By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of organizations in San Francisco, Cal., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of California, favoring House bill 20035, to extend the time for making final proof in certain desert-land entries in Fresno and Kings Counties, Cal.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Dr. David Starr Jordan, of Stanford University, Cal., favoring selection of San Francisco as meeting place of the next Peace Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Council 1271, Knights of Columbus, of San Luis Obispo, Cal., relative to religious persecution in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring House joint resolution 344, for a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Peace Society of San Jose (Cal.) State Normal School, against increase in Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of California, against larger appropriations for armament in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions in favor of woman suffrage from Ednah B. Hale, Mrs. Harriet I. Roworth. E. Carol Hodge, M. E. Carpenter, Helen Bowen Janes, of Providence; C. Isabelle Lee, East Providence; Alex. S. Arnold, Woonsocket; Marie T. Cottrell and Mrs. Robert Herrick, of Newport, all in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Joanna Sophia Buffum, Mrs. A. F. Squire, May J. Keating, Hannah E. Bacheller, Rebecca Taylor Bosworth, Harriet F. Riggs, M. Anna Ford, Rachel Wallace Bertram, Elizabeth H. Swinburne, and Henry C. Bacheller, all of Newport, R. I., in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial of various organizations of the State of California, favoring passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of business men of the seventeenth Pennsylvania congressional district, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAPES: Petitions of citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., asking for the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, relative to export of arms and ammunition by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of the State of California, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, relative to right of States to grant suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of 150 citizens of Detroit, 150 of Thief River Falls, and 75 of Parkers Prairie, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 377, to prohibit exportation of war matériel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension to Mary C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Denver, Colo., favoring House joint resolution 377, prohibiting export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of American citizens of Cedar Lake, Ind., for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 750 American citizens of Chicago, Ill., for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. C. Dahms and 17 other American citizens of Walnut Grove, Minn., for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Clinton, Iowa, favoring embargo on all contrabands of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Cedar Lake, Ind., favoring Senate bill 6688, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 12, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek from Thee grace and strength for this new day. We pray that we may have proper regard for the sacred traditions of our country, the ways of our fathers, the wisdom that comes out of the experiences of the past. Give to us also that spirit of progress which will hear the call of the new day and grace that will fortify us for facing the ever-increasing responsibilities of life. As Thy Spirit has guided the leaders of this great people in the days gone by, so do Thou abide with us still, guiding us on the upward and onward path to ever-increasing prosperity and happiness because of ever-increasing righteousness and holiness among the people. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5168) for the relief of the King Theological Hall and authorizing the conveyance of real estate to the Howard University and other grantees, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1710. An act to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions;

H. R. 7771. An act to regulate plastering in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 13226. An act prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 15215. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adjust and settle the shortages in certain accounts of said District, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16759. An act to require owners and lessees of amusement parks to furnish drinking water to patrons free of cost, etc.; and

H. R. 19552. An act providing for annual assessments of real estate in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 13815. An act to increase the limit of cost for the construction of a public building at Marlin, Tex.; and

S. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to provide for the detail of an officer of the Army for duty with the Panama-California Exposition, San Diego, Cal.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tucson, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Topeka, Sylvan Grove, Haven, Friend, Ellinwood, and Belvue, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Helen C. Bascom, secretary of the Suffrage League of Wimbledon, N. Dak. It is very short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIMBLEDON, N. DAK., *January 9, 1915.*

Senator GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.:

May this letter convey to you the earnest wish of our women and majority of our Wimbledon voters for the success of the suffrage amendment. We feel sure you will give your vote, and trust you will use your utmost influence for the adoption of this measure.

HELEN G. BASCOM,
Secretary Suffrage League.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Laporte, Monroeville, Fort Wayne, and Goshen, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the outrages committed in Mexico upon members and institutions of the Catholic Church, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of 21 citizens of Weeks Mills, Me., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented resolutions adopted by the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Malden, Mass., favoring universal peace, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Lawrence, Mass., favoring the adoption of 1-cent letter postage, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

LANDS IN NEW MEXICO.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12050) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 902) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 7252) granting a pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7253) granting a pension to Sarah A. Eddy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7254) granting an increase of pension to William R. Minert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 7255) to provide a harbor boat for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to replace the *Hartley*, at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GRONNA (for Mr. McCUMBER):

A bill (S. 7256) granting an increase of pension to Halvor Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 7257) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kelley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 7258) granting a pension to Mary Battle; and

A bill (S. 7259) granting an increase of pension to John Wiebel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7260) granting an increase of pension to Allen C. Goodwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7261) to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7262) granting a pension to Ulysses S. Baird (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment providing that from and after the 1st day of November, 1916, it shall be unlawful to manufacture, barter, sell, or give away any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other alcoholic liquors of any kind within the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $4,600 for the maintenance of an assay office at Boise, Idaho, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500,000 for continuing the construction of irrigation systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1710. An act to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions;

H. R. 7771. An act to regulate plastering in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 13226. An act prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 15215. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adjust and settle the shortages in certain accounts of said District, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16759. An act to require owners and lessees of amusement parks to furnish drinking water to patrons free of cost, etc.; and

H. R. 19552. An act providing for annual assessments of real estate in the District of Columbia.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to call up the motion I made yesterday to suspend the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the notice.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] yesterday gave notice that, in accordance with Rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, he would move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI for the purpose of moving an amendment to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he expects to refer the proposed amendment of the rules to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I mean to make the motion that it be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Without a reference to the committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. The rules do not require any reference. I ask that the motion be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to raise the point of order that the rule can not be modified in this way; that the proposed modification ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules and reported from the Committee on Rules.

I wish to say, as to this particular amendment, I should like to see it added to the bill, and, as I understand it, I expect to vote for it; but I do not think the rule contemplated that the rules themselves should be suspended or modified in this informal manner simply by giving notice one day and passing a resolution the next day, without reference to a committee. If so, our rules become at once very lacking in stability and will, it seems to me, be subject to change almost at the whim of the Senate.

I have been here only a little over three years, and during that period I am sure no rule has been suspended in this way.

I make the point of order that the notice should go to the Committee on Rules for report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Chair will permit me, I shall say to the Senator from Georgia that this is the only sure way we have of securing consideration for the prohibition amendment. I am proceeding regularly under a rule that was adopted in order to give the Senate the right to attach legislation that it deemed proper and advisable to bills of this character.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yielded to the Senator from Texas and I wish to answer him now. I do not find a precedent, though there may be a precedent, for the course he seeks to have adopted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand there never has been a rule suspended in the Senate. At least it has not been done since I have been a Member.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have a precedent before me. On March 2, 1861, a rule was suspended in just this way. A motion to suspend the rules was held in order after proper notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule. Under Rule XL the Chair is of the opinion that the Senate has the unqualified power in accordance with this notice to suspend the rule if it chooses to do so. If it does not choose to do so, the proper procedure is to move to refer the notice to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I move that a reference be had to the Committee on Rules, and I do it because I am opposed to this mode of suspending the rules. I think it is dangerous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is in order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia to refer the notice of the proposed amendment of the rule to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. I observe that he is absent, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. MCCUMBER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent from the city. He is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is paired on all votes with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. ROOT (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted, but may I ask if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. ROOT. Then I withdraw my vote on account of my pair with that Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with that Senator, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] is absent, on account of illness, and that he is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] heretofore announced to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is absent from the Senate on account of illness and is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I learn that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], if present, would vote on the same side of this question with myself. So I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] and his pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is detained at home on account of sickness.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bankhead	James	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Johnson	Perkins	Smith, Md.
Burton	Kern	Pittman	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pomerene	Stephenson
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Stone
Cummins	Lodge	Reed	Thornton
Dillingham	McLean	Robinson	Tillman
Goff	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	
Hardwick	Nelson	Shively	
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Simmons	

NAYS—34.

Ashurst	Crawford	Norris	Thompson
Borah	Gallinger	Oliver	Townsend
Brady	Gore	Page	Vardaman
Bristow	Gronna	Poindexter	Walsh
Burleigh	Hollis	Shafroth	Weeks
Chamberlain	Jones	Sheppard	White
Chilton	Kenyon	Sherman	Works
Clapp	Lane	Sterling	
Colt	Myers	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—25.

Brandegee	Hughes	Owen	Sutherland
Camden	Lea, Tenn.	Penrose	Thomas
Catron	Lewis	Root	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Shields	Williams
du Pont	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	
Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	
Fletcher	Newlands	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice of the proposed amendment to the rules is referred to the Committee on Rules and will be printed.

IMPORT DUTIES COLLECTED AT VERA CRUZ.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution (S. Res. 514), submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 8th instant, requesting the President to furnish the Senate with certain information relative to money collected by the United States at Vera Cruz during the occupation of that city by the military forces of the United States.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution just stated go over until to-morrow morning on the same condition on which it went over yesterday until to-day, retaining its place without change. To-morrow morning, so far as I am concerned at least, I shall be entirely willing to have the resolution disposed of.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution going over until to-morrow; but, in so far as I am concerned, I shall endeavor to get a vote on it to-morrow morning. I understand that is all the Senator from Missouri asks?

Mr. STONE. So far as I am concerned, I shall not ask to have the resolution go over beyond to-morrow. I have so stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over until to-morrow morning.

NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Friday next, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, with the permission of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the preparation of the national defense with relation to the joint resolution which I have introduced.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6060, being the immigration bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the unfinished business——

Mr. ROBINSON. I make the point of order that the motion is not subject to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not subject to debate. The question is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the immigration bill?

Mr. REED. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

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

Mr. REED. What is the regular unfinished business of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. REED. If the conference report on the bill referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is now taken up, does that not displace the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not. The unfinished business comes up at 2 o'clock. The question is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the immigration bill?

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. REED. I desire to inquire of the Senator who has the report in charge to what print of the bill the conference report refers?

Mr. ROBINSON. My information is that it refers to the official print.

Mr. REED. I have endeavored to locate the various amendments which have been agreed to, disagreed to, or changed. I sent for a copy of the bill showing the amendments printed and numbered, but I am unable by comparing the report of the committee of conference with that print to locate the changes or to ascertain where some of them come in the bill. I am inclined to the opinion that there have been either a number of mistakes made in the printing of the report or else that the report refers to some other print. If the Senator from Arkansas has before him the print of January 4, showing the amendments numbered, I desire to call his attention more in detail to what I have already stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will inquire of the Senator from Missouri to what particular amendment he refers?

Mr. REED. I refer to a number of amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will indicate the amendment to which he refers, I shall endeavor to elucidate the matter.

Mr. REED. Well, I call the Senator's attention to page 1 of the conference report, to the language which is contained in the fourth paragraph from the bottom, which is as follows:

In lines 3 and 4 of the matter inserted by the Senate, strike out "and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile."

That reference does not harmonize with the copy of the bill printed with the amendments numbered, and there is nothing to indicate that it refers to amendment numbered 23.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will read the paragraph just preceding and part of the same matter, he will find that it refers to amendment numbered 23 and is part of that amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will read the part I am referring to and some of the context:

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and in lieu thereof insert the following: "practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "treaties, conventions, or."

In lines 3 and 4 of the matter inserted by the Senate strike out "and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile."

Mr. President, I can not tell to what that refers.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the conference report refers to the amendments by number.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. When a bill goes into conference, of course, the amendments of the Senate are all numbered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I can locate the matter referred to in the first paragraph. Then follows this language:

Strike out the matter——

Mr. LODGE. To which one is the Senator referring?

Mr. REED. I will begin again, if the Senator will permit me, and call his attention to the second paragraph of the matter following the words "Amendment numbered 11":

Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and in lieu thereof insert the following: "practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy"; and the Senate agree to the same.

I can locate that; but take what follows:

Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "treaties, conventions, or".

Mr. BRYAN. But the Senator omits a whole paragraph. The last quotation is under amendment numbered 17.

Mr. LODGE. Amendment numbered 17 is another amendment.

Mr. REED. I am following the print.

Mr. LODGE. I think not. The language the Senator has read refers to amendment numbered 17.

Mr. REED. There is nothing about amendment numbered 17 in my copy.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order; we are utterly unable to hear what is going on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. Yes; but I wish to say to the Senator now, because I think it may clear this matter up, that I have here a print of the conference report, and my attention has just been called by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], who undertook to correct me, to his print, and I find his print is entirely different from mine.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I think the matter can be explained. The House of Representatives ordered the conference report printed on the 9th of January, 1915. It was found that there were a great many type errors in that print, among others, the omission of amendment numbered 17, so that it looked, according to the print, as if all the amendments to which the Senator has referred came under amendment numbered 11. Owing to those errors in the printing, there was a reprint ordered on January 11, 1915.

Mr. REED. Was that ordered by the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am referring to the House print.

Mr. REED. The report was expressly ordered printed by the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to a question of order. I am interested in this conference report, but can not understand what is going on on account of the confusion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is in no worse condition than the Chair and the rest of the Senate, but it is impossible for the presiding officer to compel Senators to take their seats.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the conference report was reported to the House on yesterday a request was made and granted that it should be printed.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the conferees agreed on Saturday; the House members asked for a print of the conference report on that day, the 9th, but when the print was made it was found to be erroneous, with some omissions and type errors in it, which the Senator has pointed out in reading from it. Therefore a reprint was ordered on Monday.

Mr. ROBINSON. And the correct print, as I am informed, is on the desk of every Senator.

Mr. LODGE. It is. We have also—I did not know that before—a Senate print, which is on every desk and which is correct, like the second House print. The second House print and the Senate print are correct. The error arose from the Senator having the first House print, which was incorrect.

Mr. REED. I think that probably is an exact statement of the facts. I sent over to the Senate this morning early for the conference report print, and I was furnished with a document purporting to be the conference report. I spent something like an hour and a half in trying to trace out the various amendments, and found it impossible; so, Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to give these amendments a real examination.

Mr. LODGE. The first House print was so confused that nobody could make out what it meant. It left out some of the most important words.

Mr. REED. I think, under the circumstances, the report ought to go over in order to give the Senate a chance to examine it. That was the whole purpose of having it lie over until to-day. I do not know whether other Senators were misled by the erroneous print or the blundering print or whatever we want to call it, but I certainly was misled by it, and I do not know at this moment what the changes are, although I have pursued the matter with all reasonable industry and care. I do not want to have to vote on this conference report without knowing what has been done by the conferees. The report itself is, of course, utterly meaningless for the most part, except as it is compared with the bill; and as the print which I received and which was an official document would not compare with the bill I was completely in the dark, and I am yet.

Now, we are asked to vote upon this conference report as a whole. Until there is an opportunity given to investigate it it ought not to be pressed on the attention of the Senate, and I hope it will be allowed to go over until to-morrow, so that it may be examined.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the conference report and the statement were printed and appear in the RECORD this morning. It seems to me that that afforded a reasonable opportunity for Senators who were interested in the subject to familiarize themselves with the effect of the report. I do not think the matter should be further delayed. It is true that the conference report must be voted upon as a whole; but it is also true that the statement, which has been printed and which is short, clearly shows the effect of the conference agreement as to the important amendments in the bill.

I therefore insist that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator from Missouri desires, I will submit a brief explanation of the conference report.

Mr. REED. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senate included in the bill, among others, two important amendments, namely, the amendment excluding persons of African descent and the so-called Belgian amendment. Prior to the appointment of the conferees the body at the other end of the Capitol considered these two amendments, and by overwhelming votes refused to concur in them. The votes were so overwhelming as to make it clear to the conferees that it would be impossible to reach an agreement retaining these two amendments in the bill, and therefore in the agreement the Senate conferees receded from them.

These are perhaps the most important Senate amendments which were not agreed to in conference.

The important or principal changes in the law as it exists which the conference carries into effect are as follows:

First, the increase of the head tax to $6 on adult aliens and the exemption of all minor aliens from any head tax whatever. The effect of that, in all probability, would not greatly increase or diminish the receipts of the Government from the head tax.

The next important change in existing law which the conference agreement carries into effect by virtue of the amendment adopted relates to amendment No. 24, striking out the House provision prohibiting the exclusion of the wives or minor children of American citizens under any circumstances whatever.

The third substitutes a new section 11, submitted by the Secretary of Labor, to take the place of the House provision relative to examination on board ships engaged in the transportation of aliens. That amendment of the Senate was concurred in; and the discussion in the Senate on the bill disclosed the reasons and the imperative necessity, as I take it, for the adoption of that amendment—the fact that it would be inoperative by reason of the circumstance that the inspectors and medical supervisors could not enter upon the foreign vessels in foreign ports for the purpose of making the inspection referred to.

The fourth important amendment of existing law is that which denies to alien prostitutes the privilege of obtaining United States citizenship through marriage. That amendment was also, as I remember, fully discussed in the Senate, and its purposes and provisions are, I take it, well understood. That is retained in the bill.

The fifth amendment of importance which was agreed to requires transportation companies carrying immigrants from Mexico or Canada to the United States to provide suitable landing places.

The amendment relating to polygamy was modified in the conference so that, as it goes into the bill, it will operate as an exclusion of those who practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy.

There are a large number of amendments which have been concurred in, and some of them were modified in the conference, relating mainly, and some of them exclusively, to the administrative features of the bill; the necessity of these modifications—I am speaking of them now as a whole—being disclosed by statements and representations made by persons in the department charged with the enforcement of the law.

I think I have spoken briefly of the most material changes in existing law which the conference report, if agreed to, will carry into effect. I do not know that I desire at this time to state anything further concerning the subject.

Mr. REED. What is the number of the Belgian amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON. The Belgian amendment is a part of amendment numbered 24. I will state, in explanation of that fact, that when this amendment was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts and agreed to by the Senate it probably should have been given a new and separate number, but by an inadvertence on the part of the Public Printer this was not done. It was numbered as a part of amendment 24, and appears in the bill as new matter inserted by the Senate after striking out the House matter, which elimination was numbered amendment 24.

Mr. REED. In what shape is that amendment now left?

Mr. ROBINSON. The entire language under 24 goes out of the bill under the conference agreement.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill, if he feels at liberty to state, whether that amendment went out of the bill upon the theory that it was a discrimination between different nations, or whether it went out on the theory that it was not desirable to furnish any relief to the victims of the present European war who might be obliged to seek habitation elsewhere in order either to escape the rigors of the war or to secure a livelihood? On which theory was it stricken out?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, of course I would not and I can not undertake to express what was in the minds of individual conferees; but one of the controlling considerations, I take it, influencing the conferees in the agreement as to this amendment was the fact that the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote had declined to concur in the amendment, making it apparently impossible to secure the adoption of the amendment if it should be pursued.

I think I might with propriety say that if the mind of each individual member of the conference had been searched there might have been found some difference as to whether or not the first consideration mentioned by the Senator from Missouri—namely, the question of complaints as to discrimination—was an influential factor in that regard.

Mr. REED. I should like to inquire, as a parliamentary proposition, if a bill passes the House and comes to the Senate, and is there amended, and is sent back to the House, and the House votes upon the Senate amendments, whether the bill does not then automatically come back to the Senate?

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator from Missouri address that inquiry to me, or to the Chair?

Mr. REED. I am addressing it to the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not know whether I stated that my understanding is that when the House asked for a conference and the Senate agreed to same the papers are with the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the House having disagreed to the Senate amendments and a conference having been requested the question goes to the conferees.

Mr. ROBINSON. The rule provides, Mr. President, that the House agreeing to the conference shall make the first report, and it follows from that that the Senate has possession of the papers.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we agreed to the conference; but on the matter of the conference the bill comes before the House with the Senate amendments. The House, of course, as a body has a right to deal with all the amendments and agree to them all en bloc; it has a right to disagree to them all en bloc, which is the usual custom on appropriation bills, or it may agree to some and disagree to others.

In this case the House agreed specifically to two or three of the Senate amendments by vote. Of course, the moment they concurred in the Senate amendments that took those amendments out of conference. Where they disagreed it made no difference whether they disagreed to them en bloc or whether they disagreed to one or two specifically and to the rest en bloc, which was what they did. They voted, on certain amendments, to disagree; and they voted on those particular amendments to disagree because that was in the nature of instructions to their conferees, which they had a perfect right, of course, to give. Their instructions to the conferees were, by vote of 275 to 72, not to agree to the amendment excluding from this country persons of African race. By an overwhelming vote, on which there was no division, they voted not to agree to the Belgian amendment. I am not sure that there may not have been one or two others where they took special votes. Then they voted to disagree to all of the remaining amendments en bloc, and there was nothing unusual in the procedure. The fact that one amendment was selected to be disagreed to was merely in the nature of an instruction, which they had a perfect right to give.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether or not the House itself adopted any amendments to the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; the bill was not amendable. The bill at that stage could not be amended. They adopted no amendments whatever to the bill. They simply exercised their right of concurring or not concurring. Of course, the vote to concur comes first, because the main object is bringing the minds of the two Houses together, and where they moved to concur,

as they did, on the "constitutional psychopathic inferiority," the House agreed to that amendment, and of course where they agreed to an amendment it was out of conference. It was settled. Then they passed on and disagreed to one or two amendments in which they took particular interest, and then disagreed to all the rest en bloc and sent the matter to conference.

I may say that owing to the rule of the House the conferees—as I think they always are, but in this case especially—were most minutely careful that nothing that could possibly be considered new matter should go into the bill or into any amendment. The House rule is very strict. The point of order that there is new matter in a conference report at once sends it back to the conferees without any vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall desire to put into the RECORD a few observations of my own, and a few expressions of opinion by others, touching the wisdom of striking out the amendment permitting Belgians to come to the United States regardless of the literacy test. Before I do that, however, and merely in passing, I wish to take exception to the reason assigned for striking out the House language of section 11, which provides that the immigration authorities may place inspectors on board vessels coming to this country, and ascertain in that way the character of the people who are coming and also the kind of treatment they receive from the management of the vessels, together with any other facts that may be of interest.

The reason assigned for striking out the House language and for the submission by the conferees of the Senate substitute is that we have no authority to place our agents upon these vessels. Mr. President, that matter was completely thrashed out in the debate, and the chairman of the committee finally admitted that while the owner of a foreign vessel could exclude from that vessel our agents if he saw fit, at the same time this Government could prohibit the landing of any vessel which refused to conform to our immigration regulations. We have as great a right to place our agents on board vessels to inspect an immigrant who is crossing the ocean as we have to place agents in foreign ports to inspect an immigrant who is about to cross the ocean. We have a greater right, because the vessel in making its voyage is obliged to land in our port, whereas we have no such control over foreign harbors.

It would be much franker and much more commendable if the committee would simply say that we have receded because certain foreign nations, undoubtedly instigated by certain foreign shipowners, have seen fit to protest against the exercise on the part of this Government of a power which it clearly possesses. I wished to say just that much in regard to section 11.

Mr. President, I now challenge attention to the gravity of the action that we are now asked to take with reference to amendment numbered 24, which provides:

> That the provisions of this act relating to the illiteracy test or induced or assisted immigration shall not apply to agricultural immigrants from Belgium who come to the United States during the course of the present European war, or within one year after its termination owing to circumstances or conditions arising from the war, if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner General of Immigration that said Belgian immigrants come with intent to engage in the work of agriculture in the United States and become American citizens.

During the debate on the bill objection was made to singling out the Belgians, the point urged being that by granting this special favor to Belgium we were discriminating against the people of other countries and running counter to the "most-favored-nation clause" of various treaties. It was determined here in the Senate that such conflict did not exist, and that we could pass this amendment at our pleasure. The Senate did adopt the amendment after full debate. It is now brushed aside in the conference.

Speaking for myself and voicing the sentiments of some others, I would have preferred this amendment to have been broadened so that those who shall come from European countries under similar circumstances—that those who may be driven here by the hardships of war—might also have been included. But there did seem to be a special reason for favoring the Belgians, not a reason found in the legal status, perhaps, but in the actual conditions. These brave, enlightened, patriotic people find their country completely within the iron grip of the armies of a foreign enemy.

The papers of Washington only last night and, I think, this morning state to us that there are some five million people in Belgium absolutely destitute and dependent for sustenance upon the benefactions of the world, and especially of the American Commonwealth. We read that over $15,000,000 in either money or goods has been gathered by charitable hands in this country and sent across the ocean to feed these starving and desperate people. To my mind, as a practical question, it is much better to place these dependents in a position where they can earn their own living and reestablish homes for themselves than it is to continue them as objects of bounty and charity while compelling them to live in a land where the hardships of war have destroyed their means of livelihood.

To my mind, as a matter of plain common sense, it is better to bring these people here, open our doors, make them welcome, than it is to send alms thousands of miles to feed the hungry millions who for a long time must remain nonproductive and dependent. I therefore am inclined to the opinion that the Senate ought to insist upon this amendment. The voice of humanity calls to us; the cry of distress is heard across the sea.

The committee, by this report, has said to the Senate and to the world: "We prefer an African who can read to a Belgian who can not read. We prefer to bring into our country to make a part of its citizenry an African or West Indian negro who can read the mystic 40 words printed upon a card by an immigration official to a Belgian who can trace his ancestry back through the centuries to that heroic band who died in defense of their land when it was invaded by the legions of Rome." You welcome the West Indian or African negro who can read 40 words; you drive from our shores the Belgian woman who can not read, although her husband lies stark upon the field while her children cry for bread. I do not like the parallel. Men of the South can not like the parallel.

Are you so anxious to intensify the race problem? Do you by encouraging an influx of negroes do the members of that race who were born here a great unkindness?

The conference committee have also agreed to strike out the Senate amendment relating to the victims of religious intolerance. As the House passed the bill it provided an exemption from the literacy test for those who come here solely to escape religious persecution. The Senate struck out the word "solely." In brief, the principal reason was that it can scarcely ever be said an immigrant, however much he may have suffered for conscience's sake, comes to our land because of that single cause. That will constitute his principal motive, but there is also the desire, the hope, the glorious dream of prosperity, happiness, and liberty. Such a man does not come from a sole motive. Because he has dared to dream of liberty he must be sent back to his tormentors.

Mr. President, the spirit of this bill, in its narrow selfishness, is that of the man who having directly or through his ancestors escaped from the hardships, cruelties, and tyrannies of other lands, now stands upon this liberty-lighted shore and pushes back into the hopeless night of despotism those who are now seeking to escape.

Will this bill admit a single Jew? Under a strict construction not one of them will be exempted from the literacy test. The Jew within the pale, straining his eager eyes toward this land, has two causes for immigration; one is to escape the intolerable persecution he has suffered on account of his race and religion, the other an infinite longing to stand upon free soil and as a free man to live to make for his family a home where love and peace shall abide. Under this bill that man, if he was denied the opportunity to learn to read, must be excluded, because his motive in coming here is not solely and only for the purpose of escaping religious persecution. Because he loves liberty he must be returned to slavery.

That word "solely" was placed in this bill for the purpose of emasculating the exemptions. Our traditional policy has been to grant sanctuary to all seeking refuge from political or religious persecution. We now propose to absolutely exclude the refugee from political tyranny and to exclude those seeking to escape religious persecution if they come to our shores because they also love our free institutions.

I have been told—I do not claim that what I have learned is binding upon anyone—that the reason to some extent urged—I do not say in the committee of conference—for striking out the clause that prohibited Africans from coming to this country was because if that provision were left in the bill a two-thirds vote could not be obtained to override a veto of the President.

I do not know what the President will do with this bill; I hold no warrant to speak for him. I undertake to say that the President of the United States will approach this great question with that intelligence, patriotism, and breadth of view which has hitherto characterized his public acts, and that his determination will be upon the merits. I think but little of an effort to arrange a bill in advance so that it can accumulate enough votes to force it over a veto which somebody imagines, I presume wholly without any authority or reason, may fall under presidential disapproval. I want to see that amendment put back into the bill.

Since I have referred to the President's position, let me add a quotation from his pen, not that it necessarily foreshadows

the action he may take on this bill, but because the words themselves ought even at this eleventh hour to appeal to some Members of the Senate, especially to those who have been preaching the doctrine that whatever the administration wants it is our duty to grant. More particularly should it arrest the attention of those who have lustily cried "treason" each time certain of us have ventured to differ from the President.

Mr. President, I read a letter written by Mr. Wilson less than 90 days before he was elected President of the United States. It is addressed to Representative SABATH, and was by him, I presume with the consent of its author, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1912:

SEAGIRT, N. J., *August 20.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: It is very gratifying to me that after our conversation on the subject you should have felt so assured of my friendship for our large foreign-born population as to lead you to advise them that my election to the Presidency would be best for them as well as for all other citizens who are looking to rescue this Government from privilege and open wide the doors of opportunity in America alike to the worthy immigrants who come here to find larger liberty and to those who were born in America. The Democratic Party could not without forgetting its very origin advocate an illiberal policy in the matter of immigration. The party may almost be said to have originated in opposition to the alien and sedition laws by which the Federalist Party sought to all but shut the doors against naturalization and at the same time silence the criticism of our people against their Government. America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity.

Let me read that again:

America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity.

Let me paraphrase it: America will now grudgingly open her gates to those who are able to pass a certain educational test, and not otherwise. I read on:

And she will never seek another course under the guidance of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I am addressing myself to the conscience of the American people, that sooner or later will lift the veil and behold the ugly visage of proscription and race hate that is back of this legislation. I repeat to the country this language:

America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity, and she will never seek another course under the guidance of the Democratic Party.

That was said before the election to a distinguished Member of Congress, and I think, though I can not say with certainty, that the letter was given publication by the permission of Woodrow Wilson, then our candidate and now the distinguished occupant of the greatest official position of earth. I continue reading:

I am in hearty accord with the ancient faith and practice of the party that has honored me by nominating me for President. There must be regulation of immigration. Criminals must not be admitted. Those who are diseased or defective must be excluded in order to safeguard the physical integrity of our people. Neither can we receive those who are unable to support themselves. And we should see to it that those who come are not unfitted to enter into the life of the country. The necessary limits have been recognized again and again in such legislation. There was a time when through the efforts of steamship companies and of men who wished to bring over those whom they could at once use and impose upon there were brought into the country by the thousands men whom it was demoralizing to receive. But timely legislation stopped that. Sound and honest men and women out of every one of the great European stocks, who come of their own volition and make homes for themselves are welcome amongst us; no one can justly criticize our laws if only those who are sound and honest are admitted. Debased men and men of an unserviceable kind may come out of any race of stock, but America has enriched her genius, has made it various and universal, as she has renewed herself out of all the ancient peoples, from Norway to Italy, and the rich lands of the Mediterranean, who have the literature and history of the world.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. President, let us stop and analyze this letter. First, the President tells us that the Democratic Party "without forgetting its very origin," can not advocate an illiberal policy in the matter of immigration; second, "that America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity"—not who can read and write, not who possesses an education, but to "everyone who loves liberty and seeks opportunity," and then he gives this assurance:

And she will never seek another course under the guidance of the Democratic Party.

But now, lest there should be any misunderstanding or mistake, he proceeds, with that clearness which characterizes all of his utterances, to specify exactly the kind of people that should be excluded:

Criminals must not be admitted. Those who are diseased or defective must be excluded in order to safeguard the physical integrity of our people. Neither can we receive those who are unable to support themselves. And we should see to it that those who come are not unfitted to enter into the life of the country.

Those are the specifications. Then, to remove all doubt and strike out every possibility of misunderstanding or mistake as to what he means, he adds this:

The necessary limits have been recognized again and again in such legislation.

Mr. President, if that was not an assurance that we would not go beyond the old limits which he had recited, which were already graven upon our laws, then human language is without meaning and pledges and promises are without binding effect. Every foreign-born son and daughter of America reading that letter understood, and had the right to understand, that our candidate for President was giving assurance to the country, and especially to them, that no bars, save of the kind he so clearly specified, would be placed in the way of their relatives and friends who might thereafter come, as they had come. It was a pledge that the old pathway of the law would continue to be followed.

I have the right to stand here and appeal to Democrats upon this subject. I was in charge of the foreign bureau of the national executive committee having jurisdiction over all the country west of the Ohio River; and, sir, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of those letters were printed and sent to the foreign-born voters of the United States. They were sent by mail; they were distributed through political organizations; they were carried by captains of precincts and into the homes of tens of thousands of these people. This was the appeal we made: "Here is the pledge and promise of a man whose character is so exalted as to make a breach of faith impossible."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. There are very few Senators present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Md.
Borah	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Bristow	Hardwick	Oliver	Stone
Bryan	Hitchcock	Page	Sutherland
Burton	Hughes	Perkins	Swanson
Camden	James	Poindexter	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson	Pomerene	Thompson
Chilton	Jones	Ransdell	Thornton
Clapp	Kenyon	Reed	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Robinson	Townsend
Crawford	La Follette	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	Lane	Shafroth	White
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Williams
du Pont	Lodge	Simmons	Works

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the Senate on account of death in his family. He is paired with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in connection with that letter written by Mr. Wilson—for he was then Mr. Wilson, now our beloved President—I call attention to another letter.

A SENATOR. How much you love him.

Mr. REED. Oh, I will be found with him, holding up his hands, when very probably some of those who fawn upon him today and who smile and cry out when I use the term "beloved President" are helping to tear him to pieces. I now direct attention to another letter, written on March 13, 1912, to Mr. Piotrowski, a Polish attorney of the city of Chicago, a man of learning, intelligence, patriotism, and a leader of the Polish people who live in this country. Mr. Piotrowski had called attention to certain passages in a history written by Mr. Wilson which seemed to Mr. Piotrowski and others to reflect upon the Polish people and certain other European races. The language employed by Mr. Wilson in his history was at the date of the letter being employed in opposition to Mr. Wilson's candidacy for the nomination. As the representative of these Polish people, Mr. Piotrowski wrote Mr. Wilson, calling attention to the objectionable language. Here is the President's answer. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1912. Mr. Sabath inserted the letter in his speech. When I recall how many, many thousands of them we circulated from the national committee headquarters in Chicago among the foreign-born population of the United States, I am a little constrained to believe that Mr. SABATH put this letter in the RECORD as a part of his

speech because it could be thus conveniently and cheaply circulated. I read:

MY DEAR MR. PIOTROWSKI: I remember with pleasure meeting you when I was in Chicago, and esteem it a privilege to reply to your frank and interesting letter of March 11.

