from Missouri it does not seem to me so absolutely ridiculous that they should have or that women like them should have seats here to make arguments of their own. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no amendment be proposed the question is, shall the joint resolution be engrossed for a third reading?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAIR. Why not take the yeas and nays on the passage?

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call is withdrawn.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. COCKRELL. I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon this question the yeas and nays will necessarily be taken.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHACE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. DAWES (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY]. I regret that I am not able to vote on this question. I should vote "yea" if he were here.

Mr. COKE. My colleague [Mr. MAXEY], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. GRAY (when Mr. GORMAN's name was called). I am requested by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to say that he is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. STANFORD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CAMDEN]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, but I see his colleague voted "nay," and as I am opposed to the resolution I will record my vote "nay."

Mr. KENNA. I am paired on all questions with the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON]. If he were present I should vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. BROWN. I was requested by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to announce his pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], and to say that if the Senator from South Carolina were present he would vote "nay." I do not know how the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote.

Mr. CULLOM. I was requested by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to announce his pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 34; as follows:

YEAS—16.

Blair,	Cullom,	Manderson,	Platt,
Bowen,	Dolph,	Mitchell of Oreg.,	Sherman,
Cheney,	Farwell,	Mitchell of Pa.,	Teller,
Conger,	Hoar,	Palmer,	Wilson of Iowa.

NAYS—34.

Beck,	Evarts,	McPherson,	Spooner,
Berry,	George,	Mahone,	Vance,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Morgan,	Vest,
Brown,	Hampton,	Morrill,	Walthall,
Call,	Harris,	Payne,	Whitthorne,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Pugh,	Williams,
Coke,	Ingalls,	Saulsbury,	Wilson of Md.
Colquitt,	Jones of Nevada,	Sawyer,	
Eustis,	McMillan,	Sewell,	

ABSENT—26.

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Riddleberger,
Allison,	Fair,	Jones of Florida,	Sabin,
Butler,	Frye,	Kenna,	Stanford,
Camden,	Gibson,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Miller,	Voorhees.
Chace,	Hale,	Plumb,	
Dawes,	Harrison,	Ransom,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds have not voted for the resolution. It is not passed.

Mr. PLUMB subsequently said: I wish to state that I was unexpectedly called out of the Senate just before the vote was taken on the constitutional amendment, and to also state that if I had been here I should have voted for it.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MINNEAPOLIS.

Mr. MAHONE. Mr. President, the sundry civil appropriation bill is in rapid process of preparation for report to the Senate, and we may look for it in the next day or two. There are several public building bills on the Calendar for which provision ought to be made on the sundry civil bill, and I ask unanimous consent now that we may proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1799. It will not take more than ten or fifteen minutes to get through with all these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill the title of which will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A bill (S. 1920) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Minneapolis, Minn."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROOMS IN TOWN HALL BUILDING, JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. MAHONE. Now, I move to take up Order of Business 1892, being Senate joint resolution No. 51.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 51) authorizing and directing the Department of Justice to transfer certain rooms which have been occupied by the United States courts to the city of Jackson, Miss.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SANTA FÉ, N. MEX.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to take up the bill (H. R. 9371) being Order of Business 1872.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9371) for the completion of a public building at Santa Fé, N. Mex.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHESTER, PA.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (S. 2303) being Order of Business 1893.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2303) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MILWAUKEE.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (S. 3001) being Order of Business 1907.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 3001) for the erection of a public building at Milwaukee, Wis., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was in line 37, after the words "provided further" to strike out:

"That in the purchase of said site, and in the construction and proper equipment of said building, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized, and is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell and convey the present property of the United States in said city now occupied as a public building, with the site thereof, and to appropriate and apply the proceeds therefrom to said purchase of said site or to the construction of said building, and the proper furnishing and equipment thereof, in addition to any sum herein otherwise appropriated."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall be, and he is hereby, authorized, whenever, in his judgment, the public interest will admit, in his discretion, to sell and convey the present property of the United States in said city now occupied as a public building, with the site thereof, the proceeds of the sale of said property to be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section 2, line 2, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

In addition to the clear proceeds from the sale and conveyance of any property of the United States designated in the next preceding section.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$1,200,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MORGAN CITY, LA.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to take up the bill (S. 1322) being Order of Business 1908.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1322) to provide for the construction of a public building at the city of Morgan City (port of Brashear), State of Louisiana, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ABINGDON, VA.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to take up the bill (H. R. 2539) being Order of Business 1909.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 2539) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange property purchased at Abingdon, Va., as a site or a public building, for more suitable property, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was at the end of section 1, to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That such other or new site so secured shall not be located east of the site now owned by the United States and herein authorized to be exchanged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as an additional section the following:

SEC. 2. That the further sum of \$25,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the construction of such building at Abingdon, Va., as will furnish such accommodations for the United States courts and the post-office there as the business of each now require.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL, the title was amended by adding the words "and for other purposes."

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7218) being Order of Business 1910.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 7218) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Chattanooga, Tenn.," approved February 25, 1885, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with amendments in line 8, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "two;" in the same line, after the word "hundred," to strike out "and fifty;" in line 17, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "two," and in the same line, after the word "hundred," to strike out the words "and fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, &c., That the act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Chattanooga, Tenn.," approved February 25, 1885, be, and the same is hereby, so amended as to provide that the cost of said building, including site and building complete, shall not exceed the sum of \$200,000: *Provided*, That the site shall not be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site, nor plan for said building, shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the sum of \$200,000 for site and building.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LOS ANGELES, CAL.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (H. R. 191) being Order of Business 1911.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 191) providing for the erection of a public building at Los Angeles, Cal., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (S. 2908) being Order of Business 1912.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2908) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, S. C.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed that there is a House bill of the same title.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose to ask the Senator from Virginia if there was a House bill on the same subject and for the same object reported this morning.

Mr. MAHONE. Yes, sir; Order of Business 2132.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I ask for the consideration of the House bill.

Mr. MAHONE. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the House bill on the same subject will be considered before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10051) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, S. C.

Mr. HAMPTON. I think that the Senate bill provides for an appropriation of \$400,000, and if I caught the reading of the House bill aright it provides for \$300,000. I think it is best, to avoid any complication or any difference between the two Houses, that we should accept the reduction, and I am perfectly willing to allow the House bill to pass without amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JEFFERSON, TEX.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to take up the bill (H. R. 9644) being Order of Business 1935.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 9644) for the erection of a public building at Jefferson, Tex., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BECK. I have been listening with some care and I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia whether all these bills carry their own appropriations, or must they go to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MAHONE. Some carry their own appropriations and some do not. Some of them will have to go to that committee. I have only three more to get through.

Mr. BECK. The committee meets for the last time on the sundry civil bill to-morrow morning, and all which do not carry appropriations ought to be passed to-night.

Mr. MAHONE. We shall be through in five minutes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HASTINGS, NEBR.

Mr. MAHONE. I now move to take up the bill (S. 1974) being Order of Business 1936.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1974) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hastings, Nebr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment in line 6, after the words "accommodation of," to insert "United States court to be located there;" so as to make the bill read.

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase a site and to cause to be erected at the city of Hastings, in the State of Nebraska, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of United States court to be located there, the post-office, and other Government offices in said city, with fire-proof vaults extending to each story; the site, and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the cost of \$100,000; and the sum of \$75,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase of said site and the completion of said building: *Provided*, That there shall be an open space of not less than 50 feet upon every side of said building, including streets and alleys, and that no part of said sum shall be expended until a valid title to said site shall be vested in the United States, and the State of Nebraska shall cede to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owners thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of any civil process therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAHONE, the title was amended by adding the words "and for other purposes."

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HANOVER, N. H.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (S. 3121) being Order of Business 1994.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 3121) for the erection of a public building at Hanover, N. H., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. MAHONE. I move now to take up the bill (S. 3055) being Order of Business 2002.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 3055) for the extension and repair of the public building at Newark, N. J., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BECK. I move to take up the bill (S. 2578) to prohibit members of Congress from acting as attorneys or employes for railroad companies holding charters or having received grant of lands or pecuniary aid from the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to inquire what is the position of the bill (S. 372) known as the agricultural experiment-station bill, which was by vote of the Senate this morning postponed until 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the bill of the Senator from Kentucky is taken up it will become the unfinished business, unless the Senate disposes of it before adjournment. If the bill is taken up it becomes the unfinished business of to-morrow, unless it be disposed of before adjournment to-day.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McMILLAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That motion is in order.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator withhold the motion a moment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to say that the present occupant of the chair was not occupying the chair when the motion passed by which the unfinished business, the agricultural experiment-station bill, was postponed until to-morrow at 2 o'clock. It is the unfinished business by vote of the Senate to-morrow at 2 o'clock. That was the vote of the Senate.

The motion was to postpone the unfinished business until 2 o'clock to-morrow. That motion carried. Thereupon I moved to take up the suffrage resolution, so that the unfinished business of which the Senator from Mississippi is in charge will be in order by vote of the Senate to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senate should adjourn at this moment the motion of the Senator from Kentucky would fall necessarily, because the Senate has not acted on it. If the motion to adjourn is voted down and the bill proposed by the Senator from Kentucky is taken up, it will be in order and supersede the special order for to-morrow. The unfinished business always supersedes a special order. The Chair states the rule so that Senators may vote understandingly. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Kentucky will have precisely the same right to make the motion to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BECK. As soon as the morning business is over to-morrow morning I will make the motion I have now made. I withdraw it for the time being. I do not want to embarrass Senators.

Mr. HARRIS. You can insist on it now.

Mr. BECK. I do not want to embarrass anybody.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1887.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

On motion of Mr. DOCKERY the reading of so much of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday as related to the introduction of bills and resolutions was dispensed with. The remainder of the Journal was read and approved.

COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. LAWLER obtained unanimous consent that the following letter, addressed to him by Admiral Porter, in relation to coast defenses, should be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House:

LETTER OF ADMIRAL PORTER.

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1886.

MY DEAR SIR: In addition to the information I have already furnished in my report to the Secretary of the Navy, I would first refer you to the report of the board ordered by the President May 12, 1885, consisting of the following:

Hon. William C. Endicott, Secretary of War, president.
Brig. Gen. Stephen V. Benét, Chief of Ordnance.
Brig. Gen. John Newton, Chief of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Henry L. Abbot, Corps of Engineers.
Capt. Charles S. Smith, Ordnance Department.
Commander William T. Sampson, United States Navy.
Commander Casper F. Goodrich, United States Navy.
Mr. Joseph Morgan, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Erastus Corning of New York.

The reports of the Chief of Engineers of the Army have annually laid before the country the condition of the national defenses, and attention is especially invited to those of 1880, 1881, 1882, and 1884. These reports are conclusive, and show the miserable state of the defenses all along the coast of the United States.

The board on fortifications and other defense represent the following harbors as entirely defenseless:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. New York. | 16. Savannah. |
| 2. San Francisco. | 17. Galveston. |
| 3. Boston. | 18. Portland, Oreg. |
| 4. The lake ports. | 19. Pensacola, Fla. |
| 5. Hampton Roads. | 20. Wilmington, N. C. |
| 6. New Orleans. | 21. San Diego, Cal. |
| 7. Philadelphia. | 22. Portsmouth, N. H. |
| 8. Washington. | 23. Defenses of Cumberland Sound at Fort Clinch. |
| 9. Baltimore. | 24. Defenses of ports of the Kennebec River at Fort Popham. |
| 10. Portland, Me. | 25. New Bedford, Mass. |
| 11. Rhode Island ports in Narragansett Bay. | 26. Defenses of ports on the Penobscot River, Maine, at Fort Knox. |
| 12. Key West. | 27. New Haven, Conn. |
| 13. Charleston, S. C. | |
| 14. Mobile. | |
| 15. New London. | |

NOTE.—Defenses are most urgently required at the first eleven ports named.

These harbors are, to my knowledge, entirely defenseless against a single first-rate armor-clad, which could enter any of them at any time without any difficulty. Twenty heavy iron-clads could in as many days lay every important town on our seaboard under contribution; so that by a well-concerted action by an enemy every harbor on our coast, on the same day, would fall into their hands.

We have a certain amount of submarine and torpedo defenses, which, with proper forts, would be very valuable to assist in keeping out an enemy; but, in the absence of such forts, they would amount to very little. An enemy's fleet would soon batter down any forts that we have, and there would then be no difficulty in taking up the torpedoes or cutting the wires, when the fleet would pass on wheresoever they please.