My history was written on so condensed a scale that I am only too well aware that passages such as you quote are open to misconstruction, though I think their meaning is plain when they are fairly scrutinized. No one who knows anything of the history of Europe can fail to be familiar with the distinguished history of the Polish people, and any writer who spoke without discrimination of members of that nation as constituting an undesirable element in population would not only be doing a gross injustice, but exhibiting a great ignorance. I did not know all of the facts you so interestingly set forth in your letter, but *I did know in a general way of the honorable and useful careers of the Polish citizens of America and the self-respect and steady achievement of the Polish communities which have been long established in various parts of the country.* In the passage quoted from my history, I was speaking of a particular time when it had become the practice of certain employers on this side of the water to import large numbers of unskilled laborers, under contract, for the purpose of displacing American labor, for which they would have been obliged to pay more. They were drawing, in many cases, upon a class of people who would not have come of their own motion, and who were not truly representative of the finer elements of the countries from which they came. It was, of course, never in my mind to compare the normal immigrant from Europe with the Chinese laborer. Indeed, I had no discrimination in mind, which involved anything more than calling attention to the fact that whatever might be the merits of the question as to the admission of Chinese into this country from the point of view of general public policy, the labor of the Chinese had been intelligent and extremely useful in many fields which they had been permitted to enter.

I know that a just and thoughtful man like yourself will pay no attention to the miscellaneous misinterpretations which have been put upon the passage referred to, and that you will have already interpreted my meaning as I have here endeavored to interpret it.

Your letter has very graciously afforded me an opportunity to make this explanation.

Cordially and sincerely, yours, WOODROW WILSON.

During the reading of the letter, which appears above in full,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, House bill 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, under the unanimous-consent agreement, is the regular order of business.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can not proceed now except for five minutes under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. REED. The bill is now before the Senate. I am about to discuss the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will direct the Secretary to read the unanimous-consent agreement, so that the Senator from Missouri may understand what it is.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator from Missouri was no doubt absent yesterday when we agreed to vote at 2 o'clock to-day upon the pending amendment to the appropriation bill.

Mr. REED. Of course under the circumstances I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement debate is limited to five minutes.

Mr. REED. I will be obliged to the Senator from Maryland if he will permit me to finish reading the letter. It will not take over two minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow the Secretary to read the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. REED. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the agreement entered into yesterday.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on to-morrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1915, at not later than 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may then be pending or that may be offered to the reported amendment of the committee on pages 1 and 2 of the bill H. R. 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and immediately thereafter on the said amendment of the committee, as amended or otherwise: *Provided*, That after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than five minutes upon any single amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], which will be read.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks without reading the balance of the letter.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee, on page 2 of the bill, insert the following——

Mr. SHAFROTH. My amendment does not propose to vitiate anything the committee has done. It is in addition to that, a qualification upon it.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment proposed to be inserted by the committee insert the following——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Myers	Shively
Borah	Gronna	Norris	Simmons
Brady	Hardwick	Oliver	Smoot
Bristow	Hollis	Page	Sterling
Burton	James	Perkins	Stone
Camden	Johnson	Pomerene	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones	Ransdell	Swanson
Chilton	Kenyon	Reed	Thomas
Clapp	La Follette	Robinson	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Root	Thornton
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Dillingham	Lodge	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fletcher	McLean	Sheppard	White
Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the vote which is about to be taken I understand is upon the amendment which I offered to the pending bill, and it provides as follows:

That from and after the 30th day of June, 1916, 60 per cent of all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District and 40 per cent out of the revenues of the United States.

As we have under the rule five minutes' time to discuss the amendment, I desire to say a few words in relation to it. I believe the discussion has developed an almost unanimous belief, or at least a preponderance of belief, that the half-and-half principle is wrong, owing to the fact that it makes the Government of the United States pay too large a proportion of the expenses of the District of Columbia. I believe it is almost universally acknowledged that to throw the Government back to the old system of raising revenues upon the property of the District and not charging the United States Government anything, but the United States Government seemingly contributing to it by reason of the presence of a great Capital here, with the necessary employees that it brings to the Capital, would not be fair. So I have proposed a measure which is in accordance with the report of a commission which was made about 38 or 39 years ago, namely, that in the District there was 60 per cent of private property and 40 per cent of public property. While the District has grown and the Government has grown, I think the relation between the two is about the same now that it was then.

I believe the proposition of dividing the expenditures by half and half leads to an extravagance upon the part of the District of Columbia that this amendment would in part at least avoid. In other words, while we have a half-and-half division of the expenses, it is natural for the people of the District to say, "Let us have the improvement; it will cost us only 50 cents on the dollar. Let us have that expenditure and let us have this expenditure on anything that comes up." That being the case, I think it leads to extravagance; and I believe that cutting down the Government's share to 40 per cent will have a tendency to make the people hesitate and say, "Well, we do not believe that we had better do it; we would have to pay 60 per cent of this expenditure"; and so it would have a tendency to economy in the District government here.

I believe also that a principle of economy would pervade to such an extent that, by reason of the saving to the District of Columbia, I doubt very much whether the people of the District of Columbia would have to pay any more taxes than they pay now. The fact is that they would not advocate and would not estimate for various improvements and they would avoid such expenditures under this arrangement that I propose.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is just and right. I believe it is too high to make the Government pay 50 per cent.

Now, as to the date I have put for the commencement of the operation of this provision of 40 and 60 per cent, you will notice that I have fixed the 30th day of June, 1916. The reason I have done that is this: Various amounts of assessments have been made, and it is estimated that from those assessments already made the District of Columbia will raise $8,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1916. It is said by the

advocates of the House measure that the surplus which exists by reason of having $8,000,000 at command when the bill calls for only five and a half million dollars, or perhaps $6,000,000, would leave $2,000,000 raised upon the property of the District of Columbia, and they say that money ought to be applied to the part which the United States Government should pay on the half-and-half principle. I do not think that is right; I do not think that is fair to the District; but if we fix the date at the 30th day of June, 1916, then we have the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia on notice that after that time the ratio shall not be half and half but that it shall be 60 and 40 per cent.

It seems to me that in preparing their budget and determining what expenditures they shall make, having in view the proportion the District shall pay and the part the Government shall pay, as a matter of fact they could more nearly determine what the District thinks is most important and what appropriation should be made for the District, and therefore there should be a year's time to consider the question. Then it would solve the question as to whether this surplus money above the appropriations should be used on the part of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order against the amendment that it proposes general legislation upon an appropriation bill. It seems to me very clearly that it is general legislation. It provides that from and after the 30th day of June, 1916, this division shall be made of 60 and 40 per cent. It is very clearly not a limitation upon this appropriation bill or any item in it. It is a general rule which applies to the entire District for all time to come and does not begin to operate until this appropriation bill has been completely carried into operation. It is therefore opposed to the provisions of Rule XVI, paragraph 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator read the rule?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It provides that—

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment—

And so forth.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire if this is not simply an amendment of legislation. If the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is out of order, then the amendment of the Senate committee is out of order as legislation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President; because the amendment proposed by the committee is a limitation upon the various items of appropriation made by the bill, while this seems to be a change in the general law.

Mr. BRISTOW. In what way is it a limitation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The provision of the committee amendment is—

> That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRISTOW. In what way is that a limitation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is a limitation upon all the appropriations which are made, the limitation being that one-half shall be paid by the General Government and one-half by the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. Allow me to suggest to my colleague that the committee amendment is the present law; it does not change the law at all. The House provision changes the law. The Senate committee amendment is simply a reenactment of the present law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I want to say that the House provision——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state the ground upon which I believe the amendment is relevant. There comes over from the House of Representatives a provision which is a change of an existing law, which is a permanent law. It is a change of that permanent law, and it proposes to change that permanent law by a provision in the House bill. We have unquestionably a right to perfect any provision which comes over from the House. Consequently, in striking out the provision of the House I propose to substitute a permanent measure, and it seems to me it is perfectly relevant in that it is not like a change of existing law when it is either not germane or when it is to some extent new. We are discussing the House plan and we are discussing the principle of a half-and-half division of expenditures relative to the District of Columbia. The House has changed the law from the half-and-half principle, shifting to the District of Columbia a larger proportion, and when I come here——

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask the Senator whether his amendment is a substitute for the House provision or for the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not see that that is material, because it is on the subject matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to know, outside of the parliamentary proposition, when we come to vote on it, if we ever do. If the Senator's proposition is a substitute for the House provision, it is a different proposition as a matter of parliamentary law than though he substituted it for the Senate committee amendment; but, as a matter of fact, there is still another difference that goes to the merit of it. I would vote for it in one case and vote against it in the other.

Mr. SHAFROTH. My amendment comes up in this way: The House provision is stricken out by the committee. It is reported here as stricken out. The Senate committee reports an amendment to that. I want the House measure stricken out, but I do not think that the Senate committee amendment is exactly right. Surely I have a right to amend the Senate committee amendment by adding thereto a certain qualification.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly the Senator has a right to offer his amendment as a substitute for the Senate committee amendment, or he has a right to offer it as a substitute for the House provision. He can perfect either the amendment of the committee, or he can perfect the text of the bill itself, but we ought to know what the order is.

Mr. JAMES. It would not be in order now, however, as a substitute for the House provision, because the amendment of the Senate committee must be first acted on.

Mr. NORRIS. We can perfect the provision of the bill. That will take precedence over an amendment that is proposed to insert.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The effect of my amendment added to the committee amendment is to make the two a substitute for the House provision, and inasmuch as the House provision deals with the change of law and does, as a matter of fact, change the law——

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator offers his amendment to be added to the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, then he has two propositions contained together that are absolutely contradictory.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; they are not contradictory.

Mr. NORRIS. It can be offered as a substitute, I concede, to the Senate committee's proposition to pay on the half-and-half principle that is standing side by side with another matter in the same bill. It proposes that it shall be put on some other principle that is absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator does not comprehend my amendment. My amendment is in line with the Senate committee amendment until June 30, 1916, and then there is added the change.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the Senator offers his amendment as an addition to the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. As a substitute for the House provision. It seems to me, that being the case, of course it is in order. I shall ask that the Senate committee amendment, together with my language added to it, be adopted as a substitute for the House provision.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will understand the point of order is not debatable, except as the Chair may want to be enlightened.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wants to be enlightened upon the question of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In connection with what the Senator has been saying, I want to suggest to the Senator——

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The point of order which I make is not that the amendment proposed changes existing law, but as it is made it proposes general legislation. The House provision, it is true, proposes to change existing law; but as I read it is not general legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; because it applies only to the appropriations in this bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is the general law. It says it "repeals all laws inconsistent herewith," and that evidently refers to existing law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of course that would be so, but it would repeal such laws only in so far as this appropriation bill is concerned.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Because they are only inconsistent during the life of this appropriation bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, Mr. President.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When this bill has served its purpose, then Congress can deal with the subject anew in another appropriation bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This language——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me a moment, if it had specified that this provision of law which adopts the half-and-half principle, referring to it by section or otherwise, is unconditionally repealed, then the Senator would be right. The House provision, however, first of all provides that certain sums shall be appropriated, and then provides for a division of those sums between the United States and the District of Columbia, and then says "all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed." It does not repeal the laws for all time or unconditionally, but it only repeals them in so far as they are in conflict with the provisions in this bill; and the repeal only applies in so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was going to add, if the Senator will permit me, that however it may be construed, of course a point of order such as I am making against the Senator's amendment would not lie in this body to the House provision.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I want to suggest that if this amendment was confined to the appropriation to be made for this year, providing that it should be 40 per cent on the part of the Government and 60 per cent on the part of the District, then it would not be general legislation; but this is an attempt to legislate beyond the time when this appropriation can operate, and is, I think, general legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the point of order made by my colleague is well taken. We are dealing with an amendment now offered on the floor. The committee to which the bill was referred could make amendments to the House provision. The House, in passing the bill, could have repealed any law they wanted to repeal, and they did it in this provision. The Senate committee had a right as a committee to make an amendment to the House provision, but under Rule XVI an amendment offered on the floor that is general legislation is not permissible. That is the point of order made by my colleague, and I have not a doubt that the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is general legislation, as stated so well by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I want to say that my amendment, added to the Senate committee amendment, constitutes a substitute for the House provision. I say that the House provision is intended for general legislation and its words are in accordance therewith. Let me read it:

> That all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District to the extent that they are available, and the balance shall be paid out of money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, and all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Anyone who has examined the discussion that occurred in the House will see that the entire discussion was as to the change of the existing law, the half-and-half principle, and that that provision was intended for the purpose of changing the ratio between the Government and the District of Columbia. It says in the first part that the following sums are appropriated, but this is a distinct and separate clause, and does not modify it. It does not say as applied only to this year. It simply is a general clause with relation to it. As a matter of fact, if it should be held that I should have to submit a limit it would be perfectly within the rules of the Senate to strike out the word "one-half," where it relates to the General Government, and insert in the Senate committee amendment "40 per cent," and to strike out "one-half," where it relates to the District of Columbia, and insert "60 per cent." That would apply only to the fiscal year; but I want to avoid that, because I want the District of Columbia to have the full benefit of all the moneys that they will collect under the assessments which they have made. For that reason the amount of $3,000,000 should go to them, but unquestionably, if we were to make the amendment in accordance with that, simply striking out "one-half" and putting in "40 per cent," it would be a limitation upon the amendment proposed by the committee, and consequently would be perfectly germane to it, but I do not think it would be a fair amendment to the District of Columbia, and therefore I propose to have it take effect June 30, 1916.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is well within the rule if he will follow the latter course, but the Senator is certainly outside of the rule in offering his amendment as he did.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But it seems to me I have a right to perfect any substitute, and the Senate committee amendment is a substitute. It strikes out all the text and inserts matter in lieu of it, and I have a right to perfect the substitute; and as the House provision changes the existing law and is general legislation, it seems to me both the Senate committee amendment and my amendment to substitute are in order.

Mr. SMOOT. The House has a perfect right to change legislation, because they make up the appropriation bills. They can put anything in the bill they desire.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly; and——

Mr. SMOOT. An amendment could be made by the committee of the Senate, but this is an amendment offered on the floor, and our rules are against accepting such an amendment when it embodies legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Not where you can perfect a substitute. Unquestionably you can perfect the substitute. I propose to amend the substitute itself. This is a qualification upon the substitute.

Mr. THOMAS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. How long can a point of order which under the rule is not debatable be debated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state frankly he does not know. The Chair supposes that he can hear Senators on the question of the point of order. The Chair would be inclined under ordinary circumstances to submit the point of order to the Senate; but inasmuch as we have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 2 o'clock, the Chair supposes he might as well decide it. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "one half" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "one-third"; and, in line 8, to strike out the words "other half" and to substitute therefor the words "remaining two-thirds," so that if amended it would read:

> That one-third of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the remaining two-thirds out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this matter has been debated so long that I trust we shall take a direct vote on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. It is perfectly understood; and while I trust that the amendment will be defeated; I have no disposition to debate it.

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

Mr. WORKS and Mr. SMITH of Maryland addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor, as he first addressed the Chair.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have listened to a good deal of this discussion upon the question of the half-and-half system of dealing with the financial affairs of the District of Columbia. It is simply a recurrence or a renewal of a discussion that has been going on in Congress ever since I have been here. I think it is about time that we should take some definite steps to settle that question once for all. I do not think it should be settled in an appropriation bill. It seems to me that there should be some general legislation respecting this matter in justice to the people of the District of Columbia.

Whether it is necessary that there should be a commission appointed for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, I am not so sure. It may be that Congress has sufficient facts now before it to enable it to legislate intelligently upon that question, but I am opposed to settling the question in this offhand way on an appropriation bill. For that reason, and not because I indorse the half-and-half system—for I have very grave doubts as to whether it is a fair and just settlement of the finances as between the Government and the District of Columbia—but because this is not the time nor the manner in which that question should be settled I shall vote against the proposed change of the law as it exists to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we are undertaking to change here the proportion of taxes that are to be paid by the District of Columbia and the Government, forgetting that the law to-day fixes the rate of taxation at 15 mills. If the valuation of property in the District is not sufficient at the rate of 15 mills tax, then the expenses of the District could not be paid under the provisions of this proposed law. I think that this whole question ought to be settled by general legislation, and that at the same time not only the question of the proportion which is to be paid should be settled, but also the rate of taxation which is to be fixed for the District of Columbia. The people in the District have nothing to say about that; Congress has all to say; it is solely in its power. The one question should not be settled on an appropriation bill, leaving the other question entirely unsettled.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered, as it must clearly appear to every Senator, provides that the Government shall pay one-third of the expenses of the District of Columbia. Under the system of taxation in force now, under the laws passed by Congress, the District of Columbia is raising a sufficient amount of revenue to pay its two-thirds. That system of taxation, which is lower than that in any other city I know of in the whole Republic, and allowing all character of securities to go untaxed, raises this amount of revenue. I think it is a perfectly just amendment; I think it is abundantly fair in every respect to the District of Columbia, and I hope it will be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I believe it will be fair to the people of this District if the Government of the United States pays one-third of all the taxes. It must be evident to every Member of this body and to every Member of the other House that some change will have to be made; it must be evident to every Member here that the rate which has been prescribed by Congress limiting it to one and a half per cent is not satisfactory. There can be no injustice done the District by adopting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky. It has been admitted that $8,000,000 will be raised by the District under the present system of taxation, and a third more would be practically $3,000,000, or $11,000,000 in all. Suppose that there shall be a small deficiency, what of it? Congress can take care of that in the next District appropriation bill or in the deficiency bill.

I predict that in the near future some changes will be made in the laws relating to taxation in the District of Columbia, and this seems to me to be the only way that we can begin to do it. I shall therefore vote for the amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is equitable and just. I can not agree with my friend from California [Mr. WORKS], who wants a commission or some scheme of that kind devised to consider this matter. A commission was appointed many years ago; it reported in favor, so I am informed, of a division of 60 to 40. That was approximately 40 years ago.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall do so in just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. And Congress at the time, instead of following the recommendation of that commission, formulated the present plan of 50 to 50.

As the Senator from California says, this matter has been under debate for years. I remember it has been fully discussed in the newspapers and in the Halls of both branches of Congress. We are all fairly familiar with it. Nobody can deny that the taxes per thousand dollars in the District of Columbia are less than in any city in the United States.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. I only wanted to correct a statement of the Senator from Kansas that I have said that I desired the appointment of a commission. I made no such statement as that. I am not at all sure that a commission is necessary in order to determine this matter.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then I misunderstood the Senator. I have been diverted time and again, and I have probably confused that with remarks made by other Senators.

I think we understand the matter well, and it seems to me that if 60 to 40, which was recommended by a commission 35 or 40 years ago, was just at that time, the enormous increase in the value of taxable property in the District since then is such that one-third to two-thirds would be equitable now.

There is no reason why the people of the District of Columbia should be exempted from taxation and the burdens put upon the people of the United States, who are already paying good deal higher taxes than are the people in the District of Columbia. There is not a Senator here who lives in a city of 5,000 inhabitants or more in the United States, who is not paying a heavier tax on every dollar's worth of property he owns in such city than is paid in the District of Columbia. You can not justify such a discrimination against the people of the United States in favor of the people of the District of Columbia, in my opinion. So I am pleased that the Senator from Kentucky has offered this amendment.

I regret that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] was ruled out of order; it was, in my opinion, an erroneous ruling; but nevertheless this amendment, if adopted and if it becomes the permanent policy of the Government, certainly will be very much more equitable and just than is the present arrangement.

Mr. VARDAMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, my views upon the pending amendment are in entire accord with those expressed by the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, my observation is that a commission such as the one proposed to be created to take testimony and report a proper plan of government for the District of Columbia is often more for the purpose of delay than with a view to perfecting a system.

I want at the outset to disclaim any spirit of antagonism to the interests of the people of the District of Columbia. The good people of my own State who have honored me with a place in this great body have no better claim upon me to protect their interests than the citizens of the District of Columbia. I think the suggestion that Congress would do the residents of this favored spot of earth an injustice in the matter of taxation is a reflection upon the patriotism and intelligence of the Members of this body.

Nor do I in any way share the opinion of Senators who have suggested that autonomy, the right of self-government, should be granted to this District. This District belongs to the United States, and its government is a function which the General Government should exercise for many reasons. The one all-sufficient reason is that we have once tried local self-government here, and the utter incompetency of the negroes to perform properly the supreme duties of citizenship, and the ease with which they were controlled by a lot of unscrupulous white politicians made the experiment a dismal failure. No thoughtful patriotic resident of the city of Washington would have that venture repeated.

Nor do I believe that the citizens of the District of Columbia should bear all the expenses of maintaining this city. I believe that the city should be supported in a way and that its affairs might be conducted in a manner which would make it a city worthy of this great Nation, and in which every citizen of the Republic will take a just and pardonable pride.

I am opposed to taxing the people of this city any more than the people of other communities situated as they are are taxed upon their property for every advantage which they enjoy at the hands of the municipality. All that may be lacking to carry out the plan of managing this city as the Capital of the Nation ought to be contributed by the General Government.

I have heard it asserted here, and I think without contradiction, that the taxes paid in this city upon real estate are less than the taxes levied in the great majority of other cities—they are very much less than the taxes paid in the little city in which I live—and that a large part of the invisible, intangible property which ought to bear taxation escapes altogether. If that be true, it is little short of an outrage. It is an injustice to the taxpayers of the entire Nation outside of the District of Columbia, and to permit the system to remain longer in vogue involves a serious neglect of the first duty devolving upon the Members of this body. I will not be a party to such a dereliction.

The suggestion has been made that if you tax property in the District under a rigid and radical law men will leave the community. That means if you make the plutocratic tax dodger do his duty to his Government he will trek. Well, the man who does not want to bear his proportion of the burdens of the Government whose laws he invokes for protection in the enjoyment of his rights and the privileges of citizenship is not a good citizen, and the community is better off when he gets out of it. Such a person is an outlaw of the least desirable type,

notwithstanding the fact he may swim swiftly in the social current.

I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, because I know it will not work an injustice to the District of Columbia or to its citizens. On the contrary, I think it right and far better than the committee amendment. I prefer, however, the provision of the House bill as it came to us, which requires the expenses of the city to be paid out of the revenues derived from taxation upon the citizens of the city as far as it goes, the balance to be contributed by the General Government, and I sincerely hope that the House provision may be adopted by the Senate and that the amendment offered by the Senate committee may be rejected.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, this question has been discussed probably as fully as is required, but it seems to me that it would be a very unwise step to take, with the information we have, to change the method which now prevails of providing for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

It has been stated here, and not denied, that some 20 laws now on the statute books affecting the District of Columbia would be repealed by the pending provision, or at least would be seriously affected by it Has anybody traced that suggestion out to ascertain how far it would lead? Have all the results been ascertained? Certainly no business man would proceed blindly in this way.

It has been stated that there is no danger of any injustice being done the District of Columbia. I do not assume that there is any Member of the Senate who wishes to do an injustice to the District, and yet if it is true, as it seems to be admitted—at least it has not been denied—that 60 per cent of the property in the District is owned by individuals and 40 per cent by the Government, then certainly the half-and-half provision is not unjust when the fact is considered that the 60 per cent have not one word to say about what is done with their property and that the 40 per cent determines what improvements shall be made, and therefore what taxes shall be levied.

The expenses of this city are probably greater than those of any other city of like size in the United States. The improvements here are greater and more extensive. The Government, and it alone, determines those improvements. The city, if it was master of its own affairs and paid all of its expenses, would not go so far as the Federal Government has gone. And yet this is the Capital of the Nation. It should be the very best and most modern city in the world, and the Government, which absolutely controls all, should pay at least that portion of the expenses of this District which the demands of a National Capital require. At any rate it is the part of wisdom to know what we are doing in order that the Senate may not blindly do an injustice in the exercise of its arbitrary power over the District.

We are interested that the money appropriated shall be honestly expended and that the people not only of the District but of the United States, to whom this city belongs, shall get the worth of the taxes which are levied and paid out in the District.

I do not know whether or not we are prepared to pass on this subject as a matter of legislation outside an appropriation bill. I am not sure that, with present information, a wise substantive law could be enacted. The questions involved are complicated and of great importance. A commission working through the summer would, in my judgment, be highly serviceable. Therefore it seems to me that we had better not disturb the present arrangement until we are sure that the thing we propose to substitute for it is better for all parties concerned. I am constrained by these considerations to vote against all propositions to change existing law until after fuller information it shall be found inequable and until a better plan is presented.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to move to amend the amendment by inserting "40 per cent and 60 per cent." I recognize the fact that, in the first instance, the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is an amendment to the amendment of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky having moved to strike out the words "half-and-half" and insert "one-third and two-thirds," but it is very clear, it seems to me, that Rule XVIII permits me to make the motion to amend the amendment. I will read that rule. It is as follows:

> If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided; but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert. But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

Mr. President, it seems to me, according to that rule, that I have a right to move to insert——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The Chair will state that the motion is in order, but the Senator is out of order in discussing the question before there is any point of order made.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that the amendment is in the third degree and out of order. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Colorado can not present this motion, and that the rule which he read shows that he can not do so. There is pending a motion to strike out and insert. There is then a motion to amend the portion to be inserted. The rule provides that we can vote down a motion to amend the part to be inserted, and, after voting down the proposition to amend, can present another proposition to amend it. Those of us who think the proposed division on a basis of one-third and two-thirds extreme and who wish to vote with the Senator from Colorado for a division of 40 and 60 per cent can vote against the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky; and after that has been voted down, if it shall be voted down, then the motion of the Senator from Colorado will be in order and can be presented.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, then how does the Senator dispose of Rule XVIII, which says expressly, as I understand, that such a motion as I have made can be submitted and entertained? It seems to me that under that rule the amendment I have submitted is in order. I thought the rule was the other way, but when my attention was called to Rule XVIII it seemed to me clearly to fortify the position I have taken. My motion becomes the first motion to be considered, and then if it is overruled the motion of the Senator from Kentucky will be the next question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado, I think, is well within his rights in offering the amendment which he has offered as an amendment to the amendment; but he is wrong in invoking Rule XVIII, because that rule applies to cases where a substitute has been offered. Where a substitute is offered the right is given to perfect the substitute before offering it for the original proposition, but that does not apply in this instance. However, the motion made by the Senator to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is in order under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is my motion.

Mr. SMOOT. The criticism I offered was against invoking Rule XVIII to sustain the position the Senator has taken, because, in my opinion, that rule does not sustain it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, as I understand, the original amendment is that reported by the committee, which is an amendment offered to the original House text. That is followed by the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to amend the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an amendment in the first degree.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then follows the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, which would clearly be in the third degree, and I do not think it would be in order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would be true in the absence of Rule XVIII, but under Rule XVIII, as I see it, my amendment becomes in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion to amend is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. VARDAMAN. As I understand, then, the motion of the Senator from Colorado is a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is its effect.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then we are voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I hope that neither of the amendments will prevail. I do not know that every Member of the Senate is aware of the fact that there is before the Senate an amendment providing for the creation of a commission to thoroughly investigate this matter and report at the next session of Congress. It does seem to me that in a matter of such great importance no Senator ought to refuse to secure all the information possible upon the subject.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In a few moments I will give way.

Mr. JONES. I merely want to ask if the Senator knows that there will be no point of order interposed against the commission

proposition, because it would be clearly subject to a point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am only stating my objections to the amendments which have been offered to the pending measure. It does seem to me that there should be no objection to our getting all the information possible before we decide upon a question of such great importance to the people of the country and of the District of Columbia. For the life of me, I can not see why anybody should object.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] just now remarked that he thought that the amendment providing for a commission was offered for the purpose of delay. I want to say to him and to the Senate that I have had something to do with that proposal, and, so far as I am concerned, I want no delay; but I want justice to the National Government and justice to the District of Columbia. I say it is a subject that should be investigated, and all the information possible should be obtained upon it. We should not stand here on the floor and guess at what would be a proper proportion for the Government to pay and what would be a proper proportion for the District of Columbia to pay.

Under the proposed amendment providing for a commission to investigate this subject there would be no needless delay. The fact is that the Senator from Colorado, under the amendment he has offered, postpones any change until June, 1916, whereas under the amendment providing for a commission to investigate the subject the question could be brought before the next session of Congress and then decided, and certainly that will be in advance of the time proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

I do not say that the present system under which the District pays 50 per cent and the Government pays 50 per cent of the expenses of the District government is right. I do not know, and I want to know. Therefore I want an investigation, and I want all the information that can be obtained by a commission. I hope the Senate will take that view of it. Let us get at this matter in a businesslike way and secure all the information that can be obtained. After getting that information we certainly can vote more intelligently than we can at this time, when any action we might take would largely be a matter of guesswork and patchwork.

This amendment, it seems to me, is new legislation. It abolishes the organic law and substitutes for it an arrangement under which a different proportion will be paid by the Government and by the District of Columbia than under the present system. I hope that the amendments will not prevail.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I asked the question I did of the Senator from Maryland in perfect good faith, because if the amendment providing for a commission is to be put on the bill I might vote differently upon some of the amendments. I hope that it will be put on the bill. I do not like the idea of disturbing the whole fiscal arrangement on this bill by an amendment that only goes for a year at best. The whole matter will come up again when we have another District of Columbia appropriation bill.

I was very much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to have the division of 40 and 60 per cent take effect in 1916, because I felt that prior to that time we probably would have the report of this commission, and the Senate, when they acted upon the matter, if they thought it was not proper to continue that provision, would make whatever change was necessary. I do not feel that I would be justified under the circumstances in voting to change the 50 per cent plan; but in voting that way I should like to have this provision for a commission in the bill, not for the purpose of delaying the matter, but for the purpose of doing justice to the District of Columbia in a proper way, for the purpose of having submitted to the Senate some data and information upon which we can act and make permanent legislation, and not have this contest come up every year upon every appropriation bill.

So I hope no point of order will be made on the proposition for a commission, and that we can provide for that, so that we will be ready, when the next bill comes around, to enact permanent legislation. I think I shall be disposed to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Colorado now, because it would take effect immediately, and it looks as if we are simply trying to grab the $2,000,000 of extra money that will be raised by taxation in the District.

I think there was much merit in the proposition first submitted by the Senator from Colorado, but I do not think there is in the last.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word suggested by the statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that he hopes no point of order will be made against the tax-commission amendment.

I think that if any one thing has been demonstrated by this discussion—and I have listened to it with great interest, and I have heard, I think, nearly all of it—it is that there is a necessity for a tax commission to investigate, first, the question as to what proportion of the expenses of the District of Columbia should be paid by the General Government and what proportion by the District itself. Secondly, Mr. President, there should be a commission to investigate other questions to which the tax laws of the District apply, or to which proper tax laws should apply; namely, the basis and the rate of taxation, to which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] alluded yesterday.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may have in mind clearly the proposition with reference to a tax commission, I wish to read the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] yesterday. It provides for the appointment of a joint select committee for these purposes. I read—

> whose duty it shall be to prepare and submit to Congress a statement of the proper proportion of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, or any branch thereof, including interest on the funded debt, which shall be borne by said District and the United States, respectively, together with the reasons upon which their conclusions may be based.

Now, I want to call particular attention to the other features of this proposed amendment. It further provides as follows:

> That said committee be further authorized and directed to investigate the tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia, together with all questions relating to the classes and kinds of property taxable thereunder, as well as all questions relating to the basis and rates of taxation of such property, with a view to any necessary change in or revision of said laws; and that said committee shall make report of its findings and recommendations to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the variety of opinions here concerning the proportion that the Government should pay and that the District should pay of the expenses of the District of Columbia, some insisting that the proportion should be 40 and 60 per cent for the Government and District, respectively; others 50 and 50, and others 33⅓ per cent to 66⅔ per cent; considering this variety of opinion, and considering also the further and very important questions relating to the basis of taxation and the rate of taxation, the proper course for this year would be to adhere to the half and half plan, and meanwhile send all these questions to a joint committee or commission. We can not discuss them intelligently here in the limited time we have, nor arrive at any just conclusion in regard to these important questions. The time at which the select committee is required to report is not long, and the $1,800,000 now in the Treasury can be devoted by this Congress, as I understand, to purposes of improvement, the amount to be met now or at some subsequent time by a direct appropriation by the Government of its like sum of $1,800,000. It seems to me that this is the wise course and the sane course to pursue at this particular juncture, rather than to attempt by this bill to change the amount to be paid by the Government and District, respectively.

In this connection, Mr. President, are we ready, for example, to adopt the plan of assessing intangibles or moneys or credits at their full value? It is one of the most difficult problems in all taxation. It is a question to which a joint committee ought to give attention. They are not now taxed. But while I believe in a provision that will require the taxation of moneys and credits, I am not satisfied as to the basis on which they should be taxed, and would like to see the results of a committee's investigation of that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES and Mr. KENYON called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAMES. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. The vote will develop that.

Mr. OVERMAN. The absence of a quorum being suggested, I think the roll must be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

During the roll call,

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. There seems to be a misunderstanding as to what this roll call is for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that the absence of a quorum was suggested. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that the roll call can not be interrupted. The roll call has been ordered by the Chair on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the calling of the roll is now in order. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will ask the Chair what is the proposition before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposition before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, is not the call of the roll the matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it proceed, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CAMDEN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make the point of order that it is out of order to call the roll for a vote pending the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, which was made by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That assumes that a call for a quorum has been made, but the Chair understands that the call for a quorum has not been made.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I inquire whether the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. In his absence I refrain from voting.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN]. I wish to state, however, that on this question, if my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH];

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS].