I send you herewith a copy of a report by Commander Casper F. Goodrich, United States Navy, on the capture of Alexandria, Egypt, by the English fleet. We have no port in the United States so thoroughly armed with the best rifled cannon as was the port of Alexandria—two hundred and five guns (not all rifled, however) being brought to bear on the English—yet in ten and one-half hours the British fleet of eight iron-clads and five wooden gun-boats, carrying thirty-nine heavy guns and the secondary battery now usual in modern ships, knocked the forts to pieces, dismounted all their heavy guns, and the town lay at their mercy. This result shows in the most striking manner the incapacity of our various coast defenses to resist the attack of an enemy by sea. Attacked by land forces alone, we have soldiers enough in this country to keep out the armies of any one power in Europe. Commander Goodrich's report is well worth perusal, and contains a mine of information and warning.

Our lake-board cities are entirely open to the attacks of the British navy. In twenty-four hours the English could overrun our lakes with gunboats and ironclads by means of the Welland Canal, and we have not a gun to prevent their doing so. We have but one vessel on the lakes (the Michigan), which is entirely unfit for war purposes. The only nation from which we have anything to fear on the lakes is Great Britain, as no other could attack us in that quarter.

You ask: "Is it not vitally essential to the necessities for the public defense that the Army and Navy should be placed in condition of co-operation so far as defenses are concerned?" Unless fortifications are constructed of iron, are able to stand as much hammering as armored vessels, and have much heavier guns than ships can carry, the forts are useless opposed to a fleet provided with the modern heavy rifles and secondary batteries of machine guns. Such forts as ours, no matter what guns they might have, could not stand any time before the fire of heavy batteries afloat, and to beat off an enemy they would require the co-operation of a large force of ironclads equal at least in the character of their guns and armor to the ships attacking the forts.

It is a curious fact that there is no case on record where fleets have been brought to bear against fortifications, and the ships were properly handled and had a sufficient number of guns to keep up a continuous fire, that the forts were not silenced. I merely mention a few instances:

Lord Exmouth attacked Algiers in 1816. At that time Algiers was one of the most strongly fortified places in the world (having 1,000 guns mounted), yet the British fleet (mounting about 900) drove the enemy from their guns and captured the city in a few hours.

Admiral Sir John Duckworth, in 1807, passed the Dardanelles, leading to Constantinople, one of the most strongly defended places in the world and mounting guns carrying 800-pound shot. The fleet sustained little damage from the fire of the Turkish guns, and anchored off Constantinople.

The French bombarded the forts of St. Jean d'Acre (very heavy ones) and the ships gained the day.

In 1839 a small French squadron, under the command of the Prince de Joinville, attacked the great fortress of San Juan d'Ulloa at Vera Cruz, and in a very few hours dismounted most of the guns and destroyed part of the fort.

In the early part of this century the English attacked Havana, which, as we all know, is defended by a wonderful net-work of heavy forts, yet the British fleet went in, anchored, and kept up such a terrible fire that the forts were unable to check them. After having punished the Spaniards sufficiently the fleet cruised before the harbor and blockaded it.

Our own successes during the civil war against Forts Henry and Donelson, Arkansas Post, Vicksburg, Port Hudson, New Orleans, Port Royal, Mobile Bay, Fort Fisher, and other points are only a repetition of what has been done so many times before by a fair number of ships.

And now, since armor-clads have been made almost impenetrable to shot, forts attacked by strong squadrons and unsupported by heavy ships, torpedoes, submarine mines, and obstructions of various kinds will generally succumb to the ships.

Therefore it is a vital necessity in time of war for forts to have the co-operation of naval forces. Many persons go so far as to say that in time of war a strong part of the personnel of a fort should consist of naval officers and seamen, as they are more familiar with the vital parts of the attacking ships and are better judges of how to measure the velocity of a ship under way and how to sight the guns under such circumstances.

To your fourth question I would say that I can not give any comparative statement that would be creditable to the United States Navy. The condition of our navy as regards its ships of war is so discreditable to the nation that I think an American who goes abroad and sees the powerful navies that have been built up by European powers would hang his head with shame, for there is not a nation on earth having any naval pretensions that could not wage war upon our coasts with perfect impunity.

The Chinese, who, a few years ago could boast of nothing better than junks mounting a few guns, have now a navy that could drive our East India squadron from their coast if at any moment complications should arise there; and when we think how often Chinese subjects have been brutally treated in this country it would not be strange if their Government, irritated on some of these occasions, should order our squadron from off their coast, drive the few merchant vessels we have there out to sea, and enforce their edicts, against which we would be powerless to contend.

Japan, which was open to the commerce of the world about 1855, and was slow to adopt a modern system of warfare, has a more powerful navy than the United States. In fact, I can not mention a single nation professing to be a naval power that could not humiliate us to-morrow if so disposed.

The result of our civil war was to set all the nations of the earth to building heavy ironclads and fast cruisers, so that foreign workshops have been filled to overflowing with laboring men building ships of war and making thousands of the heaviest kind of rifled guns, while we have been content to patch our ancient wooden ships and send them abroad with their old cast-iron guns, a laughing-stock for the nations of the earth.

It is a wonder to me that foreign nations have continued to extend to the flag of the United States, in its present weak condition, the respect it once had the power to enforce when its ships and guns were the best in the world. It is a lamentable fact that we are a great nation of people with unlimited resources; wealth superior to that of any nation on the face of the earth, with an overflowing treasury that is really a source of unhappiness to us, a large population at the most inclement season of the year asking for work. Yet the representatives of the people, unheeding their cry, seem unconscious of the danger of war that threatens us.

War is a calamity that often comes without premonition. The first thing we know we are likely to be involved in a controversy with some powerful nation, and the next thing we will be aware of will be a fleet of iron-clads anchored in our harbors. There is no nation in the world which would bear such an event less tamely than the American.

We have been singularly exempt from complications with the powers of Europe, and it may look as though we were likely to remain so. Our exemption is owing to the fact that we are so far removed from Europe, and have not meddled with the affairs of foreign nations. We are in many respects very necessary to them, as our granaries feed their huge armies and navies, to say nothing of their laboring classes, when, through failure of their crops, they are reduced to extremities.

But we can not expect to be always exempt from the difficulties that beset nations any more than other powers. Within the last year we have had a difficulty with Canada on the fishing question, which at one time promised to be serious, and nothing but the moderation and good sense of this Government prevented a crisis. Canada, with an improvised navy of two schooners, made actual war upon our fishing interests, captured our vessels on the most trifling pretexts, and scarcely gave them time to meet the requirements imposed upon them by the authorities. Does any one pretend to say that these aggressions would have taken place had the Government of the United States been provided with a force of fifty heavy iron-clads and seventy fast cruisers? I unhesitatingly answer "no."

Nations are measured not by the large amount of property they may own, their ability to raise food for themselves and for others, the benefits they may confer upon mankind, or their liberal form of Government. Foreigners inquire, "What is their military power; what ships have they got to enforce their demands?" And when the American flag is seen abroad only occasionally on a merchant ship, or some miserable frigate crawls into port with our country's ensign at her peak, the Government does not seem entitled to that respect which would be accorded to a nation represented by powerful iron-clads, such as are now encountered in every out-of-the-way corner of the world.

Yet the American citizen demands when abroad, for his country and himself, the same consideration as was accorded to the Roman citizen when Rome was mistress of the world, seeming to expect that, when he says "I am an American citizen," his rights will be respected. He would probably be asked, under present circumstances, "Where is the navy that your vaunted country will send to enforce your demands, and how many gun-boats do you carry in your pocket?"

To your fifth question: What amount in your (my) judgment is necessary to be expended so as to place our Navy on the footing which the United States should enjoy, and the immediate necessities for such outlay? I would remark a parallel case to ours occurred within the last few weeks. The Spanish navy has very much run down, and although Spain has actually ten times the navy that we possess, yet it was felt that her prestige had been so lessened by the decay of her marine that a great exertion was necessary to place it on a footing with that of the other powers of Europe. When the higher officers of the navy represented to the Cortes the necessities of the case that body at once appropriated a sum of \$45,000,000 for the rehabilitation of the navy—nearly half of the surplus in our Treasury. Yet Spain has no plethoric vaults, as we have, filled with gold, and kept from circulation, lying in the Treasury and worth no more, as far as usefulness is concerned, than so much sawdust. Although Spain had no money for rebuilding the navy, she hypothecated the Government forests, which had been for centuries the hunting ground of kings and nobles, to provide the necessary funds to reinstate the country in the good opinion of Europe, although the forests are just as sacred in the eyes of Spain as the Escorial, or the Alhambra, or other monument of the past.

Spain, when she found the inefficient condition of her navy, did not hesitate a moment in regard to appropriating a large amount of money; but how different it is in this country! Instead of appropriating so much a year for the gradual increase of the Navy and allowing the Secretary of the Navy to build such ships as are necessary, Congress undertakes to specify the cost and tonnage of each vessel, and money is so appropriated that each ship must cost just so much and no more. There is no sense nor justice in appropriating money in such a manner.

The old rule was to appropriate annually a certain sum for the increase of the Navy in addition to the regular appropriation for the support of the Navy. The present rule of Congress defining the displacement of ships has resulted in the planning and building of eight different classes of vessels—no two alike (except the Boston and Atlanta)—and although the first of the new vessels was commenced nearly four years ago, not one is yet finished, and Congress has several times been called upon for small additional sums, owing to the want of which the ships were very much delayed. I would, therefore, recommend that appropriations for the yearly increase of the Navy be made in a lump sum, and that Congress permit the Navy Department to build the ships, with the proviso that any amount unexpended after the lapse of two years should not be returned to the Treasury, because it is barely possible to build ships with the amount appropriated within that time.

At the present moment there is a stagnation in the ship-building business all over the country, and you, as a public man, must know what a boon it would be to the ship-building interests of every kind to distribute a portion of the surplus revenue among them to enable them to build up the Navy and improve their own plant, which would be so greatly to the advantage of the Government in time of war. At present our private ship-yards, although they may be in condition to build each one or two ships, would find their works very inadequate if called upon to prepare in a hurry a national navy. Therefore, every opportunity should be taken to give the private as well as the public yards sufficient work to enable them not only to exist, but to increase and improve their facilities in such a manner as will best serve the country in time of danger.

I would recommend that the Government appropriate during the next ten years \$10,000,000 annually to build up the Navy and put it in position to bid defiance to any power on earth.

I have not the faintest idea of gaining a single advocate to such a measure as this, as it would be considered too extravagant, while many millions are yearly devoted to rivers and harbors, notwithstanding it is well known that a large portion of this money is not judiciously expended.

It is not only the great mass of working people who are thrown out of em-

ployment by the stoppage of our ship-yards, but there are a hundred interests all over the country connected with ship-building which are feeling the depression. If Congress were at this moment to embrace warmly the project of building up the Navy it would add a new impetus to the work-shops all over the country, and labor being cheaper than it has been before for some time, ships could be built at a very moderate price. By having continuous appropriations from year to year the suffering workers in our ship-yards all over the country would be permanently relieved.

Ours is the only country in the world that once owned a magnificent foreign commerce, and has deliberately thrown it away. During the years of its decadence we have done nothing to build it up again, while the great powers of Europe are striving with all their might to develop their foreign commerce, and to push it to the remotest corners of the earth wherever it will yield good fruit. Our ocean commerce is coexistent with the Navy. As it declined the Navy declined with it, and at this day both Navy and mercantile marine present a spectacle not paralleled in any other country.

In one respect our Navy and mercantile marine are much alike. They have been left severely alone by those whose business it was to see them kept in good condition. The foreign commerce of a great country is one of the links which binds the body politic together, and there is not a single industry which is not in some way affected by commerce. Any nation that allows its commerce to fall to decay will run the risk of losing its position as one of the great powers of the earth, and from present appearances we seem to be doomed to be counted out, both as a naval power and commercial one. What would Great Britain be to-morrow without her mighty commerce? Suppose her legislators had sat quietly year after year and seen her commerce slipping away from her, as has been the case with us, or, worse than all, see another nation seize all her carrying trade to the tune of \$150,000,000 per annum. This is exactly our condition. We have allowed Great Britain to take away our carrying trade, and we have not to-day what I consider a first-class steamship in our whole mercantile marine.