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—10.

Borah	Lane	Smith, Ga.	White
Culberson	Norris	Stone	
Gronna	Shafroth	Tillman	

NAYS—57.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Oliver	Smoot
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Overman	Sterling
Brady	Hughes	Page	Sutherland
Bristow	James	Perkins	Swanson
Bryan	Johnson	Poindexter	Thomas
Burton	Jones	Pomerene	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thornton
Chilton	Kern	Robinson	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Root	Vardaman
Colt	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Weeks
Cummins	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Dillingham	McLean	Sherman	Works
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Shively	
Gallinger	Myers	Simmons	
Goff	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—29.

Brandegee	Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Gore	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Hollis	Owen	Stephenson
Catron	Lea, Tenn.	Penrose	Walsh
Clapp	Lewis	Pittman	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Reed	
Crawford	McCumber	Shields	
Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

So Mr. SHAFROTH's amendment to the amendment of Mr. JAMES was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JAMES. I ask that the amendment may be stated to the Senate for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Kentucky offers to amend as follows:

On page 2, line 6, strike out "one-half" and insert "one-third"; and, on line 8, strike out the words "other half" and insert "remaining two-thirds."

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to state again that I hope this amendment will not prevail.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that that is the second time the Senator has spoken on this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; not on this amendment.

Mr. JAMES. Yes; on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I spoke before on the other amendment.

Mr. JAMES. It was on this amendment, Mr. President. The RECORD will show, if I am not very much mistaken, that the Senator has spoken twice upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as on the former vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before as to my pair and withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and on that account withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I again announce my pair and my inability to vote on account of the absence of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last roll call, I desire to be recorded in the negative.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, in the confusion attending the reading of the amendment I did not observe that it was limited to the present appropriation. I desire to vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—19.

Ashurst	James	Norris	Shively
Borah	Kenyon	Overman	Tillman
Bristow	Kern	Poindexter	Vardaman
Clapp	La Follette	Shafroth	White
Gronna	Lane	Sheppard	

NAYS—49.

Bankhead	Goff	Page	Stone
Brady	Gore	Perkins	Sutherland
Bryan	Hardwick	Pomerene	Swanson
Burton	Hughes	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	Jones	Robinson	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Root	Townsend
Colt	Lodge	Saulsbury	Weeks
Culberson	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works
Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Md.	
du Pont	O'Gorman	Smoot	
Gallinger	Oliver	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—28.

Brandegee	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Camden	Hollis	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Penrose	Stephenson
Crawford	Lippitt	Pittman	Walsh
Fall	McCumber	Shields	Warren

So Mr. JAMES's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JAMES. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask to have the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out, after the enacting clause, all down to and including line 5 on page 2 and to insert the following words:

That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, namely:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and his absence and withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and on that account withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] I make the same transfer as before and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair heretofore announced to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the previous announcement, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Bankhead	Gore	Oliver	Stone
Brady	Hardwick	Page	Sutherland
Bryan	Hitchcock	Perkins	Swanson
Burton	Hughes	Pomerene	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Jones	Root	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Culberson	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Dillingham	McLean	Simmons	Williams
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	Works
Gallinger	Myers	Smoot	
Goff	O'Gorman	Sterling	

NAYS—20.

Ashurst	James	Norris	Shively
Bristow	Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Clapp	Kern	Poindexter	Vardaman
Cummins	La Follette	Robinson	Walsh
Gronna	Lane	Sheppard	White

NOT VOTING—30.

Borah	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Fletcher	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Hollis	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Lea, Tenn.	Penrose	Stephenson
Catron	Lewis	Pittman	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Reed	Warren
Colt	McCumber	Shafroth	
Crawford	Martin, Va.	Shields	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the Secretary may read the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the report (No. 901), as follows:

In accordance with the notice given in writing on January 11 by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] that he would make a motion in accordance with said notice to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI for the purpose of moving a certain amendment to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, said motion having been referred by the Senate to the Committee on Rules, and the committee having considered the same, does hereby make a favorable report and recommend that for the purpose named and the consideration of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas and all amendments thereto paragraph 3 of Rule XVI be suspended.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. LODGE. I think that had better go over for a day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand unanimous consent has been given for the consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only for its presentation. There is an objection, and it goes over.

Mr. BRISTOW. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that the report of the Committee on Rules went to the calendar, or that it went over for a day?

Mr. OVERMAN. It does not go to the calendar. I think it goes over for a day, to be taken up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under what rule does the report from a committee go over for a day?

Mr. OVERMAN. This was a notice submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which was referred to the Committee on Rules, and we have reported it favorably.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but suppose it was? The Chair knows of no rule that a report of a committee goes over for a day. If it is not taken up, under the ruling of the Chair it goes to the calendar. It may be taken up by unanimous consent or upon motion to-day or to-morrow or at any other time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Am I right in understanding that the ruling of the Chair is that upon one objection the report of the committee goes over for one day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the ruling of the Chair is that the report of the Committee on Rules is the same as the report of a committee on a bill or on a resolution, or any other report that comes from a committee. It goes to the calendar upon an objection to unanimous consent for its present consideration, and can be taken up either by unanimous consent or upon motion, as any other matter that is upon the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that we proceed to the consideration of the report of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

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

Mr. LODGE (reading):

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Rule XXVI, section 2.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That rule seems to be clear, Mr. President. I will withdraw my motion and renew it to-morrow morning.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that the only way the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas could be considered is by giving the notice he has given, which is that he would ask for a suspension of the rule, and so forth. That was done yesterday. When it came up for consideration in the Senate this morning it was referred to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules has reported it back, and it seems to me the Senator from Texas has a right to insist upon the amendment offered by him at such time as amendments are in order. If the measure goes to the calendar, the bill could be passed or disposed of without this amendment being acted upon at all.

It seems to me the Senator from Texas has a right to insist upon the consideration of the motion at this time. It is offered as an amendment, and he has given notice that he would offer it. He has complied with the rules of the Senate. The Committee on Rules has reported, and reported favorably. I insist that it is the Senator's right to have the matter considered now, and that, too, without regard to the report of the committee. Rule XL is very clear, and to my mind there is no room for doubt or question as to the course which the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] should take.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can be no doubt that under the second clause of Rule XXVI, which had escaped the memory

of the Chair, the report of a committee, upon objection can not be considered to-day. It must go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will wait until the Chair concludes his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the conclusion of my remarks for the present.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the ordinary morning business, I shall move to take up this motion.

Mr. JONES. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

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

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Vice President if, when the time comes for the Senator from Texas to propose his amendment, and that is done, it would not be proper to consider this report from the committee making that amendment in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not inclined to rule ahead of time. He has trouble enough ruling at the time.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "General expenses," on page 6, line 10, after the words "survey officer," to strike out "$1,800" and insert "$2,000"; in the same line, after the word "clerks," to strike out "one $1,000, one $900" and insert "two at $1,000 each"; and in line 13, after the words "in all," to strike out "$47,476" and insert "$47,776," so as to make the clause read:

Auditor's office: Auditor, $4,000; chief clerk, $2,250; bookkeeper, $1,800; accountant, $1,500; clerks—three at $1,600 each, three at $1,400 each, one $1,350, four at $1,200 each, five at $1,000 each, one $936, two at $900 each, two at $720 each; messenger, $600; property survey officer, $2,000; clerks—two at $1,000 each; disbursing officer, $3,000; deputy disbursing officer, $1,600; clerks—one $1,200, two at $1,000 each, one $900; messenger, $600; in all, $47,776.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, after "$600," to insert "laborer, to be employed not exceeding six months, during the busy seasons, at $40 per month, $240," and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,740," so as to make the clause read:

Fish wharf and market: Market master and wharfinger, who shall have charge of the landing of vessels, the collection of wharfage and dockage rentals, and the collection of rents for fish houses at the municipal fish wharf and market, $900; assistant market master, who shall also act as laborer, $600; laborer, to be employed not exceeding six months, during the busy seasons, at $40 per month, $240; in all, $1,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 7, after the words "superintendent of," to strike out "weights, measures, and markets" and insert "markets, weights, and measures," and in line 9, after "$2,500," to strike out "assistants" and insert "inspectors of weights and measures," so as to make the clause read:

Office of superintendent of markets, weights, and measures: Superintendent, $2,500; inspectors of weights and measures—two at $1,200 each, one $1,000; clerk, $1,200; laborer, $600; in all, $7,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has there been a unanimous-consent agreement by which the committee amendments are to be considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been. The bill is being read for action upon the committee amendments now.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 10, after the word "one," to strike out "$620" and insert "$720," and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "$26,250" and insert "$26,350," so as to make the clause read:

Municipal artchitect's office: Municipal architect, $3,600; superintendent of construction, $2,000; chief draftsman, $1,700; draftsmen—one $1,400, one $1,300; heating, ventilating, and sanitary engineer, $2,000; superintendent of repairs, $1,800; assistant superintendent of repairs, $1,200; boss carpenter, boss tinner, boss painter, boss plumber, boss steam fitter, five in all, at $1,200 each; boss grader, $1,000; machinist, $1,200; clerks—one $1,050, one $720; copyist, $840; driver, $540; in all, $26,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, one page 10, line 10, after the words "authorized by law," to strike out "$2,799" and insert "$4,000," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 20, after the word "Public Utilities Commission," to strike out "$58,278.96" and insert "$69,479.96," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Public Utilities Commission, $69,479.96.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, after the word "supplies," to insert "care or hire of teams," so as to make the clause read:

For services of temporary draftsmen, computers, laborers, additional field party when required, purchase of supplies, care or hire of teams, $5,575, all expenditures hereunder to be made only on the written authority of the commissioners.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, after the word "vehicles," to insert "also traveling expenses of librarian incidental to the acquisition of books, by purchase, gift, or exchange, in studying other library systems, at the discretion of the board of library trustees, not to exceed $300," so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance, repairs, fuel, lighting, fitting up buildings, lunch-room equipment, purchase, exchange, and maintenance of bicycles and motor delivery vehicles; also traveling expenses of librarian incidental to the acquisition of books, by purchase, gift, or exchange, in studying other library systems, at the discretion of the board of library trustees, not to exceed $300; and other contingent expenses, $9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 11, page 15.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest he absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	O'Gorman	Simmons
Bristow	Hollis	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	James	Page	Smith, Md.
Burton	Johnson	Poindexter	Smoot
Camden	Jones	Pomerene	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Ransdell	Sutherland
Chilton	Kern	Reed	Swanson
Clapp	La Follette	Robinson	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Root	Thornton
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	White
Goff	Myers	Sherman	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Shively	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill for action on the committee amendments.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 11, page 15.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 16, line 1, after the words "motor vehicles," to strike out "$14,534" and insert "$15,284," so as to read:

In all, for motor vehicles, $15,284. All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 14, after the words "water department," to insert "engineer water department, master mechanic water department," and in line 16, after the word "sewers," to insert "assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division," so as to make the clause read:

Telephones connected with the system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. may be maintained in the residences of the superintendent of the water department, engineer water department, master mechanic water department, superintendent of sewers, assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division, chief inspector of the street-cleaning division, secretary of the Board of Charities, health officer, chief engineer of the fire department, and superintendent of police, under appropriations contained in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after "$5,000," to strike out "*Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not include the appropriations herein made for the fire and police departments," so as to make the clause read:

The commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to furnish necessary transportation in connection with strictly official business of the District of Columbia by the purchase of car tickets from appropriations contained in this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures herein authorized shall be so apportioned as not to exceed a total of $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. There is one question I should like to ask in regard to a paragraph which has just been passed over which was read somewhat hurriedly. On page 18, lines 5 to 9 read:

The several street railway companies in the District of Columbia are authorized and required to transport free of charge all members of the Metropolitan police force and of the District of Columbia fire department when in uniform and in the performance of their duties.

What would that mean with reference to members of the fire department, for instance?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We felt that it was just as important that members of the fire department, when wearing uniforms, should be treated in the same manner as policemen. That is the rule in most cities.

Mr. BURTON. I concede that; but what is the test as to their being engaged in the performance of their duties? It is required not only that they should be in uniform but in the performance of their duties. I can hardly understand under what circumstances a member of the fire department, whose work requires the utmost haste, would be riding in a street car in the performance of his duty.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This is the language of the House. We did not care to change it. We do not know whether there is any special objection to it or not. It came from the House in this way. We felt that certainly when not in the performance of duty they ought to pay like anybody else. I presume it was the idea that having on his uniform would be evidence that he was in the performance of duty. I do not know that any harm can grow out of it.

Mr. BURTON. However, it raises the question in every case whether a fireman is traveling in the performance of his duties. A conductor might see him in uniform and be authorized to ask the question, "Under what circumstances are you riding on this car? Are you riding to a fire, or what is the occasion of your being here?" I call attention to it only because it seems to me it is not clear.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It pertains not only to the fire department but to the police.

Mr. CLAPP. The question does not go to the carrying of policemen or firemen. The point the Senator makes, it strikes me, is a vital one, and it should be made plain in some form. What effect is to be given to the words "in the performance of their duties"? It seems to me when a policeman or a fireman is in his uniform that should be the test, because as a rule they do not wear their uniforms when riding on the street cars unless either going to or returning from their duties.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think no trouble will grow out of it. If he has a uniform on, it is supposed that he is performing his duties.

Mr. CLAPP. That is true, and that is just the point the Senator from Ohio is making. It seems to me the fact that he is in uniform should be conclusive in itself. Now, there are added the words, in addition to the uniform, "and in the performance of his duties."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It would be assumed if he was not in uniform that he was not performing any duty.

Mr. CLAPP. Then why not strike out the words "and in the performance of their duties," so there can be no question between a policeman or a fireman and the conductor of a street car; and when a fireman or a policeman was in uniform, that would be conclusive.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think it makes any material difference either way.

Mr. SMOOT. It may make this difference, that there may be a fireman who is not in uniform, and if a fire occurred he would immediately go to it.

Mr. CLAPP. Under this language he could not ride free, because he must be both in uniform and in the performance of duty.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just what I called attention to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If you want to remedy it, substitute the word "or" for the word "and."

Mr. CLAPP. That would do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. One other consideration occurs to me. These men have leaves of absence; they are not in the performance of duty during leaves of absence, and I know of no reason why the street car companies should transport them free of charge. Again, if they go to their dinner, they are not in the discharge of duties, and they ought not to be then transported free. I have an impression that the provision is a wise one, that they shall be in the performance of duties. I do not imagine that there will be any technical question raised, because the street car companies say they are willing to transport them free.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the language that has always been in the bill before.

Mr. CLAPP. The word "or" should be inserted in place of "and."

Mr. SMOOT. There is a difficulty about that, I will say to the Senator. If you have the word "or" instead of "and," then any fireman in uniform could ride on the street cars free. If it merely read "in the performance of their duties," it would open the door for every fireman to ride anywhere at any time of the day, upon any occasion, by simply saying that he was in the performance of his duties. That would open the door for a great deal of wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That would be a matter for the street car conductors themselves to determine.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it ought to be placed upon the street car conductors to decide. I think if it were left in that way it would lead to differences between firemen and street car conductors.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. What would the Senator suggest?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator having the bill in charge it is best to leave it just as the House placed it. I think less harm can come from that than to have "and" changed to "or."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have no objection to leaving it as it is.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 7, after "1890," to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,500," so as to make the clause read:

For advertising notice of taxes in arrears July 1, 1915, as required to be given by act of March 19, 1890, $3,500, to be reimbursed by a charge of 50 cents for each lot or piece of property advertised.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 9, to insert:

For the further equipment of the office of register of wills with metal file cases for the protection of the wills and records filed therein, $4,500.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask a question. Is not the office of the register of wills already provided with metal file cases?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This is for an accumulation of papers, I will say to the Senator. They have reported to us they are not properly cared for, and we felt from the report made to us it was important that a provision should be made for their care.

Mr. BURTON. I think there will be no disagreement upon this item, but do I understand that this is a departure, a new method of providing for the care of the records by furnishing metal file cases, or is it an enlargement of the facilities already existing? They now have metal file cases.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This is an enlargement of their present facilities so as to take care of the accumulated papers.

Mr. BURTON. While the honorable chairman is on his feet I should like to ask another question arising just a few lines above. There is a provision "for erection of suitable tablets," beginning in line 1 at the top of page 20:

Not exceeding the sum of $500 of the unexpended balances of the appropriations made for this purpose by the acts of June 27, 1906, and subsequent District of Columbia appropriation acts, is continued available for the fiscal year 1916.

Is it possible that appropriations made so long ago as the year 1906 have not been covered back into the Treasury?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This is an unexpended balance, as I understand. The bill came from the other House in this way.

Mr. BURTON. But, as I understand, under the law passed in the early seventies any unexpended appropriation goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that this appropriation has been made reavailable from year to year.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think it rather a peculiar way of making appropriations, to continue an available balance made as long ago as 1906—more than eight years ago—year by year by such a method of appropriation. Under the best method of making appropriations, it seems to me there should be a balance every year, and the bill should say just how much is to be used for the particular purpose. Indeed, I do not recall a reference to a balance remaining from prior appropriations which goes back so far as this. It is a trivial item, only a few hundred dollars, but it does not seem to me the best way in which to make appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That may be true, but this is an unexpended amount that was made available for any object of this character, so far as it might be needed, instead of making a new appropriation.

Mr. BURTON. In the mere matter of bookkeeping I should suppose this method would cause a great deal of complication.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the acting chairman of the committee happen to be able to state offhand what is the total amount that has been carried forward from year to year? I merely ask for information, not that I care to make any point against it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The amount is $500.

Mr. CLAPP. Then this will exhaust that appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As I understand, it will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 21, after line 3, to insert:

For constructing market buildings on the site of the present municipal fish wharf and market, including refrigerating and cold-storage plant, which shall be equipped for the accommodation of such retail business as may obtain at that point and shall serve as the wholesale receiving and distributing point for marine and other products to be retailed elsewhere in the District, $200,000.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee—this is a matter with which I am not familiar—whether, under existing law, this market will automatically pass into the control of anyone other than the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that this market will be built on Government property. We appropriated last year a sum of money to put the wharf in order. The Government controls it entirely. I will say, further, that it will bring, as revenue to the District of Columbia and to the Government, quite a large percentage of the amount that we ask shall be expended.

Mr. CLAPP. But there is no existing law under which it would automatically pass under the control of anyone else than the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Improvements and Repairs," on page 21, line 16, after the date "1916," to strike out "$89,400" and insert "$160,400," so as to make the clause read:

Work on streets and avenues: For work on streets and avenues named in Appendix M, Book of Estimates, 1916, $160,400, to be expended in the discretion of the commissioners upon streets and avenues specified in the schedules named in said appendix and in the aggregate for each schedule as stated herein, namely:

Mr. BURTON. Is this amount of $160,400 a general provision for the work on certain streets and are the later schedules, "Georgetown schedule, northwest section schedule," and so forth, a separate provision, or how is that?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is the amount which the commissioners claim is necessary to do the work that they think ought to be done, they contending that the sum of $89,400 is not sufficient for that purpose. They came before our committee and impressed us with the belief that the sum which we report to appropriate was the proper amount which should be given, though I think we cut it down.

Mr. BURTON. Is the appropriation of $160,400 separate from the items of the Georgetown and other schedules?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that that is the aggregate.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is the total of them all.

Mr. BURTON. Let me examine it for one minute.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will notice, those items make up that amount.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; the $160,400 is the aggregate of the items that follow.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. What kind of work is this? It is not paving, as I understand.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is for opening and grading, as I understand.

Mr. BURTON. Is not a share of the expense of doing this work assessed against abutting property?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. A part of this work is not paving.

Mr. BURTON. A part of it is grading. Is that assessed against abutting property?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is done under the present law, I will say to the Senator. It does include paving, the owners of abutting property having to bear a part of the expense.

Mr. BURTON. Is the law providing that an abutting owner must pay a part of the expense limited to paving?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is the law. Such owners have to pay one-half.

Mr. BURTON. But in the case of grading they do not?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The property owners on each side of the street, respectively, pay one-fourth, and the balance is paid by the Government and by the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Does this item cover grading or paving, or both?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is for both, as I understand.

Mr. BURTON. So this item includes only the share taken from the general fund as paid for by the Government and the District of Columbia, and additional sums will be provided by the abutting property owners?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is my understanding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 21, line 21, after the word "Schedule," to strike out "$6,400" and insert "$18,900," so as to make the clause read:

Northwest section schedule: $18,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 22, after the word "schedule," to strike out "$18,500" and insert "$34,000," so as to make the clause read:

Southwest section schedule: $34,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 23, after the word "schedule," to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$63,000," so as to make the clause read:

Southeast section schedule: $63,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 24, after the word "schedule," to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$39,000," so as to make the clause read:

Northeast section schedule: $39,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 25, before the word "feet," to strike out "40," and insert "45," so as to make the clause read:

Repave with asphalt the granite block roadway pavement of Tenth Street NW., from Pennsylvania Avenue to the south side of B Street, 45 feet wide, $13,500.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry there also. Is any part of the expense of repaving assessed against abutting property owners as well as the original paving? Cities have diverse regulations in regard to that. In some cities the whole cost of original paving is levied upon the abutting property owners, and afterwards the municipality maintains it. What is the custom here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Does the Senator ask what is the amount which abutting property holders have to pay?

Mr. BURTON. We have here provisions for paving, while this last paragraph provides for repaving. Does the same rule regulating the division of the expense between the general fund and the abutting property owners apply with reference to repaving as applies in regard to the original paving?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir; my understanding is that it does.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can the Senator from Maryland point us to any statute covering the subject?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the provision will be found in the last District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is a modification of the Borland amendment of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 23, after line 3, to insert:

Repave with asphalt the granite roadway of P Street NW., between Twenty-eighth Street and Wisconsin Avenue, 30 feet wide, $18,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask what proportion the property holders pay of this appropriation? I have sent for the appropriation bill referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], but I have not yet seen it. Can the Senator answer my question?

Mr. GALLINGER. The proportion fixed, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, by the last District of Columbia appropriation bill was one-fourth by the abutting property holders on each side of the street and one-half by the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

I will say further to the Senator that I am not quite sure as to whether that covered repaving. I have an impression that it did not. I think it simply covered the original construction.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know that it ought to cover repaving. That is a very serious question——

Mr. GALLINGER. That was what we thought.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For the reason that the property holder does not wear out that pavement. He having once paid his part of the expense for it, it is subsequently a charge on the public.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely the argument which influenced the committee. The pavements were worn out by automobiles and carriages coming from all parts of the District and outside of the District.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think that is quite usual. I know of no city where the repaving or repairing of streets is charged against abutting property owners. After a pavement is once constructed, it is certainly a part of the public duty to maintain it.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "reconstruct," to strike out "provided the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. pays one-half," so as to make the clause read:

Northwest: Canal Road, south side, retaining wall, reconstruct, grade, and improve, $5,000.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, what is the reason for that? The House text provides that the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. shall pay one-half. Why should that be stricken out?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. have turned this property over to the Government, and it is now the property of the Government.

Mr. BURTON. And the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. no longer has any interest in it?

Mr. GALLINGER. No interest at all.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. None whatever.

Mr. BURTON. Why should it ever have been put in the bill, then?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. My information, after inquiry, is that the property has been turned over to the Government and that the canal company has no further interest in it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does not the canal company use it chiefly?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do not use it at all. The canal company, of course, use the towpath on the opposite side of the canal, but this is a public street, and was given to the Government by the canal company.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 25, after line 6, to insert:

Northwest: Connecticut Avenue, Tilden Street to Grant Road, grade and improve, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 8, to insert:

Northwest: Albemarle Street, Connecticut Avenue to Reno Road, grade, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 10, to insert:

Northwest: Kenyon Street, Georgia Avenue to Park Place, grade and improve, $9,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 12, to insert:

Northeast: Benning Road, end of macadam to Central Avenue, grade and improve, $4,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "$103,300" and insert "$152,900," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $152,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 4, after the word "truck," to strike out "$145,000" and insert "$160,000," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs to suburban roads: For current work of repairs to suburban roads and suburban streets, including maintenance of motor vehicles, four motor cycles, and one truck, $160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, after the word "repairs," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$22,000"; and, in line 13, after the word "deposited," to strike out "in the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts" and insert "to the credit of the appropriation for the fiscal year in which they are collected," so as to make the clause read:

Bridges: For construction and repairs, $22,000. This appropriation shall be available for repairing when necessary any bridge carrying a public street over the right of way or property of any railway company, and the amounts thus expended shall be collected from such railway company in the manner provided in section 5 of an act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia, approved June 11, 1878, and shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for the fiscal year in which they are collected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Sewers," on page 28, line 8, after the word "basins," to strike out "$67,500" and insert "$75,000," so as to make the clause read:

For main and pipe sewers and receiving basins, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, after the word "sewers," to strike out "$145,100" and insert "$175,000," so as to make the clause read:

For suburban sewers, $175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 13, after the word "sewers," to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase or condemnation of rights of way for construction, maintenance, and repair of public sewers, $2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, after "$50,000," to insert "to continue available until expended," so as to make the clause read:

Anacostia main intercepter: For continuing construction of the Anacostia main intercepter along the Anacostia River between the outfall sewer, sewage-disposal system, at Poplar Point, and Benning, D. C., $50,000, to continue available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Streets," on page 29, line 8, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$25" and insert "$27.50"; and in line 10, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$280,000," so as to make the clause read:

Dust prevention, cleaning, and snow removal: For dust prevention, sweeping, and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, under the immediate direction of the commissioners, and for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, in the discretion of the commissioners, including services and purchase and maintenance of equipment, rent of storage rooms; maintenance and repairs of stables, hire, purchase, and maintenance of horses; hire, purchase, maintenance, and repair of wagons, harness, and other equipment, allowance to inspectors and foremen for maintenance of horses and vehicles or motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed $27.50 per month for each inspector or foreman; purchase, maintenance, and repair of bicycles; and necessary incidental expenses, $280,000, and the commissioners shall so apportion this appropriation as to prevent a deficiency therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 20, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$179,945" and insert "$190,160," so as to make the clause read:

Disposal of city refuse: For collection and disposal of garbage and dead animals; miscellaneous refuse and ashes from private residences in the city of Washington and the more densely populated suburbs; collection and disposal of night soil in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That hereafter night soil may be collected and disposed of by any process satisfactory to the commissioners; payment of necessary inspection, livery of horses, and incidental expenses, $190,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 1, after "$45,000," to insert "of which sum not to exceed $5,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

Parking commission: For contingent expenses, including laborers, trimmers, nurserymen, repair men, and teamsters, cart hire, trees, tree boxes, tree stakes, tree straps, tree labels, planting and care of trees on city and suburban streets, care of trees, tree spaces, and miscellaneous items, $45,000, of which sum not to exceed $5,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 6, to strike out:

Public scales: All public scales now owned by the District of Columbia shall be sold to the highest bidder or bidders therefor, under sealed proposals which shall be invited by the commissioners, after the value of said scales shall have been appraised and for a sum or sums not less than the appraised value of each or the total appraised value of all of them; any or all of the sealed proposals received hereunder may be rejected and new proposals invited at any time prior to July 1, 1915.

The commissioners are authorized to grant licenses for the location and operation of public scales in the District of Columbia under such regulations as they may prescribe and for such fees as they shall approve, and they may grant permits, revocable on 30 days' notice, for the location of such scales on public spaces under their control.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Public scales: For replacement and repair of public scales, and all public scales may be used for weighing and verifying the weight of all commodities, $200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 23, to insert:

For construction of swimming pool, shower baths and equipment, purchase and installation of toilets, lockers, and screens, including neces-

sary personal services, for Georgetown playground, to be immediately available, $3,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "playgrounds," to strike out "$40,665" and insert "$44,415," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for playgrounds, $44,415, which sum shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 14, to insert:

For new public convenience station No. 4, to be located aboveground on public space at the intersection of Fifteenth Street and Maryland Avenue and H Street NE., $18,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Electrical department," on page 33, line 2, after the word "engineer," to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$2,750"; in line 8, after the word "each," to strike out "four" and insert "five"; and in line 13, after the words "in all," to strike out "$48,475" and insert "$49,265," so as to make the clause read:

Electrical engineer, $2,750; assistant electrical engineer, $2,000; 4 electrical inspectors, at $1,200 each; inspector, $1,000; electrician, $1,200; 2 draftsmen, at $1,000 each; 3 telegraph operators, at $1,000 each; 4 inspectors, at $900 each; expert repairman, $1,200; 3 repairmen, at $900 each; telephone operators—3, at $720 each; 5, at $540 each; 1, $450; electrical inspectors—1, $2,000; 1, $1,800; 1, $1,350; cable splicer, $1,200; assistant cable splicer, $620; clerks—1, $1,400; 1, $1,200; 2, at $1,125 each; 1, $1,050; 1, $750; assistant repairmen—1, $620; 2, at $540 each; laborers—1, $630; 3, at $600 each; 2, at $540 each; storekeeper, $875; in all, $49,265.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 23, after the word "night," to insert "after the hour of 1 o'clock antemeridian," so as to make the clause read:

The commissioners are authorized in their discretion to maintain part of the lamps on any street, avenue, alley, road, or public space, or portion thereof, for a shorter period each night after the hour of 1 o'clock antemeridian than that required by the provisions of the above-mentioned acts, at such reduced rates for said lamps as may be agreed upon by and between said commissioners and the lighting companies maintaining them.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Washington Aqueduct," on page 35, line 10, after the word "accessories," to strike out "including Conduit Road," so as to make the clause read:

For operation, including salaries of all necessary employees, maintenance, and repair of Washington Aqueduct and its accessories, McMillan Park Reservoir, Washington Aqueduct Tunnel, the filtration plant, the plant for the preliminary treatment of the water supply, authorized water meters on Federal services, motor trucks, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including the erection of a new storehouse at the filtration plant, and including maintenance of motor truck, horses, vehicles, and harness, $124,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 18, to insert:

For ordinry repairs, grading, opening ditches, and other maintenance of Conduit Road, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 9, to insert:

For completing the purchase, installation, and maintenance of water meters, to be placed on the water services to the United States buildings, reservations or grounds in the District of Columbia, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, said meters to be purchased, installed, and maintained by and remain under the observation of the officer in charge of the Washington Aqueduct, $23,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rock Creek Park," on page 36, line 24, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$20,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and improvement of Rock Creek Park, and of the Piney Branch Parkway, exclusive of building for superintendent's residence, but including not exceeding $750 repairs to the foreman's quarters necessary for the preservation thereof, to be expended under the direction of the board of control of said park in the manner now provided by law for other expenditures of the District of Columbia, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I notice a very decided difference in the form of these appropriations. In fact in following this bill it seems to me there are decided incongruities in it.

On page 33, under the head of the "Electrical department," there is an enumeration of each employee, and the salary of each is definitely fixed by law. Turning over to page 35, there is an appropriation of $124,000 for the Washington Aqueduct. That amount includes the salaries of all necessary employees. There is no specification of the salary of any employee, only the provision at the top of page 36 that—

All expenditures from this appropriation shall be reported in detail to Congress.

Next, on page 36, there as an aggregate or lump-sum appropriation for Rock Creek Park, which, I take it, includes salaries of $18,000, changed by the amendment of the committee to $20,000. Now, why should there be this different amendment adopted in the case of the last two from that of the first? It would seem that a far greater degree of care was exercised in regard to the electrical department.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that they have furnished us an itemized report of what makes up this expense of $20,000. For instance, there is "stone, and freight on same, $1,000; hauling stone, $600; lumber fittings, $150." Then it goes on with various things—"30 laborers, at $1.50 a day; skilled labor, $2.50; 3 skilled laborers, at $2; 2 skilled laborers, at $1.75; blacksmithing, tools, nails, steam pump and drill," and various things, aggregating $20,000.

Mr. BURTON. That is the Rock Creek Park?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is the Rock Creek Park; yes, sir.

Mr. BURTON. Are the salaries of superintendents or the salaries of employees included in that list, or is it merely the salaries of laborers?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They are not included. These are the salaries of laborers. Probably it was not properly stated. This amount is made up of the compensation of skilled laborers—per diem employees, not salaried officers.

Mr. BURTON. Are the salaried officers thus paid by the month or year paid by the Government of the United States directly, or are they paid half by the Government and half by the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They are paid half and half.

Mr. BURTON. Where do the salaries of the employees employed by the year, or a longer period than the laborers, appear in this bill? As I understand the Senator from Maryland, only the amounts paid as wages to laborers, who are probably only temporarily employed, are printed in the itemized list furnished to him.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator will find that on page 9, under the "Engineer department."

Mr. BURTON. Yes; I see; in line 12.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In line 12, "Foreman, Rock Creek Park, $1,200."

Mr. BURTON. And "three subforemen, at $1,050 each." Are those also employed in Rock Creek Park?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They are; but this $20,000 is for work that is done by day labor.

Mr. BURTON. I presume that any remarks I may make will have little effect, but it seems to me that it is a very faulty arrangement in an appropriation bill to carry under one item part of the expenses of Rock Creek Park, and then, under another item, as if it were the whole amount, a lump-sum appropriation of $20,000. Also, it does not seem to me that it is the best method to pursue to itemize specifically each salary in one case and to give an aggregate appropriation in another. Is that the outgrowth of custom, the method in which the estimates are made, or what is the explanation of it?

I would suggest that above all things in a list of expenditures of this kind there should be uniformity; and, again, in such a case as the Rock Creek Park that the amount specified, as on page 36, should include all the expenditures for the maintenance of that park, in the same manner as that in which they are specified for the electrical department or for the Washington Aqueduct.