While Congress is protecting a great many articles which the mass of the people think ought to be allowed to go free, it does nothing to protect our commerce. Hence it is the Navy falls into decay, having no commerce to guard, and our legislators appearing to think there is nothing else for a navy to do, local politics rule the day, and it is thus that among the conflicts of parties our commerce has been ignored so many years.

I can not at this moment recall any act of real benefit to our commerce that has passed Congress in twenty years. Some few measures have been brought forward for its relief, but nothing that would tempt people to establish ship-building yards and construct large ships as they do in England, which is at this moment the center where ships of war are built for all foreign nations, while no one thinks of coming to this country to have an iron vessel built.

The Navy has been treated worse than our ocean mercantile marine. We have for years beheld the whole world making preparation for war on a large scale, and the ocean has been tracked by the leviathan ships of war passing to and fro and protecting the commerce of their countries. Hundreds of these great armored vessels have been built for foreign powers, while the United States Government possesses but one iron vessel abroad—the little tug Palos—sent to China years ago to operate in those waters, and capable of carrying only a boat howitzer. For aught I know this formidable vessel may at this moment be flying the flag of the commander-in-chief of our naval forces until the Brooklyn, now on the way, reaches the Asiatic station. That would be a fine sight to greet the eyes of American citizens abroad, among whom are the greatest sticklers for the respect which should be shown the flag. This respect will never be accorded by foreigners until the United States ensign is carried at the peak of vessels suited to represent the majesty of our nation.

An unarmored wooden vessel with pot-metal guns at this moment no more represents the power of a nation than a policeman without his baton, revolver, steel-lined cap, and brass-bound coat represents the majesty of the law. I have no doubt that the representatives of foreign nations laugh in their sleeves when buncombe speeches are delivered in favor of supporting the Monroe doctrine by the power of our Navy—a navy which exists only on paper.

In the last ten years—and I think the people will be surprised when they know it—the grand total appropriated for the increase of the Navy has been \$3,647,617. The result is that the Navy has dwindled to twenty-eight vessels that can be actually used for active service. Twenty of these are only third-rates and five of them fourth-rates or about equivalent to tugs. The rest of our Navy is represented by fifty vessels, including old frigates, the pride of the nation in their day, laid up in "Rotten Row," old iron-clads or monitors that have been allowed under our naval system to go to decay, five iron-clads that are under contract and may be finished some of these days, thirteen tugs that might be taken for three-deckers from their high-sounding names, twelve sailing ships, built many years ago and most of them laid up. Not one of the old vessels can be used for any purpose except as a receiving ship for recruits, and not one of the active sea-going vessels could stand against a modern-built gunboat, firing machine shells, which burst on impact, for in five minutes after the commencement of the action she would be in flames from bow to tail.

The real Navy of the United States consists of the following named vessels:

Name.	Tons.	No. guns.	Caliber.	Speed.	Condition.
			Inches.		
Amphitrite.....	3,815	4	10	12	Incomplete.
Monadnock.....	3,815	4	10	12	Do.
Terror.....	3,815	4	10	12	Do.
Miantonomah.....	3,815	4	10	12	Do.
Puritan.....	6,000	4	10	13	Do.
Dolphin.....	1,300	1	6	15	Complete.
Boston.....	3,000	6	8	14	Armament incomplete.
Atlanta.....	3,000	6	8	14	Do.
Chicago.....	4,500	6	8	15	Incomplete.
Gunboat No. 1.....	1,700	6	6	18	Under advertisement.
Gunboat No. 2.....	870	4	6	12	Do.
Newark.....	4,000	12	6	18	Do.
Charleston.....	3,730	2	10	18	Do.
Baltimore.....	4,400	6	6	19	Do.
Armored cruiser.....	6,000	6	6	16	Not designed.
Armored battle-ship.....	6,000	6	6	16	Do.
Dynamite-gun ship.....				20	Do.
Torpedo-boat, first class.....					Do.

If war were to break out to-morrow not one of the above, the Dolphin excepted, would be able to fire a gun for months to come. Thirteen of the vessels are still in embryo, and if no greater haste is made to finish them than has been hitherto exercised the probability is that the fashions will so change before they are completed that they will be nearly useless for war purposes.

To your last question, "Is the present complement of officers and sailors sufficient for an increased navy?" I would reply that at the present rate of doing things it will be many years before the existing number of officers and men will be absorbed in ships afloat, because, if we should be so unfortunate as to get in the next ten years, as we have done in the past, only \$3,647,617, every ship now in the Navy to which we confidently trust the honor of our flag will have disappeared from the list through the decay which overtakes a wooden vessel after a certain number of years of active service. Eight years hence there will not be a single wooden vessel now in the Navy fit to go outside of Sandy Hook. This is a humiliating story to tell, but it is re-echoed pretty much by every chief of bureau in the Navy Department, and the sooner the truth is known all over the land the better it will be for the country.

I have given you a list of ships which I call the real Navy of the United States, but here again when we look closely at these vessels we find once more the weakness of this country. None of these vessels have guns with the exception of the Atlanta and Dolphin. The former has two 8-inch and six 6-inch breech-loading rifle guns, and the latter one 6-inch rifle and some machine guns. It will be from one to two months before the Atlanta will have her guns mounted. We are building at the Washington navy-yard new improved rifles equal in workmanship to any in the world, and the Bureau of Ordnance is hard at work on the batteries for the Chicago and Boston, which will make when finished eight 8-inch, nineteen 6-inch, and two 5-inch; in all, twenty-nine as the sum total of all the new high-powered guns contained in the United States Navy; and, to give you an idea of the paucity of resources of this favored land, most of the forgings for the tubes and jackets for these guns were furnished by manufacturers in England. Purchasing steel forgings abroad may be considered humiliating for Americans, but it is no more so than buying anything else there that can be furnished better than here or that we can not furnish at all.

Great Britain, Germany, and France have taken long strides ahead of us in gun-making, and it will require many years of hard work before we can hope to attain the same position they have; but we must "put our shoulders to the wheel" and go to work; take some of that large surplus in the Treasury and put it into steel foundries wherever you find persons able, willing, and competent to undertake gun-making.

It is not twenty, nor forty, nor a hundred guns that we require, but it is thousands of them, especially in a country whose motto seems to be "*festina lente*." England has such a start of us that she has to-day 7,000 rifled guns that she can bring into action in time of war, France has 6,000, and Russia about 5,000. Here you have at once three leading naval powers combined with 18,000 high-powered guns, while we can boast of but 29. We have some old 8-inch rifles, converted from 11-inch smooth-bores, by which a good smooth-bore was spoiled and a poor rifle was made.

You will naturally ask, what is to be done under these circumstances? First, we should not lose a week in starting to establish foundries all over the United States on the plans presented by boards created by Congress. Second, though I am sorry to be obliged to recommend it, we should go abroad and purchase guns of the best material from makers who will furnish them to us in the shortest space of time. We are not yet skilled in this branch of war workings, and we must go to those who are until we have built up our own works for fabricating guns of all kinds. I shall, for one, be very glad to see all this work done by our own artisans, for there is no greater advocate for giving all the work to be done for the naval and military establishments to the laboring class of this country. But when I see the United States helpless for the means of immediate defense, I must lay aside my sentimentality on this subject and take a common-sense view of the matter.

There should be at least six hundred of the heaviest high-powered guns purchased abroad at once for the use of the Army and Navy, so as to have armaments for our ships as soon as they are built, and to be able to defend the principal cities of the Union, which are liable to be attacked by any nation. It is not Great Britain, Russia, France, or Germany that we have to fear in our weakness so much as some of the small South American countries. Even Venezuela is about purchasing iron-clads in Europe, it is supposed to resist the mild demands made upon her by this Government for many years. She finds it cheaper to buy iron-clads than to pay a debt that does not altogether meet her ideas of justice.

We have, accessible to any sized cruiser, many large harbors with great cities on their shores with not a gun mounted to defend them. As we can not supply ourselves fast enough, let us invoke the aid of Armstrong, Krupp, Whitworth, and Schneider to put us once more on our feet. Then we will, I think, by that time be able to walk alone, but there is no way out of the present difficulty other than the one I propose. The system of making guns by dribblets will never amount to anything. To provide the country with heavy ordnance in the way we propose to go to work is very much like trying to blow a passage through the Rocky Mountains by means of pistol cartridges.

You will see from what I have said that our position is not an enviable one, but that we have it within our own reach to put ourselves on a proper footing in a very short time.

Let us now take a look at the important possessions of the United States on the Pacific coast, California, Oregon, and Washington Territory. In the great State first named a large city, the commercial center of the vast agricultural and mining interest, lies at the mercy of a single frigate. All the harbors on the coast of Oregon could be closed by two or three gun-boats. That beautiful inland sea in Washington Territory, Puget Sound, where are already laid the foundations of a mighty empire, is left entirely unprotected and liable to fall into the hands of any one of the great powers that chooses to take possession.

The fortifications possessed by the United States on Puget Sound are unworthy of the name of forts. Across the straits of Juan de Fuca the English have a navy-yard at Esquimaux, a short distance west of the city of Victoria. Prominent engineer officers of the British army have very recently thoroughly surveyed Esquimaux and Victoria with a view of adding to their already strong defenses. Hardly was the ink dry on the paper which announced this survey than we read of an immense quantity of heavy rifle guns and ordnance stores of all kinds on their way, via the Canadian Pacific Railway, to arm the projected forts.

Mark the difference between Great Britain's action and that of the United States, and see how the former stretches her hand out over her possessions, makes the land flourish wherever she owns an acre, extends her protecting arm over every citizen under her flag, and, even in the most obscure places, builds forts that can defy force, and maintains a squadron able to defend her citizens.

We, sitting here quietly, hardly realize that such a magnificent channel of trade as Puget Sound exists or that we have any rights there, while the Canadian Pacific Railway is now completed, and it is said that arrangements are perfected by which freight and passengers can be promptly transferred by rail and steamships from London, via Montreal, to Victoria, and thence by steamer to Yokohama and Hong Kong. There is enterprise for you, well calculated to throw the boasted enterprise of Americans into the shade. The nations of the earth are looking for the shortest route to and from China. The nation that can retain possession of the Eastern trade will be the richest on earth.

But all these advantages can only be had and maintained by keeping up a strong naval force. Some people talk about a small but efficient navy. How can

you expect the navy to be efficient when it is small? Its efficiency depends not only on the excellence of its ships and their equipment, but also on their number. We do not need a large army; we want a small but efficient army, as on every company of such an army we can ingraft half a dozen regiments, so that in a month we can raise six millions of men. But you can do nothing for the navy in a month, nor in a year, nor in two years. You must therefore begin and build ahead to supply naval demands, and, as I have said before, the best thing for Congress to do is to appropriate for a general increase yearly, and leave it to the Navy Department to build the ships according to the requirements of the Navy at the time, and to bother itself no more about it except to hold the Department and its assistants to a strict accountability and see that their work is better done, if possible, than is the case elsewhere.

I do not think I can say much more on this subject or advocate the claims of the Navy in warmer terms than I have. It would require a large book to hold all that could be said on the subject. I will therefore simply content myself by referring you to the able report of the board on fortifications or other defense, and its appendices, and by giving you a few lines of lately written history, which seem to be applicable to the present case:

"It is no compliment to the intelligence of sixty millions of people to have it said that the United States has not one ironclad to defend her coast; not a perfectly equipped cruiser of steel to carry her flag on the ocean; not a single gun in her coast defenses that would pierce the shield of a foreign ironclad, and not a fortification that could resist the attack of two or three of the same. We may be said to be a great nation of people, but certainly not a nation of great people; for, who will call us the latter when there seems to be such a love of accumulating wealth without the manly desire to have the means of defending it against the aggressions of any power that may choose to make war upon us? The Government of the United States can not defend itself against the weakest naval power, much less against a strong one, and we must, perforce, rely on that old system, so much in vogue in Thomas Jefferson's time, of paying tribute, as we did to the Barbary Powers, to prevent them from preying on our commerce and carrying our citizens into captivity.