Of course, it would be useless to seek to make a change in the bill, but it does seem to me that there is room for reform in that regard.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Public schools," on page 38, line 9, after the words "normal school," to strike out "$800" and insert "$900," so as to make the clause read:

Special beginning teacher in the normal school, $900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 11, after the word "teachers," to strike out "$1,397,950" and insert "$1,398,050" so as to make the clause read:

In all for teachers, $1,398,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 18, after the word "therewith," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and repair of furniture, tools, machinery, material, and books, and apparatus to be used in connection with instruction in manual training, and incidental expenses connected therewith, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 2, to insert:

For complete equipment and furnishing of the Western High School, including necessary repairs to existing equipment, to be immediately available, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 20, to insert:

For the employment of temporary personal services, to be immediately available, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 22, to insert:

Hereafter all pupils whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District of Columbia shall be admitted and taught free of charge in the schools of said District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 16, to insert:

For an eight-room addition, including an assembly hall, to the Powell School, $66,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 18, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to close public areas which may lie wholly within the boundaries of any site purchased for the Eastern High School, and the same, when so closed, shall be used as a part of said site.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to know what that means.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order upon this amendment that it involves general legislation on an appropriation bill. It gives authority to close streets, which the commissioners have not at the present time; and I object to the amendment upon that ground.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a law of the District of Columbia that provides how and in what manner streets, alleys, and uninclosed commons may be vacated? Is there such a law?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand there is no general authority to the commissioners to close these streets, and the effect of this——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the inquiry of the Chair. The Chair's inquiry is as to whether there is a law of the District of Columbia that provides what steps shall be taken for the purpose of closing streets and alleys.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I do not think there is any objection to this on the part of anybody. It is in order to perfect the school site.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is objection, and the objection was brought to my attention.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will simply say, then, that no objection was offered to us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is making an inquiry, about which the Chair would like to have information from the chairman of the committee or from some one who knows, as to whether there is a law of the District of Columbia which fixes the procedure with reference to the closing of streets and alleys.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If there is such a law, then that law would control, and this amendment could not change it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly. That is why the Chair is making the inquiry before ruling on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If there is not such a law, this undertakes to create the power.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, there was an understanding that this bill will not be finished this evening; and I join with the Senator from Georgia in the request that this matter had better be looked into. Protests against it have been made to me, and I ask the Senator from Maryland if he will not consent that this amendment shall go over until to-morrow?

Mr. GALLINGER. Before it goes over, if the Senator will permit me, there is no law giving authority for the closing of streets and alleys except by special act. As I understand the matter, a site has been selected for the Eastern High School; and there are a couple of little highways, of no consequence at all, that it is desired to have closed. The committee, upon looking into the matter, thought it was proper that they should be closed. I apprehend that the objection that comes to the Senator comes from parties in the eastern part of the city who are contesting the site that has been selected for the school.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say that I do not know the motives behind this request. I am not advised as to the merit of their objection, but I should like to have an opportunity to look into it. I do not know that I will agree with the gentlemen who are protesting against it. I should simply like to have an opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Personally, I concur with the Senator in the request that it go over. If he desires to have that done, I think the amendment ought not to be pressed to-night.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The point of order I make upon the amendment, I think, carries it out. I make the point of order I have already stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been trying to get information, and will rule only upon the information that has been given. The rule is that—

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is not general legislation.

Th VICE PRESIDENT. If there were a law of the District of Columbia which provided the method whereby streets, alleys, and uninclosed commons were to be vacated, then the Chair would be clearly of opinion that this is general legislation, being amendatory of that law; but as the statement is made that there is no such law, the Chair rules that this is not general legislation, but simply special legislation with reference to a particular plat of ground.

Mr. GALLINGER. For a special purpose. Beyond question that is a correct ruling; but I think probably the matter had better go over until to-morrow, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if there is no law on the subject, then the general law is that they can not close the streets. They have not the power to close them. That becomes the general law of the land. Nobody can close a street belonging to the Government without authority. That is the general law of the land.

Mr. GALLINGER. But we are giving authority in this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill gives authority.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When it is undertaken in this bill to give the authority, it becomes general legislation, changing a general law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; it does not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to agree with the proposition that where the amendment deals with a single subject it is general in its character.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that if you will look at it you will see that this amendment delegates general authority to close streets in any part of the city, without specifying what streets are to be closed. Now, if the commissioners came in here and said they wanted to close certain streets on a fixed site which they had selected, it would be a different matter; but here they are given authority to close streets in any part of the city—the authority which Congress itself possesses and always has held in its own hands. They should be at least asked to submit a statement of the streets they wish closed. This legislation is general in that respect and gives a very large authority, it seems to me, and one that it is undesirable to grant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As to the advisability of granting it, that is a question for the Senate; and it is also a question for the Senate on an appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair is very clear that it is nothing except special legislation in regard to the site for the Eastern High School.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The chairman of the committee has consented that the matter may go over until morning, and then we will have some definite information about what the law is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is agreed, then, that the amendment goes over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before it goes over I ask the attention of the Senator from Mississippi. I want to read two or three answers made by the chairman of the board of education. He says just this:

A street never has been opened, and Eighteenth Street is merely a rough roadway that has been made by wagons going through the squares from East Capitol to B Street.

Senator SMITH of Maryland. Does that have a bearing upon the site of the school?

Mr. BLAIR. The school site selected is four squares, and these two streets intersect those squares.

Senator SMITH of Maryland. Is there any opposition to that on the part of the people down there?

Mr. BLAIR. We have not received the slightest intimation of any opposition.

It is merely a rough roadway through the site that has been selected for this school.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As I said a moment ago, I know nothing about the question at issue, and have not looked into it. A couple of gentlemen came to me and requested that I look into the matter, and for that reason I asked that it might go over. I may not have any objection to it in the morning at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment goes over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 49, after line 2, to insert:

Hereafter any balance remaining after the purchase of sites for buildings which is necessary to clean up, grade, drain, fence in, and place the sites in safe and suitable condition for the purposes intended may be used for such purposes; and in the event of the purchase of property with buildings or other improvements thereon, any funds or amounts remaining or realized after the removal of such structures may be

applied for the purpose of putting the sites in a condition suitable for the uses for which they were purchased.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I make the point order that this is legislation of a general character. The law now turns this money back into the Treasury. This changes the use of the money.

Mr. LANE. Further than that, Mr. President, it allows them to convert a fund apparently after removing structures of some sort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the statement of the Senator from Georgia, the point of order is sustained.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Metropolitan police," on page 50, line 13, before the word "privates," to strike out "20" and insert "24"; in line 15, after the word "crime," strike out "$4,800" and insert "$5,760"; and on page 51, line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "$916,300.49" and insert "$917,260.49"; so as to make the clause read:

Major and superintendent, $4,000; assistant superintendent with rank of inspector, $2,500; three inspectors, at $1,800 each; 11 captains, at $1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, $2,000; clerk and stenographer, $1,500; clerk, who shall be assistant property clerk, $1,200; 3 clerks, at $1,000 each; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at $720 each; additional compensation for 24 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, $5,760, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 13 lieutenants, one of whom shall be harbor master, at $1,320 each; 46 sergeants, one of whom may be detailed for duty in the harbor patrol, at $1,250 each; 490 privates of class 3, at $1,200 each; 124 privates of class 2, at $1,080 each; 26 privates of class 1, at $900 each; amount required to pay salaries of privates of class 2 who will be promoted to class 3 and privates of class 1 who will be promoted to class 2 during the fiscal year 1916, $2,080.49; 6 telephone operators, at $720 each; 14 janitors, at $600 each; messengers—1, $700, 1, $600; inspector, mounted on horse or motor cycle, $240; 55 captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on horses or motor cycles, at $240 each; 64 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on bicycles, at $50 each; 20 drivers, at $840 each; 5 police matrons, at $600 each, to possess police power of arrest; in all, $917,260.49.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 14, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance of motor vehicles, $6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 16, to insert:

For the reconstruction of cell corridors, and the making, erecting, and placing therein, in the second precinct station house, of eight modern locking devices, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 20, after the words "In all," to strike out "$47,600" and insert "$53,600," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $53,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Fire department," on page 53, line 23, after the words "chief clerk," to strike out "$1,800" and insert "$2,000," so as to read:

Chief engineer, $3,500; deputy chief engineer, $2,500; three battalion chief engineers, at $2,000 each; fire marshal, $2,000; deputy fire marshal, $1,400; 2 inspectors, at $1,080 each; chief clerk, $2,000; clerk, $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next item was, in the item of appropriation for salaries of employees of the fire department, on page 54, line 9, after "$600," to insert "mechanician, who shall have had not less than five years' experience in the actual building and repair of motor vehicles, $1,400; 2 machinists, at $1,200 each; electrician, $1,200; boilermaker and blacksmith, $1,200; painter, $1,200; clerk, $1,000; machinists' helper, $900; and skilled laborer, $600"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "$568,230" and insert "$578,330," so as to read:

Hostler, $600; laborer, $600; mechanician, who shall have had not less than five years' experience in the actual building and repair of motor vehicles, $1,400; 2 machinists, at $1,200 each; electrician, $1,200; boilermaker and blacksmith, $1,200; painter, $1,200; clerk, $1,000; machinist's helper, $900; and skilled laborer, $600; in all, $578,330.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 14, to insert:

Hereafter no removal from the force of the fire department of the District of Columbia shall be made except on written charges and after an opportunity for defense on the part of the person against whom such charges may be made, but no person so removed shall be reappointed to any position in said fire department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 25, after the word "appliances," to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$8,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs to apparatus and motor vehicles and other motor-driven apparatus, and for new apparatus, new motor vehicles, and new appliances, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for the fire department, on page 55, line 4, after the word "forage," to strike out "$32,250" and insert "$35,000," so as to make the clause read:

For forage, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 10, after the words "In all," to strike out "$129,050" and insert "$124,800," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $124,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 14, to insert:

For 2 combination chemical and hose wagons, motor driven, $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, after the words "In all," to strike out "$14,200" and insert "$26,200," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $26,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to page 57, line 13, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For enforcement of the provisions of an act to prevent the spread of contagious diseases in the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1897, and an act for the prevention of scarlet fever, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, epidemic cerebrospinal meningitis, and typhoid fever in the District of Columbia, approved February 9, 1907, and an act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District, approved May 13, 1908, under the direction of the health officer of said District, and for the prevention of other communicable diseases, including salaries or compensation for personal services, not exceeding $12,000, when ordered in writing by the commissioners and necessary for the enforcement and execution of said acts, and for the prevention of such other communicable diseases as hereinbefore provided, purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, purchase of reference books and medical journals, and maintenance of quarantine station and smallpox hospital, $25,000: *Provided*, That any bacteriologist employed under this appropriation shall not be paid more than $6 per day and may be assigned by the health officer to the bacteriological examination of milk and other dairy products and of the water supplies of dairy farms, and to such other sanitary work as in the judgment of the health officer may promote the public health, whether such examinations be or be not directly related to contagious diseases.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to inquire whether these numerous employees of the health department are any of them selected under the rules of the civil service?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is my impression that they are not.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 57, after line 12, to insert:

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is hereby given the power to apprehend, detain, and treat all persons suffering from leprosy in the District of Columbia, and he shall, under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, make such regulations as may be necessary for this purpose.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask why this jurisdiction is given to the Surgeon General? Is it not altogether exceptional to select one disease and say that the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service shall have jurisdiction over it, when everything else is placed under the health officer?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator it was reported to us that in a case of leprosy here no one has authority to handle it. We felt that authority ought to be lodged in some one to take charge of it.

Mr. BURTON. Why should the Surgeon General have it, rather than the health office?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This was the recommendation of the commissioners. They came before us and stated that there are two cases of leprosy here. The commissioners said:

The commissioners had supposed that these two men were subject to certain Federal quarantine regulations, and upon the coming into the District of Early again we invited the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury to the situation and called his attention to some of his own regulations promulgated under Public Health Service laws of the country in reference to his case, in the hope and expectation that he would be taken charge of by the Federal authorities. That has not been done, and I do not know certainly what the view of the Federal authorities is on that subject.

After the matter was brought to our attention we asked the parties who were before us to suggest how it should be managed, and this was the suggestion made and adopted by us. If it does not suit the Senator from Ohio, of course, he may have some better remedy to suggest.

Mr. BURTON. It seems rather a singular provision that an exception should be made in this one case. I would suggest that those who appeared before this committee and advocated this paragraph do not seem to have provided any way for the disposition of these leprosy patients. Is there any hospital to which they are assigned? There was a case here which attracted a great deal of public attention. I take it this disease is not a very frequent one in the District.

Mr. GALLINGER. There was a case of leprosy here that became exceedingly troublesome. The health officer took jurisdiction over that case for a time, and the sufferer was confined in a building on a Government reservation. He afterwards left the District but, I believe, has returned. One other case has developed, I understand, so that there are two cases here now.

I do not know whether this is a wise provision or not, and yet it would seem desirable that there should be some official who would have authority to isolate those cases.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not true that some of the best attorneys in the city claim that there is no authority to apprehend them or isolate them?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that to be the case.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why this provision was put in the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely.

Mr. BURTON. Why is it not included under the preceding paragraph on page 56? Is it regarded as not a contagious disease?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a disputed matter, and it has always been a disputed subject. I think it is agreed that continuous association with a leper may result in others taking the disease. I think that is true of the establishment in Hawaii, where there is a leper colony. It is not, however, an acutely contagious disease; and from what knowledge I have of it, as a rule, it is not contagious.

Mr. SMOOT. The only way the disease can be contracted is by a person coming in contact with a towel used by one having the disease or with clothing worn by him. One may live in a community with a leper all his life and never contract leprosy unless he comes in direct contact with the leper himself or with some article of clothing he has worn or some article which he has handled.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand it, the Surgeon General has some doubt of his right to restrain or to place in seclusion one having this disease. Is the Senator from New Hampshire able to state any reason why such jurisdiction should be given to the Surgeon General?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not.

Mr. BURTON. And can the Senator also state why no provision seems to be made here for the isolation of the patient?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I can not give any reason for it. I think I was not at the committee meeting when that was inserted. I think such jurisdiction might more properly be placed in the hands of the health officer of the District of Columbia, and such patients might be confined in a building on a Government reservation over which we have jurisdiction. It may be the provision in the bill is a wiser one. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. BURTON. I should ask for a vote on this amendment, except for the fact that at least a part of it may be desirable legislation; and, as the bill goes to conference, this question can then be settled. It certainly seems to be rather a peculiar provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, with the permission of the chairman of the committee, I desire to send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, which I intend to offer tomorrow; and I ask that it may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 57, after line 18, to insert:

For repairs to the smallpox hospital and administration building, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 20, to insert:

For the extension of water mains to provide fire protection for the smallpox hospital, $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 16, on page 58, the last paragraph read being as follows:

Bacteriological laboratory: For maintaining and keeping in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals, $300.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 58, line 16, after the word "periodicals," it is proposed to strike out the sum "$300" and in lieu thereof to insert "$1,000."

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if he has any information other than what was before the committee on that particular item?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will ask the Secretary to read the letter which has been received by me, and which I send to the the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 8, 1915.

Hon. JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Chairman Subcommittee on District Appropriation Bill,
United States Senate.

SIR: In the District appropriation bill reported to the Senate on the 5th instant, on page 58, lines 14, 15, and 16, appears the following item:

"Bacteriological laboratory: For maintaining and keeping in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals, $300."

In the estimates submitted by the commissioners, the cost of maintaining the bacteriological laboratory and keeping it in good order, and of purchasing reference books and scientific periodicals, during the fiscal year 1916 was stated as $1,000. This is the exact amount appropriated for this purpose during the fiscal year 1914.

For the fiscal year 1915—the current fiscal year—only $300 was appropriated for the maintenance of the bacteriological laboratory and the purchase of books and periodicals, but that amount was supplemented by an appropriation of $2,000 for the purchase and installation of new apparatus, and an appropriation of $1,000 for the replacement of apparatus and supplies. However, since no appropriation was asked for the purchase and installation of new apparatus and for the replacement of apparatus and supplies during the fiscal year 1916, and none has been included in the bill as reported, all expenses properly covered by these two captions will during the fiscal year 1916 have to be borne from the appropriation for maintaining the bacteriological laboratory and keeping it in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals; and for all these purposes the amount stated in the bill as reported to the Senate, $300, is, the health officer states, utterly inadequate.

The commissioners are informed by the health officer that if only $300 be appropriated for this work, the operations of the laboratory will necessarily be seriously curtailed. There will have to be either a general reduction in the amount of work done for the contagious-disease service and for the food-inspection service, or all of the work done for the food-inspection service, with possibly a part of the work done for the contagious-disease service, will have to be omitted; or, with the exception of the examination of sputa from patients possibly tuberculous, which is required by law, all of the work done for the contagious-disease service and a part of the work done in the food-inspection service must be discontinued.

For the reasons stated, it is urged that the amount estimated by the commissioners for maintaining the bacteriological laboratory and keeping it in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals, namely, $1,000, be appropriated.

Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
By O. P. NEWMAN, *President.*

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] is busy before the Committee on Military Affairs, and he has requested me to ask that the amendment on page 47, beginning in line 19 and going to line 23, and also the amendment on page 49, beginning in line 3 and ending at line 11, go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would state to the Senator from Colorado that one of those amendments was passed over and the other went out on a point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Which amendment went out on a point of order?

Mr. GALLINGER. The amendment on page 49.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then I have no request to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 58, after line 16, to insert:

Chemical laboratory: For the purchase and installation of new apparatus and equipment, $2,080; for the replacement of apparatus and equipment, $755; and for maintaining and keeping in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals, $500; in all, $3,335.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 23, to insert:

The examinations, inspection, rules, and regulations concerning the milk supply of the District of Columbia shall be applied alike to each State shipping milk into said District.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill what is the necessity for that provision? Have different rules and regulations been applied to the various States shipping milk to the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that there was some complaint brought to the attention of the committee to the effect that there have been discriminations in the inspection of milk coming from different States, and we felt that this amendment would do no harm; I do not know whether it will

do any good; but it certainly can not be objected to, because it merely states that the rules and regulations affecting the examination of milk from the different States shall be applied alike.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to know who has been responsible for the discrimination?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know that there have been any discriminations, but there has been complaint that the inspectors have not inspected as rigidly milk from some States as they have milk from other States. At any rate that is the claim.

Mr. KENYON. Do the inspectors who have been guilty of these discriminations still hold their positions?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not say that they have been guilty; I do not know, but there has been some complaint that such has been the case. I do not know whether such is the case or not; but we felt it would do no harm to put this provision in the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the complaint which was made was that the inspectors—and the corps of inspectors which the health officer has at his disposal is limited—can not in the nature of things visit dairy herds in Ohio and in New York as frequently as they can visit dairy herds in Maryland and in Virginia. Under existing conditions it seems to be a physical impossibility for them to do so; and yet the health officer, who has devoted a considerable part of his annual report to the discussion of the milk question, insists that the health office is doing everything in its power in this matter; that there is not any real ground for the complaint, and that he thought if an amendment similar to this were adopted it would not make any difference in the administration of the law.

In this connection I desire to say, and it is proper that I should say, for the health officer of the District that no official in any department of our Government is more conscientious, earnest, and active in the enforcement of the law pertaining to the public health than is Dr. Woodward. I know that he has a special interest in the matter of the milk supply; it is something of a hobby with him. He wants the laws now on the statute books improved, and I think there is a bill pending in one or both Houses of Congress with that end in view; but it has not yet become a law.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that the health officer, however, stated that there was no objection to this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, yes; he said that it could do no harm.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he thinks that the mere declaration in this bill that the milk inspectors hereafter shall not do that which they seem heretofore to have done will avoid discrimination in the inspection of milk supplied to the District of Columbia by the different States? It appears to me that if there is any cause for this statement in the bill, that discrimination shall not be made, it naturally follows that discrimination has been made; and if discrimination has been made, the best way to get at that, it seems to me, is the removal of the men who are responsible for the discrimination rather than to say in a provision of the bill containing no penalty that they ought not to do it any more.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment merely gives notice to the inspectors that milk which comes from Pennsylvania or from New York or from any other State must be inspected in the same way as milk coming from Maryland or from Virginia; but as it is easier to inspect the herds and the dairies in Virginia and Maryland than it is in more distant States, if the amendment is adopted of course Maryland and Virginia will have the advantage in selling milk to the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not see why.

Mr. SMOOT. For the reason, Mr. President, that it is impossible——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will ask the Senator if he does not think if there is a milk inspection that all should be treated alike, and that the same rule should be observed as to the milk supply of one State that is observed as to the milk supply of another?

Mr. SMOOT. I am only saying what the result will be. The result will be that the inspectors will not be able to go to Ohio and to inspect the dairies in that State or those in West Virginia on account of the expense attached; but they will be able to go to Maryland and Virginia and inspect the dairies there and the conditions surrounding them. If they go to Maryland and Virginia and inspect the dairies, then they ought to go to Ohio and to Pennsylvania and to West Virginia; and unless they do so, there will be a discrimination. As I understand, that is why complaint has been made, namely, that the dairies have not been inspected in those States, whereas in Maryland and in Virginia they had been inspected.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Be that as it may, it does seem to me that the inspection should be the same as to milk from all the States. Certainly I can not see any good reason why the milk from one State should be subject to an inspection and the milk from another State not be subject to a like inspection.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not complaining of the inspection; I am simply saying what the result will be of this provision in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Of course an advantage may possibly accrue to the nearby States, but there should be no advantage given and no preference given to one State over another in enforcing rules as to the quality of milk to be shipped.

Mr. SMOOT. The result will be that the dairymen of Virginia and of Maryland will make complaint if the inspection is not the same in the case of milk coming from Ohio and from Pennsylvania as in the case of milk coming from the States in which they live. That will be the result of this declaration in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether the regulations require that before milk shall be brought into the District and sold, the dairies from which that milk comes shall be inspected?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do.

Mr. LODGE. Or do they simply require the milk to be inspected when it reaches the District line?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think there is an inspection here also.

Mr. SMOOT. An inspection is not required very often—that is, on any given date or so many times each year—but an inspection is required before the milk can enter the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The object, I think, is to inspect the dairies and the manner in which the cattle are kept in the various States as a safeguard before the milk is shipped. Probably there has been—I do not know whether there has been or not—complaint made that there has been a difference in the inspection. I will say that the health officer does not object to this provision.

Mr. LODGE. Is there an inspection of milk that comes in over the railroads where there has been no inspection of the dairy?

Mr. GALLINGER. Every sample is inspected.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It is all inspected?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is all inspected.

I want to say in this connection that the health officer has been extremely diligent in his work, as is evidenced by the fact that there were 171 prosecutions in the last year in the District. I understand that charges have been made in some of the New York papers that the milk supply of the District of Columbia is very impure. I do not think there is any justification for that statement. Admitting that the inspectors, who are few in number, can not go to Ohio and to northern New York and inspect diaries as frequently as they do in Virginia and in Maryland, I feel sure that for the most part they are performing their duty very diligently. They can not take a sample of milk from every dairy at the farm and analyze it; that would be impossible; it would take hundreds of men to do that; but every invoice of milk that comes into the District of Columbia is inspected and, if necessary, analyzed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. In addition to what the Senator has said, I wish to say that the inspections are made as often as the appropriation will allow.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. We appropriate so much money, and they can not make the inspections any oftener than they do.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It seems to me, then, if this inspection is to apply only to certain localities near by, and milk is to be received from other places without inspection, that we had better abolish this inspection, and have it only in the District of Columbia. If one State is to be subject to inspection, and inspectors are to be sent into that State, and they are not to be sent into other States unless the authorities see fit to do so, on account of the distance, then we had better abolish this plan and have some other means of inspecting the milk supply.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to offer a suggestion. This language is:

The examinations, inspections, rules, and regulations concerning the milk supply of the District of Columbia shall be applied alike to each State shipping milk into said District.

In my own State, for instance, the different boards of health in the various municipalities are very strict in requiring the inspection of the dairies, the testing of milk, and so forth. If the rules adopted by the board of health here require an inspection of all these dairies by local inspectors, of course it is going to work a hardship; but could not this be changed in some way so as to permit the shipping of milk into the District, for instance, from Ohio, provided the dairies and the cows there are inspected and subjected to tests, just as they are for the local markets?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That would be all right; but let that apply to the other States, too. The States near by here have their local inspection, State inspection, and very rigid inspection; but I claim that there is no justification for having the inspection in one State more rigid than that in another. Let it be equal. If it is not necessary to have the milk in the State of Ohio or in the State of New York inspected by the Government, then let us abolish the law and cease to inspect it in all the States.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not objecting at all to inspection. I believe in very rigid inspection and testing of milk, and so forth, that comes in for consumption; but I do not feel that it should be a condition precedent to the shipment of milk to this District from other States to have an inspection by your local inspectors.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland, both, that if you should require the milk when it comes here to be accompanied by a certificate showing that the dairy from which it came had been inspected by the State authorities, it seems to me that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. POMERENE. There is no objection to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if you are going to make that apply to Ohio, of course it should apply to Virginia and to Maryland or any other State.

Mr. POMERENE. I simply used Ohio as an illustration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It might be well to amend it so as to require that the milk shall be accompanied by a certificate from the proper State authorities that the dairy whence it came had been inspected.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. All that this is intended for is that all shall be treated alike.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; that would be a way of treating all alike.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the local inspection is sufficient for the State of Ohio or the State of New York, it ought to be sufficient for the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator is right about that. They ought all to be treated alike. This is a way of treating them alike and still preserving the autonomy of each State and paying some due, courteous respect to its authorities.

Mr. POMERENE. There may be one plan of inspection here in the District and another in each of the several States, and they may be equally efficient but different in form.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Then, if you want to give protection, provide that an inspection of a certain character and kind shall be certified as having taken place, and put the kind of inspection in the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. That would be better.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I wish to suggest that I have heard complaints from farmers in the vicinity of Washington that there is uncertainty as to the value of the inspections. I heard a farmer say that one inspector inspected a herd in his vicinity and condemned them as unhealthy within 30 days after they had been inspected by a former inspector, who pronounced them healthy; and then, later, the inspector of another State came along and inspected the same herd, and pronounced them all right. Now, what is the farmer to do? Two inspectors representing one authority differed as to the condition of health of the herd, and another representing another authority differed from them. The farmer is subject to all, because he markets his milk in both States.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then it would look as if they were overinspected.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not doubt it. I think there ought to be some system by which it could be tested, and then the farmer could know when his herd was all right and when it was not, and not be harrassed by continual inspectors disagreeing as to the healthful condition of his herd.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. At the same time, the Senator will agree that they ought all to be treated alike, I think.

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly; but I do think some provision ought to be made to protect the farmer as well as the consumer. I know a farmer who lost more than half of his herd. When he bought the cows they were all certified by an inspector as being in perfectly healthy condition; then another inspector came along and condemned them, and ordered them to be shot. I do think there ought to be some protection against incidents of that kind. The matter is too serious to the man who incurs the loss. It may be treated lightly by those who do not incur any loss, but it is a mighty serious thing to the man who does.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know enough about the regulations of the District of Columbia or what is required here to speak with any authority upon this subject, but I do know that it is a matter of the very utmost importance to try to secure a good milk supply for a great city.

In my State, in the great city of Boston, we have very strict laws, and yet we are exposed to this state of affairs: The railroads bring in milk picked up at the stations through Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine which never has been inspected in those States, inspection not being required because the milk is going out of the State. It is brought into Massachusetts, and we can not do anything about it, because it would be an interference with interstate commerce. That creates a very real danger in the milk supply.

I think the District of Columbia, which has a large city, Washington, ought to have proper protection in regard to its milk supply. It is of the utmost importance that it should be good to prevent the spread of disease among both children and adults. It is impossible for us to send inspectors all over the States to look after herds everywhere, but certainly there should be some inspection of milk brought into the District over the cars, of which the authorities here may not know the origin at all.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is inspected after it is brought here.

Mr. BRISTOW. But may I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not just as important that the farmer who owns the herds should be treated with proper consideration? If we are going to have a good milk supply here, it is necessary that the farmers who produce the milk shall have some certainty as to the character and quality of the inspection; otherwise, it discourages the business.

Mr. LODGE. I think the first thing to be guarded in the matter is the public health—particularly the health of children. I think that is much more important.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senators that we are going to get the rules that apply to the District, and tomorrow we will take up this matter in that regard.

Mr. POMERENE. Then this amendment will be passed over until to-morrow?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We will pass over this amendment for the present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Maryland, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 12, 1915.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Adrienne G. Wilson, Russellville.

ARIZONA.

Lawrence S. Williams, Williams.

ARKANSAS.

Lawrence D. Ballew, Des Arc.
Benjamin C. Milhoan, Hartford.

CALIFORNIA.

W. A. Dickey, Chino.
George R. Frampton, Artesia.
S. J. Hindmann, Inglewood.
Harry Hines, Santa Monica.
W. B. King, Atwater.
John Mitchell, Ontario.
C. D. Overshiner, Santa Ana.
Lewis C. Poor, Sherman.
Nathan L. Rannells, La Jolla.
Alfred W. Rozier, Tuolumne.
Leota M. Stewart, Rialto.

COLORADO.

James M. Brown, Mancos.
Walstien N. Haas, Silverton.
Virgil C. Ledford, Craig.

Thomas Mowatt, Ouray.
J. W. C. Shepherd, Meeker.
D. Lee Staley, Telluride.
John Uglow, Olathe.

CONNECTICUT.

George H. Foley, Mystic.
William E. Hanley, Stafford Springs.
Everett I. Pardee, Cheshire.

DELAWARE.

George R. Mears, Georgetown.

GEORGIA.

William T. Adkins, Edison.
Wilbur S. Freeman, Claxton.
T. B. Perry, Camilla.
Fannie Lou Smith, Reidsville.

HAWAII.

Edward B. Friel, Lahaina.

IDAHO.

James Campbell, Hope.
Kenneth G. Phelps, Richfield.

ILLINOIS.

John T. Carroll, Toluca.
Joseph C. Lampert, Lena.
John R. Paskell, Henry.
Glen Petefish, Virginia.

INDIANA.

Frank E. Campbell, Red Key.
Edward E. Cox, Hartford City.
George W. Doyle, Vanburen.
Alfred M. Hiatt, Pennville.
B. F. Houseman, Dunkirk.
John Postma, Milford.
Charles W. Reed, Upland.
Ellis S. Rees, Winamac.
Don C. Ward, Union City.

IOWA.

Thomas J. Capper, Elgin.
Harry H. Cate, Anita.
William Cohrt, Gladbrook.
Patrick H. Donlon, Emmetsburg.
H. E. Eiel, Buffalo Center.
John Hickey, Vail.
Edward J. Kooreman, Alton.
Fank McShane, Springfield.
F. D. Mead, Cresco.
Stanley Miller, Mount Pleasant.
William J Nelson, Grinnell.
Ella C. Nolan, Ruthven.
Jesse A. Winger, Newton.

KANSAS.

Claud Alley, Oxford.
James W. Adams, Lebanon.
Roscoe R. Beam, Anthony.
John T. Brothers, National Military Home.
William F. Grosser, Salina.
George S. Hartley, Arkansas City.
John W. Lapham, Chanute.
George A. Milliman, Oakley.
Edwin F. Moody, Onaga.
Thomas Torgeson, White City.

KENTUCKY.

William H. Atteberry, Munfordville.
Charles Hadden, Jackson.

MAINE.

Alvin E. Dresser, Millbridge.

MICHIGAN.

William A. Atyeo, Belleville.

MISSISSIPPI.

Richard H. Coke, Mendenhall.

MISSOURI.

Frank D. Ball, Holden.
Arthur L. Carter, Fairfax.
Robert L. Hamilton, Salisbury.
A. E. Michie, Webb City.
J. B. Smith, Farmington.
D. F. Willm, Crystal City.
Bennett Wardlow, Lancaster.
Peter J. Weber, Tipton.
M. B. Yates, Pattonsburg.
Will H. Zorn, Westplains.

MONTANA.

J. H. Hines, Valier.
David J. Kane, East Helena.

NEBRASKA.

I. R. Darnell, Benkelman.
Fanny Dworak, Howell.
Claude B. Grace, Trenton.
W. H. Latham, Curtis.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Andrew D. Davis, North Conway.
Charles E. Shepard, New London.

NEW JERSEY.

Maude V. Richer, Audubon.

NEW YORK.

Patrick H. Lyons, Kings Park.
Roy J. Paxon, Akron.

NORTH CAROLINA.

R. S. Newton, Southport.
William M. Henry, Brevard.
Walter S. Thomas, Rockingham.

OHIO.

Eugene C. Chapman, Plain City.
Freda M. Milligan, Lowellville.

OREGON.

Cornelius Buchanan, Florence.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

J. Henry Bodie, Leesville.
Clarence D. Cooper, Mayesville.
George W. Dick, Sumter.
Frank George, Lexington.
Alva K. Lorenz, Aiken.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

W. L. Butler, Frankfort.
John L. Davis, Letcher.
William Spencer, Onida.
Lewis E. Whitcher, Highmore.

TEXAS.

Monroe R. Allen, Weimer.
J. L. Crawford, San Benito.
Paul L. Alexander, Lamesa.
Cicero Harper, Moran.
J. Lester Hodges, Junction.
E. A. Shelton, El Paso.
Virgil E. Todd, Gilmer.
A. H. Wolfe, Ladonia.

VERMONT.

James A. Donahue, Essex Junction.
Frederick L. Smith, Brandon.

VIRGINIA.

Frank L. Sublett, Harrisonburg.

WASHINGTON.

John J. Carney, Aberdeen.
J. E. Janosky, Connell.
W. F. Roberts, jr., Elma.
William Rouse, Stanwood.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. F. Beatty, Mannington.
Charles E. Manley, Fairmont.

WYOMING.

C. E. Nolan, Superior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 12, 1915.*

The House met at 11 oclock a. m.

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

Thou who art the light of the world, the inspiration of all real greatness, the hope of our salvation, fill the hearts, we beseech Thee, of these Thy servants with true patriotism, that they may rise to the dignity of statesmen on every question of moment, on every vital issue that may come before them, that the people of this great Nation whom they represent may be faithfully and efficiently served. In the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord and Master. Amen.

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

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 703 (H. Rept. 1276).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of H. J. Res. 1. There shall be not exceeding six hours' general debate, to be divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. At the conclusion of such general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final passage, without any intervening motion, except one motion to recommit: *Provided*, That all Members speaking upon the resolution or amendments offered thereto shall have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD, and all Members shall have the right to print remarks for not exceeding five legislative days: *Provided further*, That all debate shall be confined to the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] about how much time he desires for discussion of the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have considerable requests for time. Has the gentleman from Texas any suggestion as to time on the rule?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me an hour ought to be sufficient, 30 minutes on a side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have requests for more time than that.

Mr. HENRY. Does not the gentleman think he could get along with 30 minutes on his side? There will be 6 hours of general debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish the gentleman from Texas would suggest an hour on a side.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be two hours of debate on the rule, one hour to be controlled by myself and one hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], at the end of which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that debate on the rule be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and that at the end of the two hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas what the rule provides as to debate on the main proposition?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for six hours of general debate, and then the Mondell amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Were the six hours agreed upon without difficulty in the committee in fixing the resolution as to the amount of time that should properly be allotted for the discussion of this subject?

Mr. HENRY. I think there was considerable difficulty. Some gentleman wanted much longer time than six hours for general debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose there is not really going to be any discussion of the rule itself, is there? It is going to be on the main proposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The discussion, of course, will be on the main proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MANN. Ordering the previous question will probably save time. Otherwise there might be a roll call; and if agreement can be reached to order the previous question, in the end is it not better to give that much time to the debate, where gentlemen desire it?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the debate were confined to the rule, I will say frankly to the gentleman from Illinois that I would not object, but I have really grown a trifle weary of rules being brought in here and then discussions upon the main proposition being had instead of upon the rule. I am willing always, and always have been, to have liberal debate upon great propositions like this, when it is to be upon the main proposition, but evasion and debating of the main proposition under the guise of debating the rule does not appeal to me.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a practical proposition. Unless the gentleman from Texas should move the previous question within an hour's time, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I take it, or somebody else would be entitled to be recognized for an hour, and at the end of the two hours the previous question would still not be ordered.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas could now move the previous question.

Mr. MANN. He can move it any time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would leave 20 minutes of debate on a side on the rule, and that is what I am in favor of.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I make this suggestion, that we agree that the previous question shall be considered as ordered at the end of one hour and a half debate on the rule—45 minutes to be controlled by myself and 45 by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]—and we will really save time by that, if we order the previous question now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule shall not exceed an hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by himself and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas, and that at the end of an hour and a half the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my colleague from Texas a question for the general information of the House. Does the gentleman propose to conclude this matter on this legislative day?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; the intention is to finish it to-night.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, there is to be six hours of general debate and an hour and a half, which would make seven hours and a half of debate, which with the consideration under the five-minute rule would take it at least until 8 o'clock.

Mr. HENRY. I think we can easily finish it by 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. GARNER. I ask for information both for myself and other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the rule is plain enough. It provides that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider the Mondell suffrage amendment, and then for general debate not to exceed six hours. After that the resolution shall be considered under the five-minute rule allowing the utmost freedom of amendment and debate. Therefore there is nothing in the terms of the rule that makes it severe or unreasonable, and I take it that the House is ready to meet this question fairly and to vote whether or not we shall grant the women of this country the elective franchise.

Democratic Representatives have already met in caucus during this Congress and decided by a record vote that this is a State question, and the proposition should be remanded to the respective States for solution and settlement. I assume that gentlemen of my party are now ready for a record vote in this House as in the Democratic caucus, and take the same stand they did when they had it up for consideration in our party deliberations. And I assume also that gentlemen on that side of the House are ready to meet this important question, which is a great issue. There has been much agitation and consideration, and I have always taken the position that when any great problem like this has been before the American people and they have considered it that their Representatives should accord to them the privilege of considering it on the floor of this House. As far as I am concerned, after mature consideration I have come to a conclusion and shall have no difficulty in supporting the special rule which brings it before the House and less difficulty in casting my vote against the Mondell amendment and raising my voice against it. Recently, on the 22d day of December, we have before this House the Hobson amendment providing for national prohibition, and I voted and spoke against that amendment. In the course of my remarks I took occasion to say that if there are any two questions that pertain to the jurisdiction of the States they are those in regard to the police powers and the right of suffrage. When this Government was fashioned by the Constitution of 1789 if it had been proposed in any State in this Union that we should take the police powers away from the States or that we should lay the hands of the Federal Government on the rights of citizens to vote according to the constitutions and laws of the various States, there would not have been a single State of the original 13 in their constitutional conventions that would have voted to ratify this amendment.

Indeed many historians think that if the Constitution as originally drawn had been submitted to a popular vote of the people in the thirteen States it would not have been ratified, as was done by the various State conventions, and so narrow was

the margin in several States, even after the first 10 amendments had been tentatively agreed upon, that the Constitution almost failed of ratification. And the first State that raised its voice against the Constitution as drawn was the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, upon the sole and simple ground that the rights of the State, the sovereignty and integrity and powers of the State, had not been sufficiently preserved in the original draft of the Constitution, and Samuel Adams, who sat in the Philadelphia convention and signed the Declaration of Independence, took the position that if those first 10 amendments were not proposed and agreed upon the Constitution should not be ratified. Gov. Hancock agreed with him, and it was Massachusetts that proposed to the other States that these first 10 amendments should be adopted, so that the right and the sovereignty of the people should be preserved inviolate forever. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the Representatives of the American people should take their bearing and consider whither we are drifting.

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

Mr. HENRY. I will yield for a short question.

Mr. HOBSON. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas as intimating that it might have been a preferable policy to have referred the ratification of the original Constitution to a popular vote, which would have rejected it?

Mr. HENRY. Oh, no. I think our fathers were wise at that time when they submitted the Constitution to the constitutional conventions in the various States for their action. I am only talking about what the sentiment then was, and was going on to say that until it was proposed that those 10 amendments should be proposed and adopted the Constitution never had a chance to be ratified in any one of the States of the Union, either by a popular vote of all the people or by a constitutional convention. Why, after it had been universally agreed by the people of every State in the Union that those 10 amendments were to become a part of the Constitution, Virginia, by the scant majority of 189 to 179 votes in her convention, ratified the Constitution, and there was not a difference of more than 3 votes in some of the great States that had the question under consideration.

And after Massachusetts proposed these amendments the people were persuaded to ratify the Constitution by the strongest kind of arguments from Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, in their papers published in the Federalist. And as it was the Constitution was barely adopted. I say, and repeat it again, that if anyone had proposed in any of those conventions that the people of any State should surrender their police powers or should give up their right to control suffrage in every State there would not have been a single State to ratify the original Constitution. Therefore I say that it is time for us to take our course and bearings and ascertain whither our course leads us. For my part I have long since concluded that I will not cast my vote for any amendment, no matter in what language it may be written, that will take the right away from the State to control their police powers and to absolutely determine every phase of the suffrage question in every State of the Union. Therefore I shall vote against this amendment when the House comes to a final conclusion and shall raise my voice against it here and elsewhere whenever I am called upon to give utterance to my views.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves 35 minutes. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration makes it in order to vote on the submission of an amendment to the Constitution giving the women of America the privilege of voting.

Unlike the gentleman from Texas, I favor both the rule and the resolution. The question is of very great importance. It touches the life of the Republic at every point among all its millions of inhabitants; for the better, if those who favor it are right; for the worse, if those who oppose it are right. I firmly believe that asking the women of our country to take part in the selection of our officers and in the solution of our political problems will give the Republic a new birth and a new life, for the better in all things.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is, therefore, with due deference to the opinion of the President, of greater moment than the establishment of employment agencies even after two years of Democratic administration. The President and many of his followers insist that granting the right of suffrage to women is one that must be dealt with by the States. He invokes the doctrine of State sovereignty with the same enthusiasm and confidence that others of his party invoked that doctrine in favor of human slavery in other days. The doctrine of State rights would be a better shield to use against woman's suffrage if it were also invoked against Federal authority in preventing the spread of yellow fever and the ravages of the boll weevil in Southern States and the establishment of employment agencies in the industrial centers of the North, where there are to-day so many jobless men.

Why, within the few weeks last passed the gentleman from Texas has made these walls echo with his eloquence in support of a proposition requiring the Federal Government to finance the cotton planters of Texas, taking the place of local Texas banks.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. For a question.

Mr. HENRY. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that when the Constitution was written the States expressly delegated to the Federal Government the right to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and supply an adequate amount of currency to the people of the various States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, yes; but no one has yet assumed that that grant of the Constitution imposed upon the Federal Government the duty of financing an admittedly bankrupt private enterprise in any State of the Union. What is asked here is an amendment to the Federal Constitution giving the right of franchise to half of our adult population, so that it can be exercised under the same constitutional rights as that of coining money or regulating its value as provided for in the original document. The same Constitution provided for its amendment, and here, in an orderly way, we are seeking to amend it on a most important subject.

The laws relative to the franchise and voting should be the same in all our country. Experience and conditions incident to the matter of establishing qualifications for voting argue for the same law for all parts of the country and for 1 law instead of 48 to accomplish the same general purpose. State lines have been yielding to the demands for government from Washington more and more in recent years. The selection and maintenance, therefore, of the Government at Washington, as a matter of right, should be under franchise and election laws enacted in Washington. To say the least, the opportunity should be given to amend the Constitution in this important particular, if the people of the States see fit to make the change. And the President, as the leader of his party, when he charges the opposition with not having a new idea in 30 years, should at least find some buffer for everything new that is proposed besides the doctrine of State sovereignty that surrendered at Appomattox half a century ago.

The question of woman suffrage is of first importance on both sides of the Atlantic and is associated in every mind with political and sociological changes that look to the betterment of mankind. Men have assumed the authority to govern for more than 60 centuries—20 centuries under Christian civilization—and yet men settle questions of difference to-day in Europe and America with the same barbaric force that Cain and Abel resorted to in the settlement of their first dispute.

Under the direction of men the flower of the young manhood, the pride of mothers, and the only hope of a great posterity in Europe, is to-day sacrificed in barbaric war. Young men are slaughtered by ten and hundreds of thousands, and millions are maimed for life. Standing in the dawn of the twentieth century, it all staggers the imagination.

Last April the President of the United States invoked in our own country the war forces of our Nation to settle a difference with the then President of the Republic of Mexico. The contending forces of the two countries met in the battle of Vera Cruz and the sons of 21 American mothers were killed and 155 Mexicans met their death, some of them women and children. And after the burial of the dead nothing was settled. The salute was not fired and the arms and ammunition for the President of Mexico that had Vera Cruz for their destination were landed at another Mexican port. Nothing was settled.

Mr. Speaker, the women who furnish the men to fight the battles should have something to say as to what conditions justify the battles to be fought. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to admonish the people in the galleries once more. They must not give signs of assent or dissent by way of applause, and if they should continue it the Chair will be obliged to have the galleries cleared. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. After all, Mr. Speaker, have we made much progress in some of the really great questions of government? We easily break through the veneer we call civilization and expose the barbarian. May we not hope that in both minor and major matters the participation of the mothers of the Nation in the affairs of the Nation will early result in the betterment of many sociological and political conditions, and in the settle-

ment of international disputes without resorting to the arbitrament of arms, and in the establishment of a really substantial civilization?

Woman has been equal to every duty that has been imposed upon her and to every responsibility she has assumed. The franchise will give her opportunities for good in the Republic, if what we have been taught and what we teach with respect to high standards of voters and voting is true. Women will raise the standard in politics as she has raised and maintained the standard in every relation she sustains in life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat will he permit me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used 12 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand, the only question before us here is whether or not we are willing to propose this amendment to the legislatures of the different States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is the question before the House to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. Are you a member of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Were you not willing that the Committee on Rules should let the House determine this question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, why not go ahead and submit this question to the States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I leave that to the gentleman from Texas and those who agree with him to answer. I favored the resolution in committee, and I favor it here.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I may say that I intend to vote for this resolution. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas whether his party has declared for woman suffrage in their last platform or any other platform?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, no. I am assuming the responsibility here. There are some new things in the Republican Party, the President's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding; and he should discover something newer than the doctrine of State sovereignty as a shield against everything new. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this proposition is one which was discussed in great detail in the Committee on Rules. As a member of that committee I had the privilege of voting to report it to the House for action. A three-day hearing was held by the committee, and the main thing demonstrated there was that the demand for woman suffrage is not a sectional but a national demand.

Its advocates are found in every State and probably every town in the Union. The South has its organizations devoted to this cause just as the North and East and West. It is not a class movement, and the leader in exclusive society vies with the working girl in enthusiasm and devotion. It is an American movement, and the refined, home-loving women of America make up its vital strength.

They have placed their plea before Congress as the body which represents the entire Nation. This proposed constitutional amendment places the question of woman suffrage squarely where it belongs, in the national field of action. If it is right and expedient that women should vote in Oregon, it is equally right and expedient that they should vote in Pennsylvania. There is no magic power in a State line to make the women in Illinois fit to govern themselves and in Kentucky unfit to govern themselves.

There is no just reason why the question of woman suffrage should be met piecemeal and solved in fractions. America is not a collection of sovereign States; it is a Nation, founded on the sovereignty of its people. The Constitution is the organic law of the Nation, and it provides for its own amendment. The method provided is difficult, so difficult that it requires an almost unanimous public sentiment in order to secure its amendment. Three-fourths of the States must ratify a proposed amendment before it becomes effective, and this makes it possible for a most insignificant minority to prevent a change. One-fortieth of the voters may prevent the adoption of an amendment demanded by thirty-nine fortieths of the voters.

In spite of such handicaps the supporters of woman suffrage are simply asking that Congress refer this amendment to the States for their action. It is a just request and calls upon Congress to perform its duty only, to submit a question which is of vital importance to the States for their decision, whatever that decision may be. With the demand coming from all quarters, with public sentiment fully formed, and the people ready to act upon the question, I maintain that no Representative of the people is justified in voting to refuse to allow the solution by the duly constituted power.

Woman suffrage is a natural evolution in that democracy which has traversed the centuries, gaining new victories with every conflict. The ballot has always been regarded as the symbol of human liberty, and it has been secured by larger groups in every forward movement. In spite of every effort on the part of the few, who have always sought to control government for their own selfish ends, property qualifications, religious tests, and other barriers have been thrown down and universal manhood suffrage is an accomplished fact.

To-day the ballot is denied but one class of American citizens, and that class America's women. The scum and riffraff of the land, the unconvicted thief and thug, the moral leper, take their places at the ballot box as American citizens, while the womanhood of the Nation is pushed aside. Such injustice can not long endure, and no power of reaction can stop the final determination of America that as the ballot is not conditioned on race nor color neither shall it be conditioned on sex.

I believe in woman suffrage, because I believe in democracy. The person who opposes woman suffrage may be a believer in democracy, but he does not believe in putting it into practice. That kind of faith without works is about the deadest thing imaginable.

I believe that the government where the supreme controlling power is vested in the entire citizenship is the best possible form of government. Supreme power in the hands of a few, or a particular class, has never resulted and will never result in the welfare of the many. The rights and interests of individuals and classes can only be safeguarded when they are able to give effective expression of their will. The only way to give an effective expression of will in this country is through the pencil in the booth on the day of election. The ballot is a weapon of defense and a tool for service, and neither the securing of rights nor the performance of duties in the best sense is possible without it. When officials are chosen without the consent of all, then those who had no voice in their selection are subjects, not citizens. Women are citizens, they are part of the people, and they have a right to help elect those who shall represent them and to help make the laws under which they shall live and to which they must render obedience.

Are the rights and interests of women safeguarded to-day where they can not enforce their demand through the ballot? Let us consider the case of the 1,514,000 women who are working in the field; most of them labor south of the Mason and Dixon line. It is a half million more than the number of slaves who worked in the fields when this Nation declared war on slavery.

Four hundred and nine thousand of this number are 16 years of age and under. They are robbed of their childhood and forced to toil inhumanly long hours in heavy drudgery. Nine hundred and fifty thousand are between 16 and 45 years of age; their round of life is barren of hope and happiness and the future holds nothing for them but despair. One hundred and sixty-five thousand are 45 years of age and over; even old age can not escape the burdens which would prove unendurable to the average man.

These are facts given in the census reports and they can not be denied. In spite of the boasted chivalry of opponents of woman suffrage, who declare that they wish to place woman on the pedestal of reverence and worship, here are sweethearts, wives, and mothers torn from the home and chained to the plow. These women form a chain gang of civilization, and their condition should bring the blush of shame to every American.

Do you hear an outcry against this degradation of womanhood from these worshippers of lovely woman, who declare that their sole desire is to protect women from contact with the sordid world? They have time to consider many questions, but not a moment for this problem of the woman in the fields. They forget these helpless, defenseless ones because they can not demand attention and enforce that demand.

It is not necessary to select one class of woman workers to prove the injustice which exists. The whole range of woman's part in industry shows that women do not secure the same share of the wealth they produce as do men. Three-fifths of all women

in industry, according to Prof. Scott Nearing, get less than $8 a week. At a hearing in New York City last week a representative of the Wanamaker stores testified that $9 a week was the least on which a woman worker could be expected to maintain herself decently. The study of minimum wage commissions in many States and cities has shown that a very large proportion of the women workers in American industry receive less than a living wage; that is, a sum sufficient to maintain physical conditions alone at the most efficient standard.

In many cases women work side by side with men, performing the same duties and producing the same output, at half the wages. The ballot in the hands of women will break down this system of unequal pay and nothing else will do it. Hon. Carroll D. Wright, the famous statistician, after long study, makes that assertion directly when he says:

The lack of direct political influence constitutes a powerful reason why women's wages have been kept at a minimum.

A comparison between States where women have direct political influence and States where they do not settles all arguments on this score. For instance, in Massachusetts the average pay of the woman school-teacher is but one-third that of men, while in Wyoming and Utah it is provided that there shall be equal pay for equal work.

I maintain that until women have the right of franchise they can not secure justice for themselves. Until they secure it we must expect conditions such as I have described, together with a situation which permits the payment of a fine of $20 by the owners of a Triangle factory, whose negligence results in a fire which costs the lives of 145 women employees. We must expect to see legislatures appropriating millions of the money of all the people for the protection of cattle and hogs and sheep while the claims of womanhood for a square deal go unheeded.

But I go further and maintain that the Nation needs the vote of its womanhood fully as much as the women need the ballot. This Nation needs intelligent, educated voters, and more girls than boys are being graduated from our high schools and colleges every year. It needs native-born voters, and there are 129 men of foreign birth to every 100 women of foreign birth in the country. It needs law-abiding votes, and women form the minority of all the criminal and vicious classes. It needs voters who will put the rights of humanity above the right to plunder, and woman by her very nature is peculiarly interested in conserving human life and surrounding it with the greatest possible protection.

To-day, as always, the first and greatest item in humanity's bill of rights is the right to live. With America's womanhood prevented from giving an effective expression to her will, how has America dealt with the conditions which menace life and health? The answer comes back in a famous phrase, "Human life is the cheapest commodity in America."

Although the care of the public health is the first duty of statesmen, we have so neglected the whole question that even the statistics necessary to an accurate statement of the situation is lacking. I have searched long and arduously to glean from governmental publications some actual facts regarding vital statistics in this country, but I have searched in vain. If you desire to know the number of farm animals in this country, you can secure the information easily. You can not learn how many American citizens died last year. You can find exactly the extent of tubercular diseases among cattle, but you can not learn the number of Americans suffering from tuberculosis. You can get the figures of the loss of crops due to the boll weevil; you can not get the figures of the loss due to typhoid fever.

To remedy such a situation I have introduced a measure in this Congress which would enable us to at least know the truth, so that we might arrive at a remedy. Needless to say, in the strenuous rush of passing legislation dealing with the things of property, Congress has been unable to consider this legislation dealing with persons.

But through partial reports gathered from various sources we can estimate that each year 1,600,000 sons and daughters of American mothers die. Only one-fourth of these are over 65 years of age, so that 1,200,000 persons under 65 years of age die every year. Of that number, 650,000, or more than half, die before they are five years of age. That is a veritable slaughter of the innocents, for a large proportion of them are uselessly sacrificed for lack of the simplest precautions.

One hundred and fifty thousand die from the preventable plague, tuberculosis; 25,000 deaths are due to the preventable disease, typhoid fever; and 135,000 more die from pneumonia, whose ravages are largely due to neglect.

Besides these, 90,000 Americans are killed every year by industrial accidents and other violence, and 500,000 are seriously injured in the same manner.

A conservative estimate of the facts states that at this moment more than a million and a half Americans are on beds of helplessness and suffering from preventable diseases and accidents, while within the next 12 months American mothers will sacrifice 650,000 of their sons and daughters from preventable causes alone.

Do you suppose such conditions would long obtain in the face of the truth that even the simplest precautions would prevent such a toll of life if the mothers of America could wield their influence through the ballot? Even if it tried, the Nation could not resist a life-saving campaign with the mothers of men in a position to demand and enforce action.

But this is only one phase of the influence of women in the realm of government. No political question is before this Nation to-day but affects the woman, whose task of operating the home and feeding and clothing the children is the most important business of the human race.

Is woman's place the home? Then she must have the vote to protect her home. Every function of Government that affects the cost of condition of living affects woman even more than man. A Payne-Aldrich Schedule K exacts its tribute from the mothers, just as a financial or industrial depression lays its crushing weight upon the home maker and home keeper. Voters and their representatives are dealing to-day with food and clothing and water and gas and electric light. They deal with the liquor question and child labor and a hundred other problems which vitally concern the home and childhood. Without a voice in the selection of representatives and the making of laws women are helpless to protect their place—the home—from the evil forces which are bent upon its destruction.

That women will use their power in such an endeavor is not a theory. It has been shown beyond the shadow of a doubt in the States where they have the right of suffrage. Humane, moral, and educational legislation has been placed on the statute books of these States when the same measures are defeated again and again in the States where the women are barred from participation in government.

The Century Magazine last year published an article showing what the "woman-made" laws in Colorado, where equal suffrage has been in operation since 1893, have sought to accomplish. Following is an excerpt from that article:

1893–1900. A State home for dependent children, three of the five members of the board of control to be women; making the mother joint guardian of the child with the father; raising age of protection for girls to 18 years; a State industrial school for girls, three of the five members of the board of control to be women; a factory inspection law, and the creation of the indeterminate sentence, out of which Tom Tynan's wonderful "honor-and-trust" idea has been evolved. * * *

1900–1910. Juvenile court system; drastic compulsory education law; a child-labor law taking little ones under 14 out of factories, stores, and mines and forbidding the employees of those under 16 in unhealthful or dangerous trades; making father and mother joint heirs of deceased child; providing penalties for failure to support aged or infirm parents; a traveling library commission, consisting of five women, for the purpose of seeing that books reach the most remote mountain camp and prairie hut; making it a criminal offense to contribute to the delinquency of a child; a local option law, and the establishment of a State free employment bureau, with offices in all the principal cities and towns.

In considering the laws enacted subsequent to 1910 mark the new economic and industrial emphasis; creation of a minimum wage commission, with power to act; establishment of $50 as a minimum monthly wage for teachers and doubling the length of the minimum school year; amendments putting teeth in the child-labor law, the factory inspection law and the compulsory education law; a workman's compensation act; a law putting loan sharks out of business; a strong nonsupport law, and a companion statute making nonsupport an extraditable offense.

With regard to the liquor traffic there can be no question that the voting woman is as bitterly opposed to the saloon as she is to the brothel. Kansas, of course, has had State-wide prohibition for years; and Illinois, Oregon, and Arizona, where the woman vote is scarcely a year old, can not be fairly counted either one way or the other. All the other six, however, have local option laws that are drying up the liquor like some huge blotter.

Wyoming is 90 per cent dry. Colorado has 50 "dry" counties out of 62. Only 18 of Utah's 28 counties are "wet," and 16 of these are mining camps. Idaho, 90 per cent dry, passed a search and seizure bill at the last session; also a law compelling an oath from patrons of drug stores. And California's list of "dry" towns has grown from 200-odd to over 600 since suffrage.

Mr. Speaker, the test of woman suffrage in the States where the right has been granted proves that it introduces a saving element into the politics of the present day. It centers attention upon the rights of manhood and womanhood and childhood, and this Nation needs that to-day just as it needed it in the days preceding the Civil War. Of that period Wendell Phillips said:

Your Websters, your Clays, your Calhouns, your Douglases, however able intellectually they may have been, have never dared nor cared to touch the moral element of our national life. Either the shallow and heartless trade of politics had eaten out their own moral being or they feared to enter the unknown land of lofty right and wrong.

Neither of these great names has linked itself and its fame with the great moral issue of the day. They deal with money questions,

with tariffs, with State law, and if by any chance they touched the slave question it was only like hucksters trading in the relics of the saints. I risk nothing when I say that the antislavery discussion was the salt of this Nation. It actually kept it alive and wholesome.

To-day another crisis is at hand. Our attention has been given to the production of wealth, and we have succeeded, until our mills and factories are the largest, our tonnage the greatest, our buildings the highest, our material possessions the richest, of any nation on the globe. We blinded ourselves for years in the delusion that these things meant real greatness and that out of such material an enduring temple of national life could be built.

But we are beginning to see that the rights of the many have been despoiled that a few might add new treasures to their already dangerously large store; that immense factories have too often meant a wilderness of darksome city streets, where poverty-stricken ones are reared in want and suffering, under conditions which can not fail to multiply vice and crime.

To grapple with the foes of the common welfare of this Nation requires every moral force that it possesses. The womanhood of America is needed in this battle. I do not profess to believe that woman suffrage will make a paradise of society in a day. Only its enemies have ever professed to believe that. But I do believe that the right of American women to express their will directly will help to take some of the shame from our splendor, some of the greed and crime from our genius and culture, some of the oppression from our prosperity, some of the party-rot-ism from our patriotism, some of the lawlessness from our legislation, and help to bridge the gulf between the house of have and the house of want. It is little short of a crime to shackle and throttle any force in America which will help to do this at a time when it is so badly needed.

To know whether woman suffrage will mean the injection of such a force into politics and government one need go only to its enemies. Arrayed against it you will find every crooked political influence in this Nation, every profiter from privilege, every seeker of unfair advantage, every exploiter of childhood, every interest that thrives on vice and crime. I do not say that no honest men and women oppose it, but I do say that these sinister interests take the lead in every battle against it, because they know what it means. Because I give them credit for a sure and certain appraisal of every beneficial and inimical movement, I would be for woman suffrage on that ground alone. I love it for its enemies, and their enmity is an unanswerable argument that woman suffrage always and everywhere tends to uplift rather than to degrade and to promote the common good of all rather than to give special privileges to the few.

There are arguments coming from respectable sources against it of course. There always are respectable opponents to every great forward movement, for there are always those who believe that everything new is dangerous and that everything old is sacred. It is said that giving the woman the vote means doubling the vote of her father or husband. If that is a valid objection, then a man's son should not be given the vote, because he generally follows in his father's footsteps. Even this objection, however, implies that the woman who is the head of the house and the property owner should have the vote to protect her own interests.

It is said that giving the suffrage to women includes giving it to ignorant and vicious women. But what about the ignorant and vicious men who vote? When it is admitted that there are countless educated and intellectual women competent to exercise a voice in government, making sex the line of disqualification is unjust and absurd.

It is said that it would be degrading for women to vote. Just why the exercise of the high and sovereign right of citizenship at the ballot box is degrading is not stated. If women are too good for the present-day politics, something is sadly wrong with politics, and the purifying influence of these good women is an immediate need. It is more likely that, instead of women being lowered by contact with politics, politics will be lifted up by contact with women.

It is said that the ballot should not be given to women, because of their inexperience in politics. How did men gain their experience? Simply by demanding a voice in the conduct of Government and making use of their opportunities when secured. That is exactly what women are asking—an opportunity to gain the experience. It can not be gained beforehand any more than one can become an accomplished violinist without using a violin.

It is said that women should not have the ballot because all women do not want it. The real question involved is, Why should those who do not want it prohibit those who do want it? Not all the slaves of the Southland wanted freedom, and some refused to leave the condition of bondage to a master, but that did not affect the principle of human freedom. Some women will not vote; neither do some men. But that does not affect the principle that the duties and privileges of citizenship belong by right to women as well as men.

In fact almost every argument advanced in opposition nullifies itself, or is nullified by other arguments in opposition. Some say that women would forsake their children to vote, while others declare that they would not vote at all. Some say their voting would cause strife in the family, while others maintain that they would always vote as their husbands commanded. Some declare that they would perpetually seek to hold office, while others declare that they would not assume the duties of public position. Some declare that women should be satisfied with the present splendid conditions in politics, while others say that politics is a corrupting and contaminating pool. Some declare that women's position without the vote is much more influential than with it, while others declare that they were created to be subordinates.

Some say that woman suffrage is not a success in the States where it has been tried, while others fight its trial elsewhere on the ground that, once tried, it is never given up.

Some say that woman suffrage does not result in the passage of humanitarian and social welfare legislation, while others declare that it always results in the passage of such "dangerous" legislation as child-labor laws, workmen's compensation, minimum wage, and so forth.

Some say that government is founded on force, and those who can not bear arms should not vote, while others declare that it is woman's sphere to bear the soldiers who bear the arms.

Mr. Speaker, these arguments, advanced in apparent good faith by opponents of woman suffrage, but show the weakness of the cobweb strands vainly expected to fetter real democracy in this Nation. Barriers of State rights, with their twilight zones of confusion and irresponsibility; difficulty in amending the Constitution, which shackles the will of the people; powers of privilege, which dread even-handed justice, however potent and subtle, must in the end bow conquered before the right of the womanhood of America to have a voice in government.

The defeat of this resolution can not permanently prevent its triumph. The history of this Nation shows one thing above all others, and that is that any great question of justice and right is never considered settled finally until it is settled right.

I can not chart the future and indicate the date when woman suffrage will be an accomplished fact. I do know that the day must come when America, founded through the groping in human hearts for democracy, will become the land of justice for men and women alike, the sovereign power placed jointly in their hands, to work out their destinies, unfettered and unbound.

There will be no faltering and no retreat until that day of triumph. For it must come before America fulfills her destiny and realizes the aspirations that have thrilled her patriot hearts to heroic deeds and inspired her patriot minds to noble visions, becoming a nation where the rule of all the people has secured for common manhood its deserved respect, common womanhood its earned rewards, and common childhood its inherent right to life and leisure.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my thanks to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] for granting me this time, knowing, as he does, that I am in favor of the resolution as well as the rule, and I shall address myself to the question of the rule in its bearing upon State rights. The gentleman from Texas has invoked the sovereignty of the States, enumerating control of their police power and control of the suffrage. The pending resolution does not impose equal suffrage upon the country, but it does permit the States themselves to decide whether they will impose equal suffrage upon themselves and equally upon the Federal Government. The section reads the same for both:

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.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY. Have not the States that right now?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; the States have the right now, each to decide for itself, and they should have the additional right to say whether in all the States and in the whole Nation women shall have the ballot.

Mr. HENRY. Has not every State in the Union the right to confer the elective franchise on women?

Mr. HOBSON. It has.

Mr. HENRY. Then why do you need this amendment?

Mr. HOBSON. We would not need it if all the States were to adopt it, but this is the only way to enable all the States to determine the policy of all the States.

The gentleman points out the difficulty of ratification. The gentleman must recognize that that very difficulty of ratification is a guaranty that the States will not act hastily or unwisely. The gentleman and those similarly minded might not trust a majority of the States, but surely if they really trust the States they should have confidence in the action of three-fourths of all the States.

The gentleman referred to the action of the Democratic caucus. The Democratic caucus pronounced this a question for the States. This resolution would take the question out of national politics and make it a State question pure and simple whether the States wish to ratify or not. The gentleman invoked the question of police power. Police power is the power of self-protection. In it resides the inherent essence of State sovereignty—the right of each State to protect the life, health, liberty, and good morals of its own citizens. To-day great interstate and national agencies are trampling upon those rights. The States have the right to employ the votes of both sexes to strengthen their real police powers.

Reference has been made to the great reform of abolishing war, one of the greatest reforms of the ages, in which woman's influence will be felt almost unanimously on the side of peace.

I desire also to refer to an even more organic reform, that of stopping the debauching of the youth of this land and all lands, the degeneracy of the race, through the liquor traffic. An overwhelming majority of the women will likewise be in favor of that reform. This is the reason why the great national liquor forces always fight woman's suffrage. When that reform is established, then and then only will the sovereign States enjoy the full and free exercise of their real police powers. To-day the rights of citizens are trampled upon. No deference is given to the conditions of morality in many localities in our great cities. The pleadings of the mothers and the wives fall on deaf ears. They are not considered in determining the police policies of these communities.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly; very briefly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If this resolution becomes a law, will every legislature in every State in the Union have to act upon it?

Mr. HOBSON. No. It will require, however, three-quarters of them to act affirmatively in order to ratify.

The brotherhood of States is the repository of the organic law. The most vital right the States possess and cherish is the power to amend the organic law of the Nation. Congress, in withholding the opportunity to exercise this right, would violate this the most fundamental right of the States. Let no Member invoke State rights, let no Member invoke the police power of the States, when he deprives the brotherhood of States of the opportunity to amend the Constitution and determine themselves the question of equal suffrage. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to adopt this rule, but if the rule is adopted I shall vote against the amendment to which it relates, and my vote upon this amendment will be governed by the same principles, in large part, that governed my vote upon the prohibition resolution. When that resolution was before the House I stated that "I believed that Congress never should propose an amendment unless, in its judgment, there is a well-settled, deliberately formed public opinion of such extent as to make it probable, at least, that if submitted the amendment will be ratified by the necessary number of States in the very near future. That condition does not exist to-day with reference to this subject, and I think no one will claim that it does exist." The same thing can be said of this resolution. I profoundly believe that every Member of Congress has a responsibility, and a most solemn one, in the proposing of constitutional amendments, and it will not be denied in this case, as it was not denied in the case of the prohibition resolution, that there is not such a deliberately formed public opinion with relation to it as to make it probable, at least, that if submitted it will be adopted in the very near future.

If upon the prohibition resolution I had taken the position that many Members of this House took—that it was merely a referendum—I should feel compelled to vote for this resolution to-day, and I expect that every Member who voted for that resolution upon that ground will vote for this resolution to-day. If I had taken the position, as some Members did, that they were opposed to the prohibition resolution upon the ground of the impossibility of enforcement, that argument would not prevail with reference to this one, because here there can be no question of lack of enforcement; and if my opposition had been placed upon that ground I should have felt compelled to vote for this one to-day. But, Mr. Speaker, to my mind there is a principle that should not be violated in particular cases, and that is, before we are authorized to submit a constitutional amendment it ought to be in response to such a well-settled, well-defined, well-established public opinion as to make it probable that if submitted it will be ratified in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is that necessary? Again referring to my remarks that were made on the prohibition resolution, I said:

> There is no such thing as the rejection of a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution by the States. If a State ratifies it, the matter is settled, so far as that State is concerned, for all time to come. But if it rejects it, it means nothing more than the postponement of the matter until another legislature is elected. In other words, if the State ratifies the proposed amendment, it has no power thereafter to reconsider its action; but if it refuses to ratify it, any subsequent legislature may again vote upon it. So when an amendment leaves Congress it is never rejected, never dies, but lives on until ratified by the required number of States; and it might easily be that when the last State has ratified it the States first ratifying it may have changed their views and, in fact, be opposed to it. This is why great care should be exercised in proposing constitutional amendments, and only after public opinion is so well settled as to practically insure early ratification should they be submitted by Congress. This is a general principle that should govern all cases. And believing in that principle as I do I can not make an exception in this case.

Mr. Speaker, what is the evidence that public opinion is not so well settled and so well established that we should not submit this at this time? During the past five years woman suffrage has prevailed in seven States. At the last election it was submitted in seven States and defeated in five States. What are we to gather from that action? That there is a well-settled public demand for an amendment to the Federal Constitution in this respect? I ask you, sir, is not such public opinion as has been expressed directly to the contrary?

I am sorry that that condition prevails, because I believe in woman suffrage. I have perhaps made as many speeches for it as any Member of this House not from a woman-suffrage State, but because as I view it public sentiment does not justify me in voting for the amendment, I can not give it my vote.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asked a question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] as to why the people should not have the opportunity to vote upon this question. Mr. Speaker, the reason that I have suggested is one; but I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he is willing to submit a constitutional amendment upon any question upon which there is an established public sentiment to a certain extent?

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman ask me that question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Why, if this was wrong I would say no; but how does the gentleman determine that there is no public sentiment for it?

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman was listening to what I just said——

Mr. BUTLER. I was listening, but the gentleman did not convince me.

Mr. LENROOT. I said that in the last election seven States voted on woman suffrage and five States rejected it.

Mr. BUTLER. That may be true—seven adopted it and five rejected it.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; seven voted on it and two adopted it.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not that indicate some public sentiment in favor of it?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but now the question I want to ask the gentleman is whether when there is a public sentiment on any particular question he is willing to submit a constitutional amendment upon that question? For instance, is he willing to submit a constitutional amendment on the recall of judicial decisions, the recall of judges, and a multitude of questions concerning which there is a well-defined public sentiment, but not to such an extent as to make it at all probable that it would be adopted?

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I decline to yield now. Now, Mr. Speaker, one other matter. My friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY, a few moments ago stated that he believed in democracy. He

said others here apparently believe in democracy, but are unwilling to put it in practice. Mr. Speaker, I not only believe in democracy, but because I wish to see it in practice is one of the reasons why I shall vote against this amendment, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he votes for this amendment will vote against the very principle that he declares his belief in.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not; I have only two minutes—[continuing] because, Mr. Speaker, the States now when acting upon the subject as a State matter the people themselves at the ballot box vote directly upon it, but if the States ratify this resolution there is never a vote at the ballot box at all; they only act through their representatives. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman believes in a democracy, which means a rule by the people where only one-half of the people can vote.

Mr. LENROOT. My reply is that we can not have a real democracy until those who are now intrusted with the powers of government shall have their will made known after an opportunity to make it known, and not by representatives only.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield now.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I can not. These, Mr. Speaker, to my mind, are fundamental principles. Treated as a State matter, voters themselves decide the question as to whether they shall have woman suffrage or not; treated as a Federal matter, the voters at the polls have no more to say about it than they have concerning any other legislative matter that they do not have a direct vote upon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, I believe in woman suffrage. Many of those who believe in it advance the argument that this amendment should be submitted and acted upon by the legislatures, because the people themselves, the voters themselves now qualified to vote, can not be trusted to act upon this matter as they ought to act. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is, they should not be deprived of their right to do so, but the remedy is, instead of spending so much time in attempting to educate the representatives of the people, more time should be expended in educating the people themselves, because, Mr. Speaker, it lies at the very foundation of this Government of ours that no great policy should be adopted changing our government in any respect unless that policy has the approval of those who are intrusted with the final power of government in this Nation, the voters themselves. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] a question, and I will take a moment of my time to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. I am distinguished.

Mr. HENRY. Speaking of referendums, would the gentleman vote for a referendum on the question of repealing the fourteenth and the fifteenth amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is now asking me a pretty hard question. I have never thought about that, but I have thought about this question, and I am convinced that the gentleman is in the wrong when he refuses the people the right to vote upon such a question as this. I have answered him the best I know how. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Would the gentleman deny the people the right to vote on the question of repealing the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Where is the demand for a referendum upon that question?

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will wait for a day or two I will think it over. [Applause.] Some things I know and some things I do not know. This one I have decided upon.

Mr. HENRY. Life is too short. I can not wait for a day or two.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has waited for a longer time for less.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the Democratic caucus of this House has decided that this is a question for the States to deal with and is not within the jurisdiction of the National Legislature, and as I am a member of that caucus and of that party, not having availed myself of the right which I did have to give notice that I should not be bound by caucus action, I shall vote for this rule, and shall vote, if the rule is adopted, against the proposed resolution. I not only shall vote against it for that reason but I shall vote against it for the further and better reason that I am conscientiously opposed to the resolution. I have no words of condemnation for those who think otherwise, because I know that there are many good but misguided people who believe in this measure. It has been stated, I believe by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], that we need the votes of the women of this country to purify our politics and to better governmental conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has existed under the Constitution for about 125 years, and I am one of those who believe that although at some times in our history the ship of state has veered a little from her constitutional course, yet after all it is the best Government under the sun or which has ever existed under the Providence of God. Men have controlled it and men will continue to control it. Others may think as they please, but I do not wish to see the day come when the women of my race in my State shall trail their skirts in the mud and mire of partisan politics. I prefer to look to the American woman as she always has been, occupying her proud estate as the queen of the American home, instead of regarding her as a ward politician in the cities. As the mother, as the wife, as the sister she exercises a broader and deeper and mightier influence than she can ever exercise or hope to on the stump and in the byways of politics in this land. The American mother, the American woman, has my admiration, my respect, and my love——

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit a few further thoughts along the line I was pursuing when the gavel of the Speaker gave me notice that my four short minutes were at an end.

Mr. Speaker, I may be considered as out of date and not abreast of these alleged progressive times, but be that as it may, I prefer in these days of fads and new-fangled ideas to cling to the aged philosophy, the ancient principles of patriotism, and the "old-time" religion of our fathers. Mr. Speaker, as strange as it may seem in this day of alleged progressive advancement and progress, I believe in the Bible. I believe in it from Genesis to and including Revelations. I believe in every word of it, as Opie Read says in The Jucklins, "from kiver to kiver." I am not like some of our overeducated citizens who believe in certain portions of the Word of God and brush aside other portions as not worthy of attention. I believe in every word in that Holy Book, and thus believing I can not, here or elsewhere, support the idiosyncrasy of woman suffrage. The Word of God inveighs against woman suffrage, and the plans of the Creator would be, in a measure, subverted by its adoption. We are told in Holy Writ that "God created the heavens and the earth." We are further told that He created light and filled the earth with living things, and that, finally, out of the dust He created man and gave him dominion over the earth and all things. We are further taught in the Good Book that "God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which Jehovah God had taken from the man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man." Holy Writ further points out the respective spheres which men and women are to occupy in the world under the Providence of God.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no possible mistake as to the part which woman is to play in the activities of the human race. God has decreed that man is to be the head of the family and woman is to be his "helpmeet," and any attempt to change this order of human affairs is an attempt to change and to overthrow one of the solemn decrees of God Almighty. In every well-regulated Christian family the wife is the "helpmeet" of the husband. She is, and should be, his equal, his copartner, and where genuine love reigns she is exactly this. But, Mr. Speaker, she is not to go out in the world to meet its trials, engage in its struggles, and fight its battles, and I venture to remark, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that no instance in American life can be found where any woman ever did this voluntarily who had a husband who was "worth the powder and lead which would be required to kill him." But let us see what God in His Holy Word has said about the sphere of woman. In the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians we find the following language:

> As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, if it is shameful for a woman to speak out in public in the service of the Master, what is it in the sight of God for her to stand upon a goods box on the corner and

appeal to the gaping crowd for votes? To give her the ballot is to unsex her and replace the tender, loving, sweet-featured mother of the past with the cold, calculating, harsh-faced, street-corner scold of politics.

Again Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, says:

Wives be in subjection unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, being Himself the savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives also be to their husbands in everything.

Mr. Speaker, nearly, if not quite, all the advocates of woman suffrage I have ever met profess to be Christians with an abiding faith in God's Holy Word. Do they believe that "wives" should be "in subjection" to their husbands? If they believe this, how can they insist upon what they are pleased to call "equal rights" for man and woman? How can they advocate a policy which must inevitably set husband against wife and wife against husband? If the husband and wife will always agree and vote the same way, then why the necessity of this innovation? If they will not always agree, will this not, in the course of time, create such dissension and controversy which will ultimately lead to the divorce court? If this be true, does it not mean, in its final analysis, the disruption of the American home, which is the foundation stone of our glorious Republic? It can but lead to this, and so far as I am concerned I shall never knowingly lend my aid to any movement which will result in the further clogging of the already overloaded dockets of the divorce courts.

Again the great Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, says:

Wives, be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.

In Paul's First Epistle to Timothy we find this:

Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness.

There are many other portions of the Scriptures, Mr. Speaker, to this same tenor and effect, but surely I have quoted enough to satisfy any reasonable person that this propaganda for "votes for women" is an attempt to take woman from the sphere in which God intended she should move and place her in direct antagonism to the teachings of the Scriptures. Are we prepared to attempt this change? Are we ready to repudiate the Scriptures and supplant God's place with this scheme of dissatisfied women and office-seeking demagogues? It is urged that the participation of the women in governmental affairs will purify our politics. I deny this, and contend that its chief effect will be to degrade woman. It is contended that the women of the country need the ballot for their own protection. Protection against what? Let a woman in any part of our broad domain be insulted or maltreated in any way and almost instantly a thousand brawny, brave, courageous men will come to her defense. Let a woman seek the courts for relief of any character and woe unto the man who will contest property rights with her before a "jury of his peers." To-day the gentle, sweet American woman has the respect, admiration, and love of the manly men of this Republic, but arm her with the ballot and she not only ceases to be respected and admired, but who would want a "ward heeler" for the mother of his children? God grant, Mr. Speaker, that this change may never come in free, liberty-loving, woman-respecting America. I think I am safe in asserting that a vast majority of American women do not desire the ballot. I know I am absolutely safe in asserting that practically all the women of America who are happily married are opposed to woman suffrage. In opposing this measure, I am speaking for that vast multitude of American wives and mothers who love their husbands and their children and who prefer to reign as queen of the home rather than to grovel in the slums of politics. The politician may ridicule the figure of the "sturdy oak and the clinging vine," but, Mr. Speaker, it represents the sweetest, the tenderest, and the most heavenly of all the relations on earth. I have a supreme contempt for the vigorous, healthy man who permits his wife to go forth in the world to labor for the family support, and I have the most thorough disgust for the married woman who lavishes all her affection on a poodle dog. Mr. Speaker, women who have husbands, children, and happy homes have no time to monkey with politics or to fondle poodle dogs. They occupy the proudest and most influential position in all the world. "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world" is as true to-day as when it was first uttered. Let us, then, leave woman where she is—the loveliest of all creation, queen of the household, and undisputed dictator of the destiny of man.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have that extra time, as a number have asked me for time.

The SPEAKER. Does that mean that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes more?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Five minutes.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman reserved 5 minutes of his 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Texas yielded him 10 minutes and I have yielded him 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. That gives the gentleman from Pennsylvania 10 minutes more.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], I believe that this is the best Government on earth, and like the gentleman from Florida I do not believe that the women should trail their skirts in the mud and the mire of partisan politics, but I am in favor of cleaning the mud and the mire out of partisan politics, and I think one of the best ways to do that is to bestow the right of suffrage upon the women of the land. [Applause.]

There has been some sentiment here this morning, and some constitutional law, and some politics, underneath the surface—mostly politics. The far-sighted Republicans and Democrats in this body are doing the sensible thing about equal suffrage. They are getting down off the limb, and that speedily. The only party of the three leading organizations which nationally declared in favor of suffrage in 1912 was the Progressive Party. [Applause and laughter.]

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

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I will not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly I do. If we had done nothing more than to put this issue squarely before the Nation we would have done a great service for the country. For it is my belief and I predict that the suffrage movement will become so formidable in the next two years that both of the old parties will follow the lead of the Progressive Party, if tardily, still commendably, and espouse it. Mr. Speaker, this day is historical in that it marks the beginning of the end of the opposition to equal suffrage. For that opposition is left with little heart, and as a matter of fact with no argument, save possibly the argument that the gentleman from Florida presents—the argument of the great, sturdy oak and the tender, clinging vine. [Laughter.]

The trouble with that argument is that the men who use it think of the American home in the terms of the spinning wheel. The spinning wheel has gone, and several social conditions and relations went with it. The American home is no longer a patriarchal institution. It is a partnership. And it is my observation that the partnership has reached that degree of development that often the more tender and clinging the vine the larger the bills are on the first of the month. [Laughter.] I hope the Speaker will not interfere with my applause by calling time on me, as applause is hard to get. [Renewed laughter.] Mr. Speaker, I have watched for years the development of woman suffrage in my own State. I have discovered this interesting feature in all suffrage discussions: The ordinary American statesman will face courageously all of American womankind and refuse her the right and privilege of suffrage, but his courage absolutely fails him when his own wife demands it of him. I have heard men in my own State for years before the adoption of suffrage say that suffrage would merely double the vote and that the women would vote with the men. I have seen the same men by hundreds after the adoption of suffrage go to the polls and vote with the women. [Laughter and applause.]

It is true that in suffrage States husbands and wives do vote together for the most part, and it is a high tribute to the condition of American home life that they do. But it is equally true that the wife has an intellectual partnership with her husband in the matter of public affairs which was not formerly hers. The very nature of this democracy has wrought the change. Our educational system has given the women complete intellectual participation in political discussion. The early public meetings were attended only by men. Women make up at least half of every modern audience. Often the male American is a hurried reader of headlines. Women are universally more leisurely gleaners of current information. And, moreover, the American woman has found in the last half century the formerly alien economic world to be more and more intimately a part of her home problems. Her responsibilities, therefore, have grown with her capacity to care for them. And with these new intellectual activities have come the knowledge of certain traditional discriminations in the law which women resent.

These conditions are the basis and foundation of the demand for suffrage.

I favor this resolution. Its adoption would be good government, good sense, and justice. Every man from a suffrage State present here to-day can testify that suffrage has not harmed the home or changed the relation of woman to her home sphere, just as every man here from a suffrage State can testify that suffrage has lifted the level of the electorate. Woman does not need suffrage so much as suffrage needs woman and the impress of her high, uncompromising, and ennobling instinct and capacity for civic decency.

I hold that this is the next step in the development of the democracy, for the democracy can best be developed through more democracy, the moving up of the individual closer to the processes of his Government—local, State, and National. And the movement can not be complete or efficacious if one-half of the social fabric only is affected. If the traditional male elector of America is to move up closer to his Government, to a near-perfect development of his Nation and the beneficences which are to be secured under that development, the women of America, equal in intellect, in capacity, and in the law, must move up with him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe women are the best part of humanity. In all the virtues that are the most esteemed of mankind I believe women far excel the men. In talking that matter over with my wife the other day I said, "Em, if I were a woman I would not marry the best man who ever lived," and she promptly said she didn't. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this resolution direct their arguments almost wholly against the "expediency" of granting the suffrage to women.

It is as though a debtor should decline to pay a just debt on the ground that the creditor might squander the money.

Even on grounds of expediency the weight of the argument is in her favor, but the real question rises beyond all questions of expediency. It is a question of right. Is woman a free moral agent entitled to a voice in the Government? Is her consent essential to just government?

It was natural that the cave man with the heaviest club should be satisfied with the laws, for he made them all, and that he should parcel out special privileges to favorites of his immediate family; and in the course of time he called himself the lord, he dwelt in a castle of stone, and the people whom he "protected" became his vassals and slaves.

And so the ages passed the stratification of society into classes, with varying degrees of servitude from the king, who claimed to rule by divine right, down through all the spawn of royalty, prince, noble, and aristocrat to commonalty, peasant, and slave, came to be recognized as the natural and proper order of things.

This became the habit of thought with all the inertia of custom and tradition.

But mental slavery is of all forms of servitude the most pernicious and the hardest to eradicate.

Throughout the ages individual, and for brief periods whole peoples, getting an inspiration of liberty have thrown off these shackles of mental slavery; but it remained for our fathers to establish a stable government that recognized the evils of class rule, the rights of the common people, and the dignity of manhood.

They flung into the face of the haughtiest crown of the old world the immortal "Declaration" that all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

The torch of liberty lighted at Lexington was fed from the hearts of the common people. It has become a great white light, blazing from the mountain tops of civilization; conceived in feebleness, that feebleness has grown to strength, that strength to splendor, until to-day this Nation stands before the gaze of a wondering world, incomparable in power, unsullied in honor, the peerless champion of human liberty—the American Union of States. [Applause.]

What American can contemplate the flag of his country without emotion of pride! What American can contemplate the countries of Europe, enveloped in the gloom and the horrors of war, misery, and famine, without devout thankfulness for the peace and plenty we enjoy!

And yet, proudly declaring that all men are created equal, for three-quarters of a century the foul cancer of human slavery fed upon the vitals of the Nation, requiring the struggles and the bloodshed of civil war to extirpate it.

And yet, while we affirm that all "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," one-half of our "people" are denied a voice in the government.

I am not referring now to the negro vote, which you men of the South, upon one plea or another, suppress, and only pause to say that when you deny him the right to vote you have no right to count him in the population, and your representation in Congress should be cut down proportionately; but I am referring to one-half of our adult population—the women of America.

In Holy Writ we learn that God created man in his own image; in the image of God, male and female created He them.

Now, suppose we take that great declaration and interpolate: God created man and woman and endowed them with inalienable rights; that to secure these rights governments are instituted deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government denies the governed an expression of their consent or dissent, it is the duty of the people to alter or abolish it.

In what particular does such interpolation violate the true meaning and spirit of that great document? What inalienable rights did God endow man with that He denied to woman?

When those grand old worthies declared that the consent of the governed was the essential of just government were they not a bit narrow when they "endowed" themselves with the exclusive right of franchise?

Women are certainly of the "governed," but when have they given their consent? They are certainly "people," and if the "people" have the right to alter any form of government the implication is "plain as a pikestaff" that women have a right to a voice in government.

I trust I have a sincere love for my fellow men, but I thank God that in His goodness all of them do not run to whiskers, whisky, and tobacco. [Laughter.]

In His infinite power He could have made all men male, but He created most of them female, and they have always been the better part.

Oh, but you say their husbands speak for them. Well, perhaps some of them do; but frequently they speak louder for the gin mills and the dives, and often when they so speak they would better keep their mouths shut.

But who speaks for those who have no husbands? About 25 per cent of our adult women either have no husbands or are supporting worthless or drunken husbands. Who speaks for them? Who speaks for those whose husbands are not fit to speak for anybody?

You say, "God commanded woman to be subject to her husband." Well, He did not do any such thing. You say, "Paul said, 'Wives, obey your husbands,'" but Paul knew nothing at all about American politics. [Applause.] What queer pleas are made by special privilege! Because God once appointed a king, kings have ever since claimed divine right. The defenders of African slavery always claimed Biblical authority. Because God once said to Eve, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband," those who insist on the political vassalage of women interpret the saying as all women "shall be subject to their husbands," but even then, aside from the fact that in every true marriage the "twain become one" and there is no element of dominancy or subjection, in any case the argument utterly fails to show that she should be politically subject to other women's husbands.

Men run their fingers through their whiskers and patronizingly talk about "endowing" woman with the franchise as though it is a "privilege" which it is their right to withhold.

The franchise is the essential badge of that freedom to which this Government is professedly dedicated. It is the necessary expression of that "consent" from which Government derives its just powers.

Male suffrage depends fundamentally upon the fact that man was created free and equal and that the consent of the governed is an essential of just government; and female suffrage has absolutely the same foundations. Women of right are entitled thereto since the formation of the Government and a growing sense of the individuality and the dignity of womanhood demands that it be recognized, not as a gift, but as an inalienable right.

Man delights to regard himself as the towering oak with the tendrils of womanhood clinging about his massive trunk. Many a man who declaims in heart-touching accents that the wife is the good angel of his heart and the sweet divinity of his home, whom he must protect from the pollution of politics, feels that

he is exercising a God-given masculine superiority when he doles out a dime to his wife to buy soap for the family washing and then chases off down to Atlantic City to rest(?). [Laughter.]

Congress can not give women the right to vote. That is one of the reserved powers of the States. Congress could not give the negro the right to vote. The Federal Constitution had to be amended. The States ratified the amendment which gave the negro the right to vote. I do not believe with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] that it was a mistake. Considering the prejudices against them, the indignities that are put upon them, and their comparatively recent emergence from a degraded slavery, the race has made remarkable progress; and where he is permitted to vote he averages fairly well; but who will say that the average American white woman is not far better fitted for the ballot than the average negro or the swarms of foreigners that your naturalization courts turn out as voters every year?

Singularly, the Constitution provides that "any person" a native-born citizen of proper age is eligible to be President and any woman securing the requisite number of electoral votes may be President, provided it is agreed that a woman citizen is a "person," which I believe a man's court denies.

Women voted for the reelection of Jefferson and the election of Cleveland as President, and in many of the States have now full or limited franchise.

I have honestly tried to find some convincing reason against woman suffrage. There are many given, and here are some of them.

Perhaps the reason oftenest urged is that woman is afraid of mice and would make a poor soldier, and nobody ought to vote that can not bear arms. Now, two-thirds of the male voters, as soldiers, would not be worth the powder that would blow them up [laughter and applause]; so the ability to bear arms is not a requisite to male suffrage. Why, then, impose it upon women? [Applause.] The soldier is not as necessary to the State as the mother. You might as well deny man the right of suffrage because he is no good as a wet-nurse as to deny woman because she can not bear arms.

They say some women do not want the ballot and therefore none should have it. You hear that her real mission is the bearing and raising of children, and the sanctity of the home will be destroyed. But this takes no account of those who have no home or those who have raised a family or those who are beyond the child-bearing age.

"She is emotional." What an argument. Many male voters are stupid, and vicious besides.

"She would vote for the handsomer man." Now, I understand why some politicians oppose woman's suffrage. [Laughter.]

"Her purity and innocence unfits her." Well, for goodness sake, if any purity can be injected into politics let it be done, for we surely need it.

"They would not vote if they had the ballot." Well, if that is so what would it hurt to recognize their right to vote?

"The bad woman would vote and her respectable sister would play bridge." This is not true. There are ten times as many good women as bad ones. The good ones would preponderate at the polls. We give bad men the ballot. Women, even bad ones, are equally entitled.

"She thinks only in terms of beaux and bonnets, has no business sagacity," and "does not get the deep insight into affairs of state that the average voter does"(?). The "deep insight" of the average voter is nothing to brag of, and the claim of male superiority, even in business sagacity, depends largely on experience, and at best is a good deal of pretense.

A woman left a widow with a family of small children may have been of the clinging-vine variety, but her oak has fallen and left her without support; but somehow, call it business sagacity, tact, or what you will, she will almost invariably keep her brood together and feed, clothe, and raise them into good citizenship, while if a man were left in similar circumstances almost invariably the children will be scattered and the home broken up.

"Manly chivalry would disappear," and "if woman were given the ballot there is great danger that she would abuse the man and set out to grow whiskers herself" (?). In such a case the only safety for a man and his "chivalry" would be to send the women back behind the lattice of the harem.

Bishop Doane, who is a great gun opposed to suffrage, says:

> Woman has no right to vote. Suffrage is a "privilege" granted by the framers of the Constitution to such persons as they deemed best.

I wonder if it ever occurred to the learned bishop that before the Constitution could grant a "privilege" or anything to anybody it first had to be ratified by the voters, and that in a republic the public will—more or less perfectly expressed by exclusive man suffrage—is precedent to all constitutions, and the right of expression of consent inheres in all citizens, irrespective of sex.

The bishop further argues that to multiply the ballot would merely multiply votes of all sorts, good and bad.

In similar strain, Bishop Vincent declares that the "greatest curse of America to-day is the vote of ignorance and superstition, and to force woman down into that bad atmosphere would be an incalculable loss to both man and woman."

The average man who has a wife and home has a stake in the country, and, as a rule, he will be found voting an honest vote, and honest votes are what we need; and if the argument is true that man and wife will usually vote the same way—and I admit it—you will have two honest votes in the ballot box where formerly there was but one, and the preponderance of honest voters will be doubled.

The arguments against woman suffrage are clearly answered by Senator Hoar, one of the profoundest thinkers the country has produced. Said he:

> Shall women leave the cradle and the kitchen to plunge into politics? No. Shall the farmer leave the farm, the artisan the shop, to plunge into politics? No. Women can contribute their share to and exercise their right in government with not more sacrifice of their other duties than is made by their husbands and brothers. The evils of universal suffrage can clearly be shown to be less than the evils of oligarchy or of any privileged classes. History and experience show that that state is best ruled where the largest number of citizens have a share in the government.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has endured for 130 years. Herein is the positive proof that, in spite of all profligacy and vice that may exist, the general average of public sentiment is on the side of decency and morality. If it were not so, the Government would have perished long since.

The American Governments, State and National, are splendid tributes to American manhood. They prove that virtue, morality, and goodness overbalance the evil and vice in the American voter. Assume, if you please, that women are no better than men—and this I deny—there is a preponderance of moral sentiment in American society.

Recognize woman's right to suffrage, and you double the preponderance of righteousness in civic affairs.

You say she is not fit? Take her influence out of society, and the land will fester and rot. Take her out of the church, and the church will crumble and fall. Take her out of your shops and your offices, and business will halt.

Some of you should wake up and see what is going on in the world. We are no longer in the medieval age, when woman was a toy or a slave, a mere dependent upon man's bounty or caprice. As the American man has slowly risen from the vassalage of feudal times so the American woman has risen and demands her inalienable birthright of political freedom.

The differences of sex impose duties and functions upon each which the other can not discharge. They complement each other, but each of them, as free moral agents, has separate and equal rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without guardianship, wardship, or duress of the other.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute additional.

Mr. HULINGS. The spindle, the distaff, and the loom have been sent to the factory. The canning, the preserving, the knitting and sewing, the darning and the washing and the unremitting drudgery that used to make the mother the "slavey" of the family are now largely done in great workshops by machinery.

The high school and the college teach the brother and sister the same lessons, and woman, largely emancipated from domestic slavery, is wonderfully demonstrating in her enlarged opportunities her fitness and capacity to discharge the full duties of citizenship.

Many of the foremost thinkers in the important civic problems that are pressing for solution and that never will be solved without woman's help, and many of the great achievers in literature, art, and the sciences are great splendid women, who by sheer intellectual power honor their sex and bless all humanity. [Applause.]

To deny such women a voice in a Government founded upon the consent of the governed is not only a wooden-headed blunder, but it is a crime against the public welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining and how much time has the gentleman from Kansas?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has 14 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 11.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 14 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 11.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I shall not use any more of my time now, probably only one more speech.

Mr. HENRY. May I ask some one on that side to use a little time?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, the ladies already have a moral and legal right to vote, and the only reason that they do not vote is because the other half or nearly half of the population is too selfish or has been too selfish to permit them to vote. It makes no difference what public sentiment may be upon this question there is an absolute fundamental right in the women to vote. Not only that, but I believe the politics of this country would be very much improved and purified if they were permitted to vote. [Applause.]

That anyone with the right to vote himself should object to others with like qualifications voting has always seemed a mystery to me. That women have the same right as men to vote no one can deny, except to dodge behind arbitrary, unprincipled laws not based on the Constitution itself, for I believe women have the constitutional right to vote. Women have had the actual right to vote ever since voting began, but have been deprived of the exercise of that right by men selfishly and wrongfully monopolizing its exercise.

It is not a question of how women would vote if they were not deprived of the right. When a man is qualified to vote he is permitted to vote as he pleases, and if he votes in good faith his vote is right, because the law makes him the judge of his own vote. His vote may not be in the best interests of the public welfare, but still he had the right, that no one can deny. But a woman, on the other hand, who has the same qualifications, and in all respects the same except her sex, is denied the exercise. Man simply sets himself up in the voting business, and says, in effect, to women:

You shall be governed by our votes and our laws. You may own property, do business, in fact, generally speaking, you may do whatever we may, but your property, your marriage relations, your children, and your conduct generally shall be subject to the will and determination of our votes, our laws, and our administration. In all these respects you shall have no word or voice to determine.

That is what men have forced women to accept. There is absolutely no logic, no sense, no explanation to it, except the explanation of force. It accomplishes no good, but retards the world's progress to prevent the women exercising their fundamental rights.

There is some discussion indulged in, as to whether women would exercise their right with equal wisdom toward the public that men do. That may be debated, but can not be settled except in a belief. Their right to vote is not debatable, for anyone with an appreciation of the fundamental principles must know that these apply to both sexes alike. But if we debate the question of whether women would, if permitted, exercise the right wisely, one thing would have to be admitted, to start with, and that is that men have made a dismal failure in running the governmental affairs. The economics of the country have gone wrong, and numberless difficult problems are now presented to be straightened out that would not have occurred under wise government, and these difficulties are due to carelessness and inefficiency.

The high cost of living to the consumers and the small returns to the consumers could not exist at one and the same time in a well-governed country. These conditions can be pointed to to show the failure of men, so in the beginning the women would have the advantage of the argument, because we can point to no governmental errors of theirs. We have not given them an opportunity to err. The women, if permitted to vote, I believe would aid materially in securing better government, but whether that be true or not does not affect their right to vote. That is absolute and fundamental.

I have received from a constituent a letter which seems to reflect light on this subject in a novel form. The letter is as follows:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

"Val," said Ole, "out dere in Tamarac dey been talkin' again about de subyect of voman suffrage. Ve hat von set-to about it ven de vas electin' delegets to de county conwention, to send delegets to de district conwention to shoose delegets to de Sheecago conwention to wote for us for President off dese Junited States, in order to proof dat vat Taft set, dat all de people are not fit to gofern deirselfs, iss true, dough vat ve vanted to proof dat for vas more dan I could understant den, ant I can't see it now. But, anyvay, I set den dat if de men dit not know enough to wote for President deirselfs, I vas in favor of callin' in de vimmen ant girls, ant, if den, ve vas not off sufficient intelligence to turn de trick ve might include de 10-jear-old kids, vid plenty more edjication on top off dat.

"But now de new Democrat postmaster has set dat he is opposed to voman suffrage on account off dat all de vimmen don't vant to wote, but I set dat all de Junited States Senators don't vant to wote all de time, neider, aldough dey get pait for doin it, ant, to deprife all off dem from deir inestimable priwileges because some off dem fail to answer to deir names on de roll call vould be a wiolent and dangerous inwasion off our liberties. If some off dose Congressmen feel like dodgin' de qvestion off prohibition, dey might feel much agriefed if not permitted to record deir preference in de matter off an increase in de mileage. Likevise, if de vimmen vas backvard on improfin' de Squampush Creek, dey might come to de front in great numbers ven it came to a matter of safin' de boys ant de home."

"Vy," I set, "dere iss no vay off accountin' for tastes, eider among de vimmen or de men. Dere iss de case off de fader in our State who vas ruined by drink and died in de poorhouse; and dere iss his vife, who supported de schildren by takin' in vashing ant made von off deir sons governor. Now, if Yon A. Yonson vas alife to-day, and it vas up to him to decide vedder or not his moder knew enough to wote, vat do you tink he vouldt say?"

"Val," he say, "some off dose States don't vant voman suffrage, ant it vouldt be a crime to force it on dem." "Val," I say, "some off dese States ditn't vant no Democrat free-trade tariff, neider, but dey got it yust de same, ant dey are firm in de opinion dat if dey can efer get reddy off dis von dey vont nefer vant no more."

Den he set dat it vas time to close up, so dat iss as far as ve got vid dat.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, there is no difference of opinion here as to the exalted sphere of woman, her wealth of intellect, nor her beauty of soul. Gentlemen have devoted much time to their discussion as though they were matters of debate. Neither these attributes nor the question as to whether the franchise should be given to women is involved, except incidentally in the matter under consideration. The real issue here is, Does Congress believe that the right possessed by the several States of the Union from the beginning of the Government, except for the constitutional provision enfranchising the negro, to determine each for itself the question of suffrage should be taken from them and that an amendment to the Federal Constitution further limiting that power should now be submitted to the country? The control of suffrage is the highest prerogative of government. The loss of that control is the loss of the most vital element of sovereignty. I am unwilling to surrender the right of Texas to exercise this control, and I am unwilling to give my support to this amendment which, if adopted, would wrest that control from her. The people of Texas have the power, they are as fair and chivalrous as any people on the earth, and we will reach the proper conclusion without the aid of either guardian or dictator. The right of the several States to control their internal affairs and the duty to retain in them all of sovereignty which the common good does not require to be delegated to the Federal Government has always been the cardinal principle of the great Democratic Party to which I owe allegiance. But I do not establish my position here upon a party doctrine. The experiments of the peoples of the earth with the various forms of government have demonstrated conclusively that civilization makes its most rapid and its most permanent progress under that system which places the power to govern and the necessity to govern as close to the people as possible.

The government of the States is infinitely closer to the people than is the Federal Government. The States are the people's units of sovereignty. I do not question for one moment the high purpose of those who are supporting this resolution, nor the disinterested devotion of the women who are insisting upon the grant of franchise to their sex. But let them go to the States, where they must finally go, for the ratification of three-fourths of the States before this amendment, if submitted by Congress, could become effective. I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that it is not proposed here to have Congress perform a merely ministerial act in sending this amendment to the States, though the argument of some gentlemen would indicate that to be their view. It is not proposed to submit this amendment under the provision of the Constitution which provides for submission upon the command of two-thirds of the States, because no such command has been given. It is proposed to have Congress act under this clause of the Constitution:

Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution.

Not submit merely, but propose, and then only when it is deemed necessary. The converse included in that language is that Congress shall not propose an amendment to the Constitution unless under its judgment and conscience it deems it necessary. The very fact that the submission of a constitutional amendment is an irrevocable act—no power on earth can recall or modify it once it is submitted—would hold Congress under the highest duty, even if the language of the Constitution were different, not to speculate upon future developments but to reserve its action, its power of control, its ability to profit by developments, up to the time when the demand for the amendment among the States would insure its reasonably expeditious ratification.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I favor the proposed constitutional amendment, because I want all States prohibited from hereafter withholding the right to vote from any American citizen upon the ground that that citizen happens to be a woman. I favor equal suffrage because to me it appears unjust and unnatural that one-half of our population should be disfranchised.

"Oh," some of our opponents say, "we agree with you on the general principle involved, but we believe it is a question for the States and not one for the Federal Government."

Is it possible that any question could be more distinctly Federal than this? Is it possible that any question could go more directly to the source of the public welfare than the right of one-half of its population to vote? If the question of the political freedom of one-half of the population is not one calling for national action, then where will you go to find a question big enough to be called national?

From the earliest times the ruling and aristocratic classes have opposed the extension of the right of suffrage. They have opposed general suffrage because they have realized that the right to vote means the right to reform by peaceful and lawful methods and bodes no good to the greedy, who by unfair and unjust laws are oppressing the poor.

Every grafter in America is opposed to woman suffrage. Every dishonest special-privilege corporation that is now robbing the public under the forms of law is opposed to woman suffrage. The grafter lives in constant terror of the ballot box. Rather than enlarge the right of suffrage by extending it to women, the grafter would prefer to diminish it by disfranchising all the male voters except those who are in on the graft and who would therefore vote to continue it.

The right of general suffrage has been one of slow growth. The men gained that right in America as the result of a brilliant revolution. It has been well said that "Progress takes no steps backward," and wherever the right of suffrage has been once gained it will never be given up. In those States where women have gained the right to vote they will never give it up. When the women of this Nation have been given the right to vote they will never give up that right.

The man who stands in the way of Nation-wide equal suffrage to-day places himself in that class of conservatives who from the earliest periods have stood for the rights of property against the rights of humanity. He places himself with the rich against the poor. He denies to a fellow being, endowed with all the natural rights and intelligence that he possesses, equality before the law. He may try to excuse himself on the ground that this is a local issue, but he will fool no one by such attempt except himself.

The ultrarich of this and all earlier Governments have realized that their right to hold their property depended upon law. In most earlier Governments the law was made by royal decree. In this country law is made by the people direct, through the initiative, or it is made by Representatives and Senators who are elected by the people. In this country the ultrarich have always feared the power of the voters. They have tried to circumscribe that power and hold it in check in every way possible so as to prevent the enactment of law which would interfere with their cherished rights of property. Why do the ultrarich fear the power of the voters? It is because they realize themselves the inherent injustice of the methods by which much of their wealth has been wrung from the poor, and they fear that the poor will use the power of the ballot to correct that injustice.

The ultrarich, feeling that the power of the ballot is a menace to them in the hands of only half the population, very naturally oppose its extension to the other half. That is the secret of the fight against the extension of the right to vote to our mothers, our wives, and our sisters.

They speak of the chivalry of the South, and the lack of any desire on the part of the noble women of that part of our country to vote. There may be a few of the wives of the railroad magnates of the South, wives of the bankers, and wives of other ultrarich men, who do not want women to have the ballot. That is also true in the North. The wives of our high-brow capitalists do not want women to have the ballot. In every city you will find clubs of women organized to fight woman's suffrage. And who belong to those clubs? The wives of men who are enjoying some special privilege, and who imagine that their graft might be endangered by giving the ballot to the intelligent women of America.

But no orator can make me believe that the wives of the poor men, either in the South or the North, are, as a class, opposed to being given the right to vote. They desire the right to vote in order that they may help their husbands in the great and peaceful task of bringing about better and fairer conditions for our common country. If the women of Germany had the right to vote there would be no war in Europe to-day. If the women of Austria had the right to vote, militarism would long since have been banished from that beautiful and naturally peaceful country. If the women of England had the right to vote, John Bull would have even more diplomacy than he has to-day, and he would get into less trouble.

The same men who are to-day opposing the extension of the right of suffrage to our mothers, our wives, and our sisters would take that same right away from our fathers, our brothers, and ourselves if they had the chance, unless we could show such property qualification as would seem to insure that we would vote on the side of property and against humanity.

The question as to which shall be paramount, the rights of property or the rights of humanity, comes up directly upon this resolution to give the right of suffrage to one-half of our adult population. Those who place the rights of property first are opposed to woman's suffrage. Those who place the rights of humanity first are in favor of woman's suffrage.

Those who hold property rights more sacred than human rights are in the minority, but they have nearly all of the property of this and every other land. They must themselves be astonished at the moderation of the male voters of this country. And they must be doubly astonished at the moderation of both the male and female voters in those States of this Union where equal suffrage has been obtained. The few who own nearly all the property realize full well that their right to hold the same and to hand it down by inheritance to the few who shall succeed them depends upon law. They also realize full well that the power to alter or amend existing law, theoretically at least, now rests with the people. The great majority of the people, the voters, being practically without property, those who have nearly all the property must marvel at the moderation of the common herd in the matter of voting for candidates and measures calculated to give greater rights to humanity and fewer rights to property.

For one I am heartily in favor of the institution of private property both in chattels and in land, but I believe that this right of private property should have such limitations thrown around it as will give to every man and every woman a reasonable opportunity by industry and frugality to acquire a competence. Those who now own nearly all the property are opposed to having any limitations put upon their use of the same or upon their right to transmit it intact to the few who shall succeed them on this earth.

I admit that there are two extreme views on this question of property. At one extreme we find the ultrarich claiming every right for property and according none to humanity, and at the other we find the communists claiming every right for humanity and none for property. The latter are not one whit more unreasonable than are the former.

Pierre Joseph Proudhon, a French philosopher of great ability and one of the originators of socialism, said nearly a hundred years ago that slavery is murder and that property is theft. He amplified his rather startling declaration by saying that when you take from a man his will power through slavery and his right of dominion over his own soul you have taken away all that is of value to the man, and that you have consequently murdered him. And he said that when you recognize in one man the right of private property, which recognition bars other persons who happen to be born onto this earth from acquiring any interest in land or chattels because previously assigned to others under this right of property, that you have stolen from the one who is so disinherited that right to which he is entitled by nature, to wit, the right to appropriate to his own use the fruits of his labor. Karl Marx, a German Jew of profound learning and great natural ability, the founder of German socialism, held to practically the same view. The founders of British, French, and German socialism, Robert Owen, Count de Saint-Simon, and Karl Marx, respectively, were all men of great learning, and Owen was a thoroughly successful business man. All of these men lived within the past hundred years. When 19 years of age Saint-Simon volunteered as a soldier to come to America and fight for our independence. He participated in the siege of Yorktown and was present at the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, and received the Order of the Cincinnati for bravery displayed on these occasions.

I believe in the institution of private property, because it affords a reward to industry, honesty, and frugality, and because it enables each family to own its own home and to be independent. I believe in our present inheritance laws which give property upon the death of the owner to his next of kin,

those who naturally have the greatest claim upon his bounty, unless the deceased shall have decreed otherwise during his lifetime.

But while I am a strong believer and a strong defender of the institution of private property and the right of inheritance I favor such limitations upon both as will prevent any man or any set of men from owning a monopoly during their lives with which to oppress the general public or from giving by inheritance to a few such a quantity of property as will virtually disinherit the rest of mankind. For illustration, no one would hardly contend that, if it were possible for one man to acquire title to all the land in the United States, he and his chain of single successors should have the right to own all that land for all the long future. In such a contingency, where is the man who would pronounce unreasonable tax laws calculated to compel the proprietor to let go of all except a reasonable portion of his holdings, or of an inheritance law which would prevent the permanent passing on of such a monopoly?

It must be apparent to all thinking men and women that as between those who are opposed to any interference whatever with what they call the rights of property and those who would abolish such rights altogether there must be a happy medium based upon the composite sense of justice of the public conscience. All who believe in the wisdom of God in putting us here together on this planet will believe that such composite judgment, when permitted to be fairly expressed, will be just. No one who believes in the vital spark of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created free and equal will be afraid of a full, fair, and complete expression of the will of all the people at the ballot box.

Let me recur again to the claim that the aristocratic South is opposed to woman suffrage. It has not been so very long ago, only five short decades, since one of the most eloquent sons of the South, Representative De Jarnette, of Virginia, stood upon this floor where I am now standing and severely criticized the North for having given the right of suffrage to men who were without property and who were merely common laborers. He said that these men were in the majority, and that their having the right of suffrage would be a standing menace to capital and to the institution of private property.

On February 15, 1861, upon this floor, Mr. De Jarnette said:

> Wherever, sir, there is free competition between labor and capital and that labor is armed with the unrestricted right to vote, the labor, being always in the majority, must sooner or later so control the law-making power as to hold capital subject to its will.

And again, on the same occasion:

> Thus society at the North is now pregnant with the seeds of its own destruction. Its only salvation is a stronger government and a restriction of the elective franchise. * * * The standing armies of the Old World are maintained to keep labor from warring on capital; not by controlling the law-making power, for there labor has not the elective franchise, * * * but those armies are maintained to protect capital from mob violence. * * * It is the free suffrage and free labor of the North which now controls the press, the bar, the schools, and the pulpit * * * It is the free labor of the North which has invaded the sanctity of God's altar and compelled its ministers to acknowledge its divinity by dethroning Jehovah and worshiping Beelzebub.

And now listen to this, which shows how closely the Congressman from Virginia linked together the right to hold human beings as slaves and the right to deny laborers any voice in our Government which might interfere with the right of the rich aristocrats to own everything. He said:

> Thus African slavery constitutes the keystone of the arch which supports the only structure which free labor, together with free suffrage, will not and can not destroy. * * *
>
> It is vain, then, for the free labor of the North, by the exercise of its revolutionary power, to attempt further the corruption of the free labor of the South. That labor, Mr. Speaker, has higher aspirations and holier purposes to accomplish; its mission, sir, is to build up, not to destroy, an empire; to obey all the restraints of law and the Constitution, and not to despise the restraints of law and trample in the dust the Constitution; to protect society by carefully guarding the pulpit, not to destroy society by corrupting it. The free labor of the North now seeks the destruction of this beautiful system of government.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are very few here to-day who are not glad that the free labor of the North succeeded in its destruction of a system of human slavery which the brilliant Mr. De Jarnette so eloquently defended and called a "beautiful system."

I hope that no one has failed to note the frequency with which Mr. De Jarnette referred with solemn dignity to "the law," "the Constitution," "society," "the pulpit," and "God's altar" in his argument in favor of the rights of property and in favor of extending those rights even to the ownership of human beings. That shows to you the absurd lengths to which the advocates of property rights will go. I say that the men who to-day defend monopoly, who defend private ownership of those public utilities which practically enslave 80 per cent of our population, refer with just as much solemn dignity and with just as much pious hypocrisy to "the law" and to "the Constitution." They care nothing for "the law" or "the Constitution," except in so far as each may be made subservient to their selfish ends.

Mr. Speaker, here is what "the law" of the land had to say about the rights of the master over his slave, which sacred rights were defended by Congressman De Jarnette in the name of the sanctity of "God's altar." In the case of Neal *v.* Farmer (9 Georgia Repts.) the court held that the master had absolute dominion over the slave, and that it was no crime even to kill a slave. The court said:

> In the absence of any statutory limitation on that property he holds it as unqualifiedly as the first proprietor held it, and his title and the extent of his property were sanctioned by the usage of nations which had grown into law. There is no sensible account to be given of property in slaves here but this. What were, then, the rights of the African chief in the slave which he had captured in war? The slave was his to sell or to give or to kill.

And in the case of State *v.* Mann (2 Devereaux's Repts., p. 268) the Supreme Court of North Carolina held that it was no crime for the owner of a woman slave to assault, beat, or wound her. The court said:

> That there may be particular instances of cruelty and barbarity where in conscience the law might properly interfere is most probable. The difficulty is to determine where the court may properly begin. Merely in the abstract it may well be asked, Which power of the master accords with right? The answer will probably sweep away all of them. But we can not look at the master in that light. The truth is that we are forbidden to enter upon a train of general reasoning upon the subject. We can not allow the power of the master to be brought into discussion in the courts of justice. The slave, to remain a slave, must be made sensible that there is no appeal from his master; that his power is in no instance usurped; but is conferred by the laws of man, at least if not by the laws of God.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these cases only to show what diabolical acts of inhumanity were defended upon this floor 50 years ago in the name of "the law" and in the name of "the Constitution." It was the defense of the "rights of property" as against the "rights of humanity."

A great war gave all Americans their political freedom and erased from our history the blot of human slavery at least as a legal institution.

A half century has rolled by, and during that time all male citizens as a class have had the right to vote. Except in a small number of States, women have been denied that great privilege. And how has the country fared?

At the close of the Civil War the wealth of the United States was $25,000,000,000, and that wealth was quite evenly distributed. To-day the wealth of the United States is $120,000,000,000, and 70 per cent of that wealth is owned by 200,000 men. In other words, two-tenths of 1 per cent of our population to-day owns 70 per cent of our wealth.

Do these figures indicate that the right of suffrage has been a detriment to the institution of private property? On the contrary, these figures show conclusively that the male voters have signally failed to properly safeguard the rights of the public against the aggrandizement of capital. Would it be any better if women were given the ballot? I do not know, but there is one thing I do know, and that is that it could not be any worse. And another thing I know is that the special interests that have acquired 70 per cent of the wealth of the United States, leaving the remaining 99,800,000 people practically industrial slaves, are opposed to woman suffrage, and those special interests usually know what is best for them. If it is best for the special interests to keep the ballot from our mothers, our wives, and our sisters, it is to our best interests to enfranchise women at once.

"Oh," they say, "what good will the enfranchisement of women do if the men have so carelessly used the ballot that the special interests have acquired practically all the wealth of the country?" They ask if the enfranchisement of women will not merely result in increasing the total number of votes cast without in any respect changing the result?

I admit that the men have used the ballot to poor advantage, but it has cost the special interests millions of dollars at each election to corrupt and influence the male voters into voting contrary to their interests, and in controlling the press and other influences which have a bearing upon men's votes.

The interests may, through a control of the press and other corrupt means, be able to control elections after women are enfranchised as they have before, but it will be harder for them to do it. There will be more voters to control, and that of itself will make the task of corruptly controlling the electorate more difficult. Besides, it will be harder to reach the mother in the home with corrupt influence than it is to reach the poor laboring man, who in many cases has no home.

I believe in the natural instincts of women for good. I believe it not only their right to vote, but I believe it is their duty to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, with pain and tribulation they bring us forth into the world; with love and affection they nurse us when we are young and educate us when we grow older into the guidance of those principles which make for our lives; they teach our children in the public schools; in the main they run our churches; they are in control to a large extent of our civic organizations; they are our counselors when we become older; to them we turn for that advice which is most valuable to us when temptation or trials come before us; and I am quite content to trust their judgment at the polls. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are strong and powerful arguments on both sides of the question of woman suffrage, and still stronger arguments on the subject of national suffrage, but the tendency of the world everywhere is toward enlarging the grant of power to those who shall control the destinies of the Nation. The uneducated, the poor, the serfs, the slaves, have been educated to the power of helping in government. We may stem the current for the moment, but civilization's progress develops unerringly the logic of granting suffrage to all who have the capacity to make proper use of it.

No one denies the intellectual power of women to make proper use of suffrage. I believe the time has come in this country where we must safely say to those who are in intimate relation with us all through life: "We ask you to help us in the management of the affairs of this great Nation, in the hope that we may make progress still greater in the future than we have in the past, in the belief that granting responsibility will bring new considerations to the great problems which we have to meet." And I feel that we are warranted in trusting in the good wife's judgment of the other half of humanity in a management of the affairs of our country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has yielded back 5 minutes. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas 7, and if nobody desires to speak the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HENRY. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desire to use the balance of his time?

Mr. MANN. We will not use the time.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the question that confronts the House to-day is the gravest question that this body can consider. It is asserted by those who advocate the right of the women of this country to vote that it is a right on their part, and yet this morning I have listened to gentlemen argue on that side of the question who come here from States that deny that right to their own women, or who come from States that but grudgingly have given a part of the franchise to the women of their own States. Do they represent the sentiment of their own people, who have the power to act and who have refused to do so?

Mr. Speaker, I deny that the exercise of the franchise is a universal right. To exercise the franchise in this American Republic is the highest privilege that can be granted. It is no more the right to exercise the franchise than it is a right possessed by man or woman to hold office. And even those States where the women of the State have been given the right of franchise, themselves deny that the franchise is a right and not a privilege. Some of the States represented on the floor of this House that will probably cast their votes in favor of woman suffrage to-day would almost unanimously, so far as the white vote is concerned, men and women alike, deny the right, if you call it a right, to other races, because you believe if you granted what you call a right you might destroy your own civilization. And, therefore, you yourselves recognize that the question of franchise is a high privilege and not a universal right. I do not speak for myself alone. As the floor leader of the majority of this House, on this occasion I have a right to speak for my party. The Democratic Party has not been silent on this question. It has not attempted to say what should be done in California or in New York or in Alabama. It has not said that the women of any State in the Union should not have the right to exercise the high privilege of the franchise, but it has said that under our Constitution, our laws, in view of the history of our Republic, this question must be settled by the individual States and not by the National Government.

There is no question that is more fundamental in the history of the Democratic Party than that each State in this Union shall govern its own franchise. If you left the question of the right to vote to the entire people of the United States, they have not the information about local affairs, they are not surrounded by all the conditions that would lead to a wise, a safe, and a patriotic solution of the question.

At one time in my own State universal manhood suffrage was granted to the people of Alabama, and that portion of my State that suffered the worst from it were the good women and children of the State of Alabama.

This right of suffrage is going to move just as fast as the conditions of the people who seek this privilege warrant them in exercising it. If you try to drive it faster than that, you but court disaster and the wreck and ruin of some portions of this country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] demands a division. Those in favor of passing this rule will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and nine gentlemen have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-seven gentlemen have risen in the negative. On this vote the ayes are 209 and the noes are 37, and the rule is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] for one hour.

Mr. MANN. The resolution has to be reported, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (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-fourth of 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. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

Mr. CULLOP rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CULLOP. When would be a proper time to offer an amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. When we get through with the six hours' debate.

Mr. CULLOP. Would it be proper to offer it now and have it pending?

The SPEAKER. It would be proper to offer it now for information.

Mr. CULLOP. Then I desire to offer it now. In line 6——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is not proper to offer it now.

The SPEAKER. He is not offering it.

Mr. MANN. He has not the floor.

Mr. CULLOP. I am asking only to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] was recognized for one hour, and he has the floor. If he wants to yield to the gentleman from Indiana he has the right to do it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. May I inquire what was the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary on this resolution?

The SPEAKER. It did not make any.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield to me for a moment I will offer the amendment.

Mr. WEBB. I prefer not to yield, Mr. Speaker. I prefer that it shall be done at the end of the debate.

Mr. CULLOP. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may offer the amendment now, so as to have it before the House for information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is proper procedure unless the gentleman can get time and give notice of his amendment. He will have an opportunity, when it is reached under the five-minute rule, to offer it.

The SPEAKER. The proper time to offer amendments is at the close of the general debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB]. The Chair would answer the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] still further, that the Chair understands that the Judiciary Committee made no recommendation whatever. It simply threw this amendment back into the House.

Mr. MANN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The Chair is entirely correct.

Mr. WEBB. That should be discovered by the report of the committee itself, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be notified when I have used five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Very well.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to woman suffrage, but I am not opposed to woman. I respect her, admire her, reverence her, because of the sacred position she occupies in all human life and growth. It is because of this respect, admiration, and reverence that I am opposed to woman suffrage.

Nature destined woman to be the home maker, the child rearer, while man is the money maker. The most sacred and potential spot on earth is the fireside shrine. Here the child receives its morals, its religion, its character; and over this shrine the devoted mother presides as the reigning sovereign, the uncrowned queen; but her influence is more powerful, her edicts more important than the acts of all the throned monarchs of earth.

I am unwilling, as a southern man, to force upon her any burden which will distract this loving potentate from her sacred, God-imposed duties.

I am unwilling to force her into the vortex of politics, where her sensitiveness and her modesty will often be offended.

She can not purify politics with the ballot. On the contrary, I fear that politics, if corrupt, might corrupt her also.

When you set the lure of active, political strife before a woman and she is drawn into it, to that extent the home must suffer.

Prof. Durant Drake, of Wesleyan University, writing in the November North American Review, says:

> It would seem (though we must speak tentatively and without dogmatism on this matter until it shall have thoroughly been thrashed out) that society must insist that the normal sphere of woman lies in the making of the home and the bringing up of children—a task so arduous and exacting as to forbid its proper fulfillment side by side with any other vocation.
>
> We must repeat that it is not a question, ultimately, of what women want, but of what they ought to want; not a question of rights, but duties.
>
> The highest good of the community as a whole has precedence over the wishes of any class; the legislation and conventions of the future must be based not upon any plea for liberty, but upon solid considerations of general human welfare.

No country in the world has emancipated woman so rapidly as has the United States, and yet woman suffragists positively refuse to submit the question of women voting to women themselves, but demand that we men shall thrust the ballot into the hands of women, even though they do not ask it.

I venture the statement that were the question of women voting submitted to the women of the United States more than 80 per cent would express themselves against it.

I am opposed to this resolution on another ground—that is, I believe in the absolute right of every State to prescribe the qualifications of its voters, and so long as our dual form of Government remains inviolate, this right must rest within the power of the States as their sovereign prerogative.

There is no analogy from the standpoint of State rights between making the Federal Government a party to the stamping out of the liquor traffic and in making it a party in fixing the qualifications of the voters of the several States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. WEBB. I will take five minutes more, Mr. Speaker.

Practically every great thinker and authority from the Supreme Court of the United States down has declared that the liquor traffic produces more pauperism, misery, and crime than all other causes combined, and certainly it is not an intrenchment upon the rights of the States for them to enlist the aid of the Federal Government in stamping out a traffic which produces such awful results. On the contrary, no one will declare that any such dire results will flow from the failure on the part of Congress to submit to the States this question, especially when a majority of the women are opposed to having the ballot thrust into their hands.

I believe that 90 per cent of the mothers in this country are not only not in favor of woman suffrage, but are positively against it.

They are willing to trust their husbands and their sons to make the laws while they make the homes.

If woman is to demand and receive equal privileges at the polls, in the workshops, and in every walk of life, then why should man be longer required to support the wife?

Why should he be put in jail for abandonment unless woman be required to suffer equally for such offense?

Why should man be longer required to support the wife any more than the wife should be required to support the husband? If man is required to work the public roads, then why not woman? If men must pay poll taxes, women must do so, too.

I am well aware that extreme suffragists, feminists, Socialists, and I. W. W.'s will say that my ideas on the question of woman suffrage are out of date and antiquated, but I beg to remind all such critics that this Government has grown in power and population as no other country on earth has grown, and for more than 100 years has been known the world over as the land of the brave and the home of the free—and all this marvelous growth has come about and this splendid reputation attained without the aid of woman's ballot.

If I thought woman suffrage was best for my country, or even for womankind, I would gladly support it, but believing sincerely that it would be harmful to both I shall stubbornly oppose it.

Mrs. Horace Brock, honorary president State Federation of Pennsylvania Women, president Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, has well said:

> The assumption that man has attained a more dignified or "superior" position in human society than woman is based on the suffrage sophistry that it is better to be a man than a woman—a common claim. Their real quarrel is not with men with women, nor with government, but with the nature that made them women instead of men. Lacking the attributes of the masculine nature which they admire, they seek some measure of identity with men by legislation. This is the fundamental fact at the bottom of the suffrage agitation.

If women are so anxious to vote, why do they not hurry across the continent to Wyoming, the State of my friend MONDELL, the author of this resolution? There they have been voting longer than in any other State in the Union, and there we find not only that no women immigrated in to exercise this precious right of franchise, but the women in proportion to the men have been actually diminishing for the last half century.

No, Mr. Speaker, the truth about this matter is that woman suffragism is more or less a fad, and if in the morning, tomorrow morning, all of these busy advocates of woman suffrage to-day should wake and find themselves actually enfranchised they would be disappointed, surprised, and chagrined. The truth of it is, my friends, these agitating women suffragists want something to agitate about, and after the agitation is over and they have secured their object they would be disappointed because no more agitation would be in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes more.

Mr. WEBB. I will take two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. WEBB. They remind me very much of the Irishman who heard that there was a run on the bank in which he had a deposit. He hurried around the corner to his bank and rushed in and said to the cashier, "Mr. Cashier, I want my $3,000, and I want it quick." "All right," said the cashier, "here it is." "Oh, faith, can I get it?" inquired the Irishman. "Yes," said the cashier; "here it is." "Well it is this way," said the Irishman, "if I can get it, I don't want it; but if I can't get it, I want it mighty bad." That is the way with many of the women suffragists. If they can get it, they do not want it; and if they can not get it, they want it very bad.

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that there are more women in the State of Pennsylvania opposed to woman suffrage than there are women in all the suffrage States in favor it. Everybody knows that this House will not vote to submit this amendment by a two-thirds vote. Everybody knows that the people of the United States are not for it. We are simply frittering away the time of this House in order to give some of these agitators the power to go over the country and attack in public speeches the Members who do not vote according to their bidding. Mr. Speaker, I for one expect to cast my vote to-day to protect woman against herself. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, here are extracts from a letter addressed to the President of the United States by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president, dated November 27, 1914, and published in the December number of The Woman's Protest:

"After 65 years of constant agitation and recruiting on the part of suffragists, their national membership, estimated on representation of 53 suffrage associations certified to by their credentials committee at their recent national convention at

Nashville, is under 200,000 for the entire United States, or less than 1 per cent of the 24,555,754 mature women in America. It is also strikingly significant that in the States where women vote, and where it is natural to look for the most women organized to help obtain the franchise for their sisters, if beneficial, only 6,700 members of suffrage associations appear to exist according to the credential report; and none of the four oldest suffrage States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho—was interested enough to represent itself by delegation at the national suffrage convention.

"Besides, Nevada and Montana have often been called the 'blackest and wettest States in the Union' by the suffragists themselves. In Nevada a direct appeal for the saloon vote was made by an advertisement signed by two officers of their suffrage organization. In Montana the W. C. T. U. was denied a place in a suffrage parade for fear of offending the 'liquor interests.' The defeat of the 'cause' in the other five States, coming as a supplement to the overwhelming defeats of suffrage at the polls in 1913 in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Michigan, is an indication that 'votes for women' are repudiated decisively in the most progressive and populous communities.

"A favorite argument with the suffragists is that 'the women should be consulted' in politics. We ask that the women be consulted on this issue above all others. The suffragists, on the other hand, dare not propose 'letting the women decide,' and their most famous advocates and apologists have specifically declined to approve the will of the majority of women. But we would have every statesman and scholar in America seriously consider the fact that the vote against woman suffrage in the recent election corresponded with the proportion of women available to advise their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers on the franchise question."

—

"MORE LIGHT ON THE 'LIQUOR INTERESTS' BUGABOO."

[From The Woman's Protest for December, 1914. Editorial.]

"Let us ascertain the truth.

"It is true that suffrage organizations have solicited campaign funds from the liquor interests. The liquor interests have declared, 'Experience has proved that we have nothing to fear from woman suffrage.'

"It is also true that the antisuffrage organization has never either solicited or received one cent of money from any individual or organization connected with the liquor interests.

"*The* antisuffragists court publicity on this subject. Do the suffragists?"

—

[From the Woman's Protest, December (p. 10).]

"Two successive and prominent speakers rose at the National Suffrage Convention at Nashville to point out that women 'need the ballot because nearly 9,000,000 women are working outside the home.' * * * We simply refer the investigator to the census report of occupations, issued June 20, 1914, in which it is shown only 8,075,772 feminine workers over 10 years of age were employed in all gainful occupations in homes or anywhere else in America at the last census, and furthermore indicates that even this number is perhaps too great, and should be 7,607,672 (p. 27, vol. 4). Of these 4,338,337, or over half, are employed as domestic or in agricultural pursuits, where every woman who makes butter or sells eggs for market is included. If suffragists can not confine their oratory to the actual number of women the census shows to be 'working outside the home'—3,974,957—and can not mention that the census also shows 20,346,961 women engaged inside of the 17,805,845 homes that house the 20,255,555 families, or further, that of the 24,555,754 women in America over 21, 20,518,833 are or have been married, we won't quibble about their honor or fairness; we only show the ridiculous contrast between suffrage statistics and the United States census.

"After a campaign in which house-to-house canvasses were made, scores of workers speaking and organizing in every county of the State, and every possible method of bringing the suffrage arguments to the people strenuously enforced by the suffrage campaigners, the proposal to adopt equal suffrage in Ohio was defeated by the voters of the State at the recent election by a majority of 182,905. This is an increase over the defeating majority registered two years ago on the same subject of 96,000 votes. And it would seem to indicate that if the suffragists attempt a third election, as they are threatening to do again in two years, their measure will go down to defeat then by about 300,000 majority—a rather discouraging sort of progress for the movement, one would think.

"Facts are rarely of much interest to a defeated party; theories are much more interesting. But here are the facts for those who care for them:

"The home-rule measure—the 'wet' or 'liquor measure'—won in Ohio by a poor, frightened 8,300 majority—less than one-twentieth of the antisuffrage majority. Yet suffragists say it was that which did it. Prohibition was defeated by 83,371—considerably less than half of the suffrage-defeating majority. And 179,132 voters voted for prohibition who did not vote for woman suffrage. Two hundred and forty-eight thousand six hundred and fifty-nine voted on the liquor measure who did not care enough about suffrage to vote either way.

"'My wife doesn't believe in woman suffrage.' That was what defeated woman suffrage in Ohio. That was the gentle slogan spoken by hundreds of thousands of men on election morning and the day before, with no idea they were uttering a campaign cry which piled up that majority against politicalizing humanity to the number of 182,905."

—

[Clipped from the Woman's Protest for December, 1914.]

"In this State the men voted against extending larger liberality toward the liquor interests; also they voted against extension of woman suffrage to women. They did differently in Montana, where they voted in favor of equal suffrage and for a law legalizing prize fighting. The contrast between the two adjoining States is so clearly marked as to render it both notable and novel. (Vermilion (S. Dak.) Republican.)

"We regret to say that in California, with equal suffrage in full force for the first time, prohibition was defeated by over 150,000 majority. And not only that but, worse still, by way of a clincher, the proposition to prevent any vote on the prohibition question for the next succeeding eight years was also carried. Thus it is evident that universal suffrage and State-wide prohibition do not necessarily trudge along hand in hand. (Exchange.)

NORTH DAKOTA.

"Another interesting fact is that the campaign cry of the suffragists was that we were in league with the liquor and vice interests generally. The figures do not seem to bear this out. Every one of the Red River Valley counties, viz: The row of counties lying along the eastern border of the State—Pembina, Walsh, Grand Forks, Traill, Cass, and Richland—counted as 'dry' counties gave a majority against suffrage, the combined majorities of these counties for us being 3,188.

"It is a curious fact that most of the counties giving a majority for suffrage are not in the 'dry' part of the State, but are in the western part of the Missouri slope.

"The election returns in this State also give additional proof that our women do not want to vote and will not vote.

"A few illustrations will demonstrate this: In Cass County, including Fargo, the home of the 'Votes for Women League,' 4,827 men voted and 196 women. In Stutsman County, the headquarters of the 'W. C. T. U.' and the home of Mrs. Elizabeth Preston Anderson, who campaigned for suffrage for 10 months, 2,580 men voted and 55 women. In Barnes County, where many prominent suffragists reside, 2,365 men voted and 85 women. In Ramsey County, 2,719 men voted and 27 women. In Traill County, 1,784 men voted and 48 women."

—

[Clipped from the Woman's Protest, December, 1914 (p. 11).]

MONTANA.

"At this writing the official count has not been made.

"To-day, if suffrage has carried, Montana faces the menace of socialism in a greater degree than it has before. The victory, if it proves to be a victory, is one for the Socialist Party, and this statement is borne out by the returns from Missoula and other socialistic strongholds, where the largest majorities were piled up for the amendment."

—

[From the Lesterville Ledger.]

"The voters of South Dakota believe that there is enough of disappointment in politics for men without attaching this additional trouble and worry on the women."

Occupational statistics of importance.

Females over 10 years of age in all occupations in the United States	8,075,772
Agriculture, forestry, and animal industry	1,807,501
Personal and domestic service	2,530,846
Manufacturing and mechanical pursuits	1,820,980
Trade	468,088
Clerical occupations	593,224
Professional service	733,885
Transportation	106,596
Public service (not elsewhere classified)	13,558
Extraction of minerals	1,094

Males in United States, 47,332,277; males in United States 10 years and over, 37,027,558; males in United States 10 years and over in gainful pursuits, 30,091,564—81.3 per cent; 81.3 per cent of males of 10 years and over are wage earners as against 23.4 per cent female wage earners.

United States Census, volume 4, on Population, dealing with occupational statistics:

Females in United States	44,639,989
Females in United States 10 years and over	34,552,712
Females in United States 10 years and over engaged in gainful occupations	8,075,772

"That is, only 23.4 per cent of the females of 10 years and over in this country earn their own living."

[Clipped from the Woman's Protest, December, 1914 (p. 12).]

"Harriet Stanton Blatch declares that women are the first class to fight their battle entirely alone. She is forgetting that the Socialists, the Progressives, the Mormons, and the Industrial Workers of the World are all staunch allies of the suffragists. Did Mrs. Blatch not take part in the suffrage parade when the Socialists carried a banner saying, 'One million Socialists vote and work for suffrage'? And is she so ungrateful as to forget that the recent suffrage victory in Nevada was entirely due to the Socialists and Mormons?"

THE RIGHTS TO BE FREE FROM DUTIES.

"In the North American Review for November Prof. Durant Drake, of Wesleyan University, discusses 'The ethics of the women's cause.' Prof. Drake is inclined to predict as inevitable certain gains for the cause of 'Votes for Women.'

"Of the rights of women the essayist reminds us that 'the woman movement is largely an expression of willfulness, of impatience of restraint. This can, of course, be idealized, and can awaken splendid and self-sacrificing loyalties; but we must not be misled by these. The fundamental requirements of our human nature and the inexorable conditions of its existence demand many sacrifices of desire. And so, however deeply we may admire and sympathize with the sex that has been so long repressed and patronizingly petted, however much we may long for women to have equally noble opportunities, and to be recognized through and through as men's comrades and equals, we must not assume that either men or women can rightly be freed from restrictions and often irksome duties.

"'Certain fundamental facts can not be ignored. Woman is a child-bearing and, more, a child-rearing animal. There is nothing humiliating in this fact, however bluntly put, any more than in the fact that man is, by necessity, a money-making animal. Of the two vocations the one that nature decrees to women is the nobler, and though attended with more pain, on the whole, the happier. At any rate, it can not without disaster be evaded. Children do not thrive well under institutional care—that is proved; they need the personal care, the patient, loving, skillful, endless care of mothers. If the human race is to continue, women must give the best of their strength to its perpetuation; if it is to develop its potentialities, physical, mental, moral, women must give years from their lives—the best years—for the care and nurture of children; they must give preliminary years to the acquirement of the knowledge and skill that shall fit them for this greatest of vocations. And if this task is decreed by nature for women, men are by a complementary duty bound to work for the support of the women thus engaged, and for the children, who must be allowed, say, 20 years apiece of play and learning time before they become, if men, producers, if women, in their turn, child rearers—so much division of labor is, in normal cases, inevitable."

[Clipped and copied from the Woman's Protest, December, 1914 (p. 14).]

"In the 'dry-and-suffrage' parade in Columbus, Ohio, the Sunday before election, five little colored girls marched, carrying a banner with the inscription, 'We are the men of to-day.'

"NOTES AND COMMENTS (P. 15).

"Many women, having little else, demand the vote, having persuaded themselves it will give them that 'else' they lack. On the contrary, the majority of the women who have that else realize that the ballot will not add to that which they have, but take from it.

"In the woman's suffrage propaganda there is involved a question far more vital and far-reaching than the mere political stability of the State. There hangs in the balance the very existence and perpetuity of the State and the moral and physical well-being of the people. The greatest evils in this country to-day are not to be found in the unsavory political corruption that occasionally comes to light; they are not to be found in the untoward encroachments of predatory trusts, nor even in the oppressive congestion of the slums. They are to be found rather in the social ideals of those classes of the people upon whom, by reason of their superior culture or affluence, responsibility for the social ideals of the nation chiefly falls, and two of the gravest and most insidious of those evils are the diminution of the family and the startling spread of divorce.

"Well said for Virginia. Virginia has recently gone 'dry,' and women do not vote. California has just had an election and went 'wet,' the women espousing the liquor cause. Another Western State also went 'wet,' the women voting the wet ticket.

"Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Mississippi are dry States and men voted them dry. Men voted Maine dry.

"For those Woman's Christian Temperance Union women, mostly from the West and North, to come down here and preach woman's suffrage to be a national law, regardless of States, was a piece of political impertinence. Suffrage is dearer to their hearts than prohibition, else they would have eschewed the subject in a southern prohibition State.

"All but this one Virginia woman, by their actions and expression, indorsed the views of Mrs. Carrie Catt, who says: 'If this present Constitution stands in our way, we propose to tear it up and make another.'"

[From the Woman's Protest. November, 1914.]

THE MENACE OF THE CONTROLLED "WOMAN VOTE" (P. 3).

"The controlled vote is the menace of the densely populated districts. That woman suffrage will add to this vote in overwhelming numbers is an antisuffrage belief. An illustration of it is found in the recent election in California, a suffrage State, which defeated prohibition, November 3.

"We quote from Hearst's (suffrage) San Francisco Examiner of November 4:

"'All the excitement during the day centered around the booths in the Barbary Coast district and those in the uptown tenderloin. McDonough brothers, Frank Daroux, "Red" Kelly, et al., who control the Barbary Coast vote, were working tooth and nail to elect Dominick J. Behan State senator, while Jim Coffroth and Johnny Crowley were working just as hard uptown for Gus Hartman.

"'McDonough brothers had several automobiles busy all day long hauling Barbary Coast dance-hall girls and the inmates of houses on Commercial Street to the different booths, and always the women were supplied with a marked sample ballot.

"'Coffroth and Crowley were not so generous uptown. They let the women walk.

"'The strangest scenes of all possibly were those around the booth opposite the St. Francis Hotel, on Union Square. It was there that all the guests of the St. Francis, the Stewart, and other hotels in that neighborhood voted. There also voted many of the women of the night life, and that the strategical importance of this booth was realized by the two factions was evidenced by the fact that Gus Hartman occupied a soap box on one side of the street in front of this booth, while Frank Daroux sat across the sidewalk from him all day long.

"'From remarks heard around the booths those women voting against prohibition were greatly in the preponderance, and many women voted on that measure alone.'"

"It is thus seen once more why a Pacific coast liquor organization declared: 'After careful investigation of the matter in suffrage States, we find we have nothing to fear from the woman's vote.' Surely these men must know whom to fear and why. Evidently they do not fear the suffragists.

"THE ELECTIONS IN THE WEST (P. 4).

"Out of seven States where the question of woman suffrage came before the electorate, five defeated it overwhelmingly; one State, Nevada, the smallest in population and in the per cent of women, has evidently been carried by the suffragists, while Montana is still in doubt, and only the official count will determine the result. In Nevada the Socialist vote was over 5,000, the Mormon vote more than 1,000, probably 6,500 votes in all out of a total vote of 20,000, or nearly one-third of the entire vote. These votes were, of course, delivered in a block to the suffrage cause.

"One feature of the result is especially gratifying: The suffragists secured no State east of the Rockies; they have captured no territory in which the home wields the influence that it wields generally in the more populous States. Even in Nevada, in the larger towns where homes were most numerous, suffrage was defeated nearly two to one; the exceptions were the mining centers of Goldfield and Tonopah, where the Socialist vote was exceptionally strong. Out in the mining camps, where there were no women, particularly the small and isolated camps, the vote was practically unanimous in favor of suffrage. This is a confirmation of the contention of the antisuffragists that women do not want the ballot. * * *

"Suffrage was most overwhelmingly defeated where the most women were consulted."

"THE PASSING OF AN EPIDEMIC OF EMOTION" (PP. 5-6).

[By Mrs. George P. White, chairman organizing committee Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. (November The Woman's Protest.)]

"How many women who live in Western States have seen the sheriff come around with a list of registered voters in order to

collect a posse to capture outlaws? How many women want to get on such a list? How many want to serve on juries or to be called upon by policemen to assist in arresting criminals?

"Yes; there are a few—and they all heartily believe in 'votes for women.' The kind of woman who wants to become a politician and a policeman wants to be everything a man is—except a soldier. But where is she going to draw the line? The line at the polls is an emblem of the firing line. It is the proper place to designate the difference in duties and responsibilities that exist between man and woman.

"And it is the only chance the world has for peace. Militarism, despotism, and socialism have all proved unable to preserve peace in the hands of men who have votes and arms.

"That the logical feminists see the relation between politics and war is shown in Allen L. Benson, the socialist-suffragist's recent contention that 'if a woman votes to send a man to the cannon's mouth she should go with him.' And the suffragists say that 'the women voting to do this would not make a corporal's guard.'"

"If 1,200 men voted for a principle they consider vital, and 600 men and 1,000 women voted against it, how could the majority enforce its opinion? The 1,600 men and women could not meet the 1,200 men in battle and win, and yet if the 1,000 women all voted for the measure the 600 men have to defend would they not logically and morally be bound to join them in the contest? But supposing the 1,000 women do not vote and do not fight, is it not true that they not only escape a useless burden that would not make any difference in the decision but they preserve their own status as noncombatants and nonpartisans? And if they can not preserve peace, they can at least modify war, make the victor kinder to the vanquished, and keep themselves and children out of battles and bloodshed. Why does not Mrs. Pethick Lawrence see further than her fingers, and, by putting the words 'political war' in her sentence, make it represent a recognized and universal truth? Then she would say: 'The moral immunity of all women in civilized nations from the terrible duty of organized murder and political war is too great a boon to the whole world to be placed in jeopardy.' And the antisuffragists would piously add 'by woman suffrage.'

"Is there anything more significant than the fact that the Colorado women—who have voted 21 years—and the English militants—whose warlike campaigns are history—are the only women who have proposed women regiments? Of course Dr. Anna Howard Shaw says she would like to be a policeman. Other feminists would like to be everything, from bootblacks to President, rather than what nature made them, namely, women. A 'policeman' in skirts would have rather a nice time persuading desperate criminals to go to jail, would she not? One of them in Chicago recently threatened to resign unless the captain of the district had her escorted home by a man when she was on duty after dark!"

"NINETEEN QUESTIONS FOR SUFFRAGISTS TO ANSWER."

[From the Woman's Protest, November, 1914.]

"*Headquarters, Pennsylvania Suffrage Association:*

"In fairness to the public, and in order to extend an accurate knowledge of just what woman suffrage may be expected to do in view of its past record, the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage invites your speakers to answer the following questions, and to give a clear explanation of the following facts and figures:

"1. Why is it that, after 65 years of constant agitation, the woman-suffrage cause is opposed by women themselves more vigorously than ever?

"2. Why is woman suffrage the only movement among women that has excited against itself an organized National and State opposition from other women?

"3. As the census report on occupations issued June 20, 1914, shows only 8,075,772 feminine workers over 10 years of age in the United States, why do suffragists claim that '8,000,000 women workers demand the ballot'?

"4. The National American Woman Suffrage Association claimed a membership of 'about 650,000' in June, 1914. The Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, the National's rival, claimed 4,000 members about the same time. This makes 654,000 suffragists in America, which is less than one-twelfth the 8,000,000 feminine workers, less than one-half the total number of women enfranchised in the nine full-suffrage States (1,998,163, according to the census), and only 2.7 per cent of the women over 21 in America. Why have 97 women out of every 100 rejected woman suffrage for 65 years; and why do less than half the enfranchised women approve their own 'emancipation' and less than one-twelfth the women workers believe in 'votes for women'?

"5. Since the census figures show 4,338,337 of the feminine workers are employed in agricultural pursuits and domestic service—on farms and in homes—and that of the 24,555,754 women over 21 in America, 20,518,833 are or have been married, and are obviously 'making homes' for the 20,255,555 families who live in the 17,805,845 dwellings in the United States, how do you prove that 'woman's work has gone out of the home and into store, factory, and shop'?

"6. Woman suffrage, you claim, will bring better labor conditions. Colorado has had woman suffrage 21 years. Why, then, is Colorado the only State in the Union that has called for Federal aid in suppressing anarchy and riot twice in 10 years—in 1904 and 1914?

"7. Woman suffrage will do away with child labor, you assert. Above-mentioned census report (pp. 73, 442, and 512) show the same percentage of children from 10 to 13 at work in Colorado as in Pennsylvania. But in Colorado the highest number of such children work out as farm laborers, whereas in Pennsylvania the highest number are employed on the home farm. Nearly twice as many children work out on farms in Colorado as are employed by their own parents. In Pennsylvania the situation is so reversed that nearly three times as many children work for their own parents as for others. Does 'votes for women' force more children to leave home and work for others?

"8. Woman suffrage will bring 'economic independence,' you declare. How is economic independence to be secured without social revolution?

"9. If votes will raise wages, as suffrage agitators promise women workers, why do men in the same industries depend on labor unions rather than on votes to get higher pay?

"10. If woman suffrage will help the woman worker, explain the following testimony, after three years of suffrage in California, before the Federal Industrial Relations Commission at Los Angeles, September 10, 1914. Mrs. Katherine P. Edson, member of the California Industrial Welfare Commission, declared:

"'No doubt a large part of our social trouble, such as the children in the street, is due to men working for an inadequate wage and women being forced to go out and work. It seems to me a hopeless situation. My opinion is that there are more women working outside their homes here than there should be. Some large dry goods stores, I understand, are contemplating refusing to employ married women because of the numerous complaints from unmarried women workers.'

"Why does a woman call the condition of labor 'hopeless' where women vote?

"11. Various department stores in Philadelphia allow their employees all day off Saturdays during the summer. Where have women secured Saturday holidays with 'a piece of paper in a ballot box'?

"12. Woman suffrage will rout rum, you allege. Then why has no State ever gone 'dry' with 'votes for women,' although 11 have done so by the moral influence of woman on the votes of men only?

"13. Where were the women voters of Colorado on November 5, 1912, when that State defeated prohibition by a majority of 40,807 votes, 116,774 ballots being cast for the saloons? As there are 213,425 women over 21 in Colorado (p. 118, Census Abstract), it would have taken only 58 per cent of them to make the State 'dry' by a majority of 6,012 without a single male vote to help them. Does this not prove that most of the women who will vote are against the very temperance that all women desire and have secured under male suffrage?

"14. Wyoming got woman suffrage in 1869. It has remained the forty-seventh Commonwealth in the Union to this day, according to the census. If women seek 'emancipation,' why has the colonization of Wyoming been so sadly neglected for 45 years, and why are there only 100 women to every 168 men in that State, which is the second lowest proportionate feminine population in the United States? Why women avoid Wyoming wants explanation.

"15. Suffragists say women should vote because they pay taxes. On this plea the foreign corporation or individual or nonresident who pays taxes should vote. The majority of women are not taxpayers, however, and their addition to the electorate would only increase the number of voters who do not pay taxes. Do suffragists advocate further extension of irresponsibility?

"16. Suffragists are indorsed by all the unstable elements in our population—the Socialists, the Industrial Workers of the World, and the feminists. Do suffragists in turn indorse socialism, sabotage, and communism? If not, why do they accept the support of Socialists and feminists and run standing appeals for such support by officially advertising for it in revolutionary

magazines given over to the defense of convicted rioters and the glorification of masculine and feminine rebellion? (See a copy of the Masses.) Note standing advertisement of National American Woman Suffrage Association.

"17. If women are competent to vote on every question, why not allow them to vote on their own enfranchisement?

"18. In view of the fact that woman suffrage proposes another duty to woman, an unnecessary duty inconsistent with her highest natural duties and functions, and, furthermore, involves great risk and additional expense to the State, we have a right to ask what it can do to improve civic conditions, and where it has done so. If suffragists can not prove 'votes for women' are worth while, how can they show any reason why woman suffrage should not be rejected?

"19. An electorate, like a standing army, is a governmental instrument to carry out the will of the people. Its extension can only be advocated as a necessity or a service to the common good. Where and when have women proved their supreme moral influence as the mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, and teachers of men as 'inferior' to the ballots and bullets that men must sometimes use? What reason can suffragists give for asking women to use the weapons of men in a vain attempt to exercise political power when the wishes of women and the wisdom of the centuries teach us to rely on the moral might that women wield in the church, the school, and the home, where our citizens are made and molded by women?

"Mrs. HORACE BROCK,
"Mrs. J. GARDNER CASSATT,
"Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage."

—

SUFFRAGISTS AGAIN ASSAIL PROMINENT PUBLIC MEN.

[From the Woman's Protest, November, 1914.]

"That suffragists sacrifice courtesy and self-respect to gain notoriety is no new thing. A striking case of such disregard of themselves and their obligations to others was shown by a delegation of suffragists who called recently on Mayor Blankenburg, of Philadelphia.

"We quote an extract from a statement on the subject issued by Mrs. George P. White, printed in the Bulletin on November 7:

"'Mayor Blankenburg is the fourth prominent public official to be insulted by representative suffragists after extending them every possible courtesy. President Taft was hissed by suffragists several years ago after a public address as their guest, the first time in history that a President of the United States had been so insulted. The suffragists refused to shake hands and "turned up their noses," by all reports, at their interview with President Wilson last spring, and, according to his own word, subjected him to an undignified cross-examination and "demanded action." On May 2 Mayor Mitchel, of New York, was insulted and ridiculed and characterized in a speech as "poor boy" at a suffrage meeting, where he was an invited guest, because he would not approve of feminism.

"'And now Mayor Blankenburg, a man whose administration has gained the respect and admiration of every man and woman in Pennsylvania for its high ideals of public service, is attacked in his own reception room by a bevy of suffragists, who level at him the charge of playing party politics and withholding money from the hungry and the unemployed.

"'Mayor Blankenburg calls the attack "offensive and insulting," and says that the suffragists have hurt their cause.'"

—

SUFFRAGISTS AND THE LIQUOR INTERESTS.

[From the Woman's Protest, November, 1914.]

"In the October issue of the Woman's Voice, official organ of the Montana Woman's Christian Temperance Union, we find this statement by the president of the association:

"'Our Woman's Christian Temperance Union had no division in the suffrage parade during fair week. Our committee was arranging for floats, banners, etc., according to invitation given, when our chairman was informed that some suffragists thought it better not to have the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the parade as a body. It is laughable to have the suffragists so considerate of the views of the liquor men that they fear to antagonize them by allowing a temperance banner in their parade. But such is their policy. So the oldest suffrage organization in the State—the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1883–1914—which is proud of its white ribbons, was not represented in the parade.'"

—

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

[From the Woman's Protest, November, 1914.]

"In Dayton, Ohio, a negro woman saw a friend in the parade. 'What's Mis' Johnson doin' there,' she queried. 'Her man is good to her.'

"At the annual convention of the Vermont State Suffrage Association, at Burlington, E. P. Jose, of Johnson, Progressive leader in the House in 1912, told the Suffragists that they were farther from the ballot to-day than 10 years ago. (Boston Transcript.)

"In the pretty complete rout and havoc of the suffragists in the Western States they have two small victories to celebrate at the big meetings they have planned for the celebration of seven victories in seven States. The National Woman Suffrage Association has worked hard to secure the reelection of Senator SMOOT, the Mormon representative from Utah, and has succeeded. The Mormon Church has always stood for suffrage, and has been in large part responsible for the spread of suffrage in the West. Nevada and Montana have many Mormons among their population. Another victory which the suffragists can celebrate is the big defeat of prohibition in California. (The Woman Citizen.)"

—

[From a circular letter addressed to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America by Mrs. Horace Brock, honorary president State Federation of Pennsylvania Women, president Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.]

"Do you believe a policy not yet proved a success in the most favorable environment in our sparsely settled Western States, where the full number of women enfranchised in 11 States is 15,000 fewer than the women over 21 in the single State of Pennsylvania, should be heedlessly undertaken on a national scale in spite of the protest at the polls of such States as Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and without examination of the results of woman suffrage and without the consent of the majority of women?

HIGH COST OF SUFFRAGE GOVERNMENT.

"Although the stanchest advocates of suffrage admit that 'votes for women' increases taxation and the high cost of government, do you know, gentlemen, that the last census report, issued June 20, 1914 (p. 43), shows that Wyoming, where women have voted 45 years, requires a higher percentage of the population in the public service than any other State in the Union—a higher percentage even than the District of Columbia?

"Also, do you realize that the census shows Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Missouri, and Ohio, all of which States have recently defeated 'votes for women,' require less than one-half the percentage of public servants engaged in Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah, where women have voted 45, 21, and 18 years, respectively?

"Moreover, though Colorado has developed perhaps the weakest State government, it has the highest per capita tax in the Union.

"This may seem at first sight to indicate that more opportunities would exist for women to be engaged as public servants where they vote. However, the census report shows the opposite to be the fact.

"These five male-suffrage States, for instance, though they use less than half the percentage of public servants employed in the four old suffrage States—the only suffrage States at the time of the enumeration—engage a higher proportion of women to men in the public service. Thus is another antisuffrage argument borne out by Government statistics showing that entrance into politics decreases the proportion of women who as nonpartisans can command appointments to high public places through merit and social service. With 'votes for women' more jobs are created and demanded—but more men than women get them—because the men can control politics more easily than public opinion; whereas it is recognized that the women without political affiliations are better public servants. In other words, woman suffrage increases not only election expenses and expenses incident to emotional and experimental legislation but the office holding—and yet positively decreases the proportion of women to men in the public service.

IN THE NAME OF DEMOCRACY.

"Suffragists ask you to disregard both experience and numbers to enact this radical legislation affecting over 24,000,000 women on the grounds of 'fundamental democracy.' Gentlemen, we accept that ground without any reservation, and we ask you in the name of democracy founded on the expressed will of the majority, whether the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, desired, at the utmost estimate, by less than one-fifth of our women, is democratic? Is it fundamental democracy, for instance, to make the Legislature of Wyoming, representing but 28,840 women, absolutely 'equal' to the Legislature of New York in deciding the perpetual political status of New York's 2,757,521 women over 21?

WHERE WOMAN'S WORK IS.

"Not only do the census figures prove the reverse, but thoughtful social students must admit that it is false that

'woman's work went out of the home with the weaving and the spinning.' Not only are 45 per cent of the gainfully occupied women employed in the home itself, but it is the normal woman's hope of happiness to possess a home. The woman in industry has no illusions about the so-called 'freedom' of economic independence. The tyrrany of the time clock, the tense, nervous strain of industrial 'speeding,' the monotonous manipulation of machines is the real 'slavery' for women—and 'freedom' is represented not by the vote or further industrial competition but by the fireside, husband, home, children, happiness.

"Women are not 'going out of the home' more and more. Instead, a letter from the Director of the Census states that the ratio of marriage is increasing, and the testimony of heads of industrial establishments is that it is not unusual nowadays to lose a half or a third of their feminine employees by marriage.

"The assumption that man has attained a more dignified or 'superior' position in human society than woman is based on the suffrage sophistry that it is better to be a man than a woman—a common claim.

"Their real quarrel is not with men, with women, nor with Government, but with the nature that made them women instead of men. Lacking the attributes of the masculine nature which they admire, they seek some measure of identity with men by legislation. This is the fundamental fact at the bottom of the suffrage agitation—the fallacy that man's position is superior to woman's. This is the belief shared alike by feminists and suffragists, that men, especially voters, are their superiors; that the relationship between men and women is that of master and servant, tyrant and slave.

"The 'woman in the home' is not a 'slave,' or fewer women in industry would seek the freedom of the fireside. Nor is she a drone, as sometimes alleged. Though the spinning and weaving have indeed left, education and sanitation have increased the duties of home management, just as modern business men, though they have long discarded the quill and the manuscript letter and taken advantage of typewriting, multigraphing, and printing, unknown to their grandfathers, are not less but more busy in the management of larger interests requiring more responsibility.

"So, too, though the home-making woman has been freed from the labors of her grandmother to a certain extent, modern society has required other duties and greater responsibilities, and the complexities of modern civilization demand all the more ability and care in the home training of the child, our greatest social problem. Women can not turn their children over to institutions, as sometimes advocated, and then go out and work for wages alongside their husbands, and they would not if they could. The mothers' pension acts were created exactly to remedy the necessity for such sacrifice of the child's right to a home.

"You will be told that 1,800,000 club women in the United States indorse woman suffrage. The fact that, even if true, this would mean less than 10 per cent of the 20,000,000 women who are neither suffragists nor enfranchised is significantly offset, however, by considering that the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage is an affiliated member of the State Federation of Pennsylvania Women and that I am honorary president of the federation and president of the antisuffragists, which would not be, of course, if our club women, as a body, had indorsed 'votes for women.'

ALL THERE IS TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

"In a recent article Dr. Shaw, president of the suffragists, says:

"'The reason men are enfranchised is that, as citizens, they have a stake in the Government. The reason women should be enfanchised is because, as citizens, they have a stake in the Government. That is all there is to this question of woman suffrage.'

* * * * * *

"The truth, though, is that both men and women have the same stake in the Government—and that stake is the family and the home. And that their common stake should be adequately represented in Government and society it is necessary that they represent it together, according to their complimental but different characteristics, he defending it on the field of battle and in politics, which is modified warfare; she preserving it as the refuge of pleasure and peace and representing it in places where the ideals and inspirations associated with wife and mother need not be counted to be considered and respected.

"Further, Dr. Shaw contends:

"'If men would divest themselves for one moment of the thought that women are related to them and other men * * * I doubt very much whether any man fundamentally sound and logical * * * could ever again utter a democratic principle without recognizing its application to the womanhood of the Nation.'

"This is faultless logic—with which every antisuffragist will agree—'if men would only divest themselves of the thought that women are related to them' * * * of course they would be suffragists.

"That is the whole trouble with woman suffrage—that after nearly 70 years of ceaseless agitation it has convinced neither the majority of men nor women that they are not relatives! When the feminists convince you, gentlemen, that your wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters are not relatives, but mere 'human beings,' belonging to a 'slave sex,' you have somehow 'subjugated' loving, defending, and protecting in every way you can imagine—you must logically embrace their theory.

"Until then the women who are related to yourselves and to the men by whom you were elected—the women who are proud of their womanhood and their relationship to men; the women who do not seek suffrage and some sort of sex neutrality as mere 'human beings,' unrelated to everything but their own individuality—ask you to vote against the Bristow-Mondell and Shafroth-Palmer amendments to enfranchise women.

SUFFRAGISTS WON'T REPRESENT WOMEN.

"As suffragists do not represent the will of women now, and beg you to ignore the will of women altogether in deciding this vital issue, as suffragists as a class represent the desire of some women to identify themselves as much as possible with man's methods and to use man's tools, neither would they fitly represent the will of women in politics.

"And to enfranchise women would merely start a corrupting force for all heedless women and create a burden on good women. We would all be forced to neglect the woman's work we want to continue, which is so vital to the Nation and the race, and take up man's weapons—chosen by suffragists and placed in our hands against our wills—to keep them from misrepresenting us further in politics. This is what we mean, gentlemen, by the 'burden of the ballot,' which is no mere play on words, but a menace to millions of earnest, thoughtful women, who believe they can serve the State better in their natural sphere than by imitating men.

THE FREEDOM OF THE FRANCHISE.

"If it is positively necessary for a few women to have the 'freedom of the franchise' to be happy, there are 11 States where this 'freedom' is available to every suffragist who considers it worth the carfare to the Mississippi. And these suffrage States are badly in need of women colonists, as with twenty times the area of Pennsylvania they have fewer women—and suffrage States average only 100 women to 146 men, while male suffrage States average 100 women to 106 men (p. 107, Abstract 13th U. S. Census).

"Therefore suffragists really owe it to their sisters in suffrage States and to their own principles to go help them count against 'man-made' laws and male majorities where women vote. Thousands of women have sought the 'freedom' of the great West for different purposes—some to get divorces at Reno or fresh air on Pike's Peak—but we have yet to hear of one solitary suffragist who has made the journey to acquire for herself the 'freedom of the franchise.' Candidly, gentlemen, have you?

"If we must refuse to consider the results of women suffrage and the number of women who want suffrage and force it on the majority through manipulation of constitutional machinery, we are asked to blindly follow the most preposterous proposition any nation was ever required to consider. At a time when the most expert statesmanship and the most experienced men are required to safeguard our national destiny; at a time when our whole people are vividly aware of the grim and terrible relationship between the ballot and the bullet, and considering military measures for the defense of our integrity, you are asked, gentlemen, to plunge our whole adult population into politics that may mean war—not alone war such as waged on the battle fields of Europe, but the sex war the suffragists have threatened; not only a war on the home, which is a sanctuary in military operations, but war in the home."

DISTRICT ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

"Official records show an immense contrast between the total possible vote in States where women vote and the actual vote. This article compares the record of six 'suffrage' States and six adjoining 'nonsuffrage' States.

"The figures indicate either that the imposition of the vote upon women has caused a host of men to evade the responsibility of the ballot or that very few women vote in the suffrage States.

"In either case the problem is serious and additional proof of the perils of woman suffrage.

"Figures showing the surprising weakness of the total vote of both males and females in the six suffrage States in the presidential election of 1912 and the contrasting high percentage of the total vote in six adjoining nonsuffrage States:

Woman-suffrage States.

California (population 21 years of age or over, exclusive of Japanese and Chinese):		
Males	890,794	
Females	665,450	
Total possible vote	1,556,244	
Actual vote for Presidency		673,527
Colorado:		
Males	269,211	
Females	213,340	
Total possible vote	482,551	
Actual vote		266,871
Wyoming:		
Males	61,519	
Females	28,426	
Total possible vote	89,945	
Actual vote		42,296
Washington:		
Males	428,825	
Females	276,429	
Total possible vote	705,254	
Actual vote		322,799
Idaho:		
Males	108,847	
Females	69,761	
Total possible vote	178,608	
Actual vote for Presidency		104,203
Utah:		
Males	101,902	
Females	85,648	
Total possible vote	187,550	
Actual vote for Presidency		111,894
Total population of men and women 21 years or more of age, exclusive of Japanese and Chinese, in six suffrage States, and therefore the total possible vote in those States		3,200,152
Total vote actually cast in those six States for the Presidency in 1912		1,521,590
The per cent which voted		47½

Nonsuffrage States.

Kansas (then a nonsuffrage State):	
Males 21 years of age or over, exclusive of Japanese and Chinese	508,425
Votes cast	365,442
Nebraska:	
Male votes possible	352,995
Votes cast	249,871
Oregon (then a nonsuffrage State):	
Male votes possible	244,719
Votes cast	137,040
Nevada:	
Male votes possible	38,443
Votes cast	20,744
South Dakota	
Male votes possible	178,054
Votes cast	116,325
Missouri:	
Male votes possible	972,483
Votes cast	698,562
Total men 21 years or over in 6 nonsuffrage States	2,295,119
Total vote in the 6 nonsuffrage States for President	1,587,984
Percentage of possible vote cast in 6 nonsuffrage States	69

"If 69 per cent of the men voted in the woman-suffrage States as they did in the nonwoman-suffrage States, an analysis of the figures shows that only 17.8 per cent of the women voters in the suffrage States actually voted.

"Here are the striking facts: In the six woman-suffrage States only 47½ per cent of the total possible vote was cast. In the six nonsuffrage States near the suffrage States 69 per cent of the total possible vote was cast, showing that woman suffrage, according to these statistics, which have been secured from the secretaries of state of the various States and from the most accurate published figures available, tends to decrease the actual voting strength rather than to increase healthy interest in politics."

—

FACTS AS AGAINST SUFFRAGE FANCY.

[By Mrs. J. Alex. Mahon.]

"In her article of Sunday, November 15, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper again accuses the antisuffragists of being in league with the liquor interests, gamblers, etc. Do the late election returns show that that is the case?

"Nevada and Montana voted for woman suffrage, the two wettest States in the Union. In Nevada there never has been voted a 'dry' town or county. The only 'dry' territories in Montana are the Indian reservations which are directly under the United States Government and where no liquor is allowed to be sold.

"North Dakota, that voted against woman suffrage, has State-wide prohibition. According to the Anti-Saloon Year Book for 1914, 68 per cent of the population of South Dakota live under no license laws and 56 per cent in Nebraska.

OMAHA AGAINST SUFFRAGE.

"The Omaha World-Herald