"We had experience enough during our civil war to satisfy us that there were certain European governments that desired the downfall of the American Union, and it was only by means of an abject compliance with their demands that we escaped war, which would have been the signal of the complete triumph of the South and the dissolution of the Union which our forefathers exercised so much wisdom in creating. What a noble sight it would have been, after the settlement of our difficulties at home, to see the American people set to work and construct a navy that would bid defiance to any naval power in the world—to rebuild the commerce that had been driven from the sea by the Alabamas and Floridas, and which was once the pride and wealth of the nation—to give an exhibition of our wealth and resources and our indomitable will that no nation should oppose us or interfere with our domestic affairs. But, instead of this, we stood still while other nations worked on and, taking advantage of our lethargy, robbed us of our commerce, took the carrying trade all in their hands, and now laugh at our ineffectual efforts to build up a navy, which, if it ever reaches a reputable standard, will show that we are so deficient in the elementary science of naval construction that we cannot keep pace even with the modern examples that have been set us by European powers.

"We can be no more exempt from war than others. Indeed, our weak condition is so well understood by all the world that it only invites aggression; and if we would not desire to rest under the imputation of being the poorest Government under the sun, and unfit to take care of the interests of sixty millions of people, we must shortly awake from an apathy that would disgrace any country and begin to provide for the national defense.

"In the civil war the people on both sides exhibited the greatest examples of courage, resource, and perseverance, showing what we could do were our shores to be invaded, for which, no doubt, in the opinion of the world, we have gained that reputation which generally follows heroic deeds; but all that credit would disappear to-morrow if we were involved in a foreign war. Our coasts would be devastated, our harbors blockaded, and we would be again obliged to pay tribute as we did to the Barbary Powers of old.

"Taking into consideration the situation of the United States at the present time, it looks as if the civil war had taught us nothing, and that we are giving wild theorists of the past and present some show of reason to assert that republican forms of government are unnecessarily expensive, revolutionary, and deficient in the elements for the maintenance of a proper protection from an outside enemy or intestine foe. A Government which maintains no army or navy for the preservation of order and law simply runs an even race with anarchy and rebellion. This is true of us in a tenfold degree, for we give our enemies in all quarters the opportunity of getting their forces first in the field. It applies more particularly to the Navy of the United States, which never seems to attract the attention of those who have charge of the national defense.

"The people of the United States can readily dispose of their anarchists on the land and provide against all their revolutionary ideas by the bullet or bayonet when they become tired of listening to these wild theorists who would upset, if they could, any Government, no matter how desirable; but they are helpless when it comes to defending themselves against the attacks of heavy ironclads, which can only be met by great vessels of war designed for the purpose, which we do not possess, and which there seems little prospect of our obtaining.

"There is but one remedy for the evils under which we are resting, and that is for the people to take the matter in hand and demand a navy that will help put down rebellion at home at its first inception and bid defiance to those abroad who would commit aggressions upon our commerce or treat our citizens unjustly in any part of the world.

"Let us not forget that something akin to the Barbary Powers still exists, though in the garb of Christian civilization, and that they were not as limited in numbers as they were in 1804. They may have the strongest treaties binding them to us in terms of amity, but they are ever ready, like the Algerines of old, to take advantage of our weakness."

I neglected, in the proper place, to invite your attention to the report of the gun foundry board. You will find much therein that is of interest regarding the subject you have undertaken to investigate. I shall be repaid for this long letter if I have in any way aided in creating an interest in the Navy of the United States, which is the only defense this country can have in the event of foreign war.

Very respectfully, yours,

DAVID D. PORTER,
Admiral U. S. Navy.

Hon. FRANK LAWLER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PORTAGE LAKE AND RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with map and accompanying papers, a report by the Board of Engineers upon the expediency of the acquisition by the Government of the Portage Lake and River Improvement Company Canal, and the Lake Superior Ship-Canal, Railway and Iron Company Canal, in the State of Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP-CANAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with accompanying maps and papers, a report by the Board of Engineers upon the expediency and desirability of the acquisition by the Government of the Bay and Lake Michigan Ship-Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF THE DALLES, COLUMBIA RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers relative to the proposed survey of the Dalles, Columbia River; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

RETIRED-LIST FOR PRIVATES AND NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a petition of certain enlisted men, asking that the act authorizing a retired-list for privates and non-commissioned officers be amended so as to reduce the period of service to twenty-five years; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

THIRD-CLASS POST-OFFICES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3128) concerning post-offices of the third class; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BENNETT, for one day, on account of sickness.
To Mr. ATKINSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave to withdraw papers from the files of the House, without leaving copies, was granted in the following cases:
To Mr. DORSEY, in the case of George Reynolds.
To Mr. WHITE, of Minnesota, in the case of William R. Tubbs.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE CONFEREES.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following conference committees on the part of the House, on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bills indicated:

Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOYLE, and Mr. PAYNE on the bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested elections.

Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KLEINER, and Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana, on the bill (S. 542) for the relief of William Ervin.

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ELDRIDGE, and Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR, on the bill (H. R. 8869) granting a pension to Mrs. Henrietta M. Drum Hunt.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 1532) to regulate commerce;
A bill (S. 2220) granting a pension to James G. Mathes;
A bill (S. 2335) for the relief of the heirs of Malitty Rose;
A bill (S. 2369) to increase the pension of William H. H. Price;
A bill (S. 2721) to remove the political disabilities of John K. Mitchell;
A bill (S. 2848) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall, of the State of Virginia;
A bill (S. 1813) to amend the law relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; and
A bill (S. 229) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wilmington, N. C.

SEED DISTRIBUTION IN TEXAS.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 10203, and that it be now considered.

The bill (H. R. 10203), to enable the Commissioner of Agriculture to make a special distribution of seeds in the drought-stricken counties of Texas, and making an appropriation therefor, was read; and also the amendment of the committee to strike out the word "fifty," in the third line of section 2, and insert "ten," so as to make the appropriation \$10,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. COWLES. It is somewhat surprising to hear gentlemen, who argue on this floor that the educational bill is unconstitutional, make a request like this. I object, and call the regular order.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported a bill (H. R. 10912) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; which

was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to reserve all points of order on this bill.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that there are no points of order to be made on this bill.

RHODE ISLAND ELECTION CONTEST—PAGE VS. PIRCE.

Mr. TURNER. I call up the contested-election case of Page vs. Pirce, from the State of Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia, as a question of privilege, calls up for present consideration the report of the Committee on Elections upon the contested-election case of Page vs. Pirce, from the State of Rhode Island. The resolution reported by the majority of the committee will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That William A. Pirce was not elected a member of the House of Representatives from the second Congressional district of Rhode Island, and that the seat be declared vacant.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, by an understanding with the minority of the Committee on Elections, I desire to ask consent of the House that this debate shall be limited to four hours, two hours on each side, with the privilege to me of calling the previous question short of the two hours on our side if the time shall not be occupied on our part.

Mr. ROWELL. With the understanding that in addition to that the contestee may be heard, if he desires it?

Mr. TURNER. No; I insist that the understanding shall be that the debate go on not to exceed four hours, two hours to be allowed to each side, if they desire to occupy it.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection that order will be made.

Mr. ROWELL. I have suggested that in case the contestee desires to be heard he should have the privilege outside of the four hours.

Mr. TURNER. I can not agree to that.

Mr. SPOONER. I shall not object if an understanding can be reached that my colleague, the contestee, be entitled to speak in addition to the time allotted for general debate. That is customary at least by courtesy in all such cases in this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to reserve an objection until I can ask a question.

Mr. TURNER. I would be glad to accommodate myself to the suggestion made, but I think two hours is ample, this question having been discussed for some time during the last session of Congress. This, as gentlemen well know, is the short session, and I have arranged with other gentlemen competing for the floor, and have obtained their consent by the assurance that this debate should not extend beyond the four hours. Gentlemen can therefore readily see why I am unable to yield further time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Before agreeing to the request for unanimous consent I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether the committee have reported in favor of the sitting member?

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been read, and may be again reported, if there be no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution was again read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposes the minority desires to present a substitute.

Mr. ROWELL. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that will also be considered as pending.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia as to the limit of debate?

Mr. SPOONER. I object, unless the contestee is allowed, as has been always the case, at least since I have been a member of this House, the opportunity of speaking himself upon this question.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. Is he present?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TURNER. As no arrangement seems to be practicable, under the circumstances, in order to keep faith with gentlemen to whom I have pledged my word, I will have to pass away from the request for unanimous consent, and notify the House that I will endeavor to rely upon it to support me in the demand for the previous question at the proper time.

I now yield to the minority of the committee, reserving my time.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be much better for the members of the House if the majority of this committee would state their position and give some reasons on which they rely for unseating Mr. PIRCE. The minority are, of course, to combat the positions assumed by the majority; but without stating any position at all, it leaves the House in the dark.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is there a report in this case?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. It ought to be read.

Mr. SPRINGER. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], with reference to the position taken by the

committee in this report, it will be sufficient to say that I, on my part, intend to rely entirely upon the citations of evidence I have adduced in the report of the committee.

Mr. ROWELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as probably not half a dozen members of the House outside of the Committee on Elections have ever read the evidence in a case where they are to act both as court and jury, I think I have a right to ask that attention be given to the discussion of this evidence by those who have examined it. We are about to investigate the right of the sitting member from the second district of Rhode Island to retain his seat on this floor; to investigate the question of whether or not the second district of Rhode Island for the balance of the Forty-ninth Congress shall be represented at all.

It is certainly a right of as great moment as the right of a claimant to a few dollars of money in court; and this contestee, this sitting member, has a right to demand of this House that, in acting as court and jury upon his rights they shall act understandingly; that they shall not only act understandingly but that they shall have regard for the rules of law which govern the rights of every American citizen.

I know it is the custom of members of the House to rely upon the opinions of some one who may have investigated, and act upon his judgment; but in a case like this I ask an independent judgment of every member of the House, because I know of no more important question to be decided than the question of whether or not a gentleman holding a seat, or claiming a seat, in this representative body of the American people is there of right or is to be deprived of his seat without right; and I ask this the more because of a little history connected with this contest, to which I ask the attention of this House for a few moments.

I ask it because that history will show that much of the testimony has been taken not only without authority of law but absolutely in violation of well-recognized rules of evidence established for the furtherance of justice and as a protection against false swearing.

The contestant in this case filed his notice of contest upon the theory that the law of Rhode Island was of such character that the elections held under it, and in pursuance of that law, were not such valid elections as this House would recognize when considering the rights of contestee; that a ballot cast under that law for contestee should not be considered in the House of his friends, and that although the sitting member received 1,751 votes more than he did, and 16 votes more than all of the various men who were voted for, yet the more than 7,000 votes of the sitting member were to be ruled out, although these votes were upon ballots legal in that State. That formed the principal basis of his contest—that complaint against the statutes of Rhode Island providing for such elections. The law, and not the facts, was the subject for his attack.

I call attention to the further fact that after the board of canvassers had determined that the sitting member was duly elected, and his certificate was issued to him, and after the terms of members elected to the Forty-ninth Congress had commenced, this contestant became a candidate for and was elected a member of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, entered upon the duties of that office, an office which he could not legally hold while he was at the same time a member of the House of Representatives, and that he thereby gave notice to all the world that he abandoned that contest.

I call attention to the further fact that under that abandonment he neglected to take any steps towards perfecting his contest and bringing it before Congress under the law which Congress had enacted regulating that kind of contest; that he permitted all the time assigned him under that law to take testimony to lapse and all the time assigned to the contestee to take testimony before he proceeded in the case in any manner; that after all that time had expired he then served notice on the contestee that he would proceed to take testimony.

The contestee disregarded that notice as a law-abiding citizen, as he had a right to do, and as was his duty to do if Congress, with the same party in a majority that is now in the majority, had correctly laid down the precedents for our action. Consequently, all of the testimony originally presented to the Committee on Elections was *ex parte* testimony. It was testimony taken out of the presence of the contestee or of anybody acting for him. Witnesses were examined that were not cross-examined, that were not expected to be cross-examined; the cost of which cross-examination Congress could not award to contestee without disregarding its own law and its rule well established in a former contested-election case.

That testimony was offered before the committee. The committee had no power under the law to act under it and report a resolution upon the question of who was entitled to a seat. Nor did the committee assume any such authority. But they did report a resolution, which was passed by the majority of this House, granting the contestee the right to cross-examine the witnesses whose *ex parte* testimony was on file, and to examine witness on his own behalf, and to contestant to take testimony in rebuttal. Under that permission of this House the contestee proceeded to cross-examine the witnesses of the contestant—such of them as answered to his subpoena.

Numbers of them refused to answer to that subpoena, and the majority report in this case is based upon the testimony taken *ex parte* and without law, without cross-examination, where the witnesses de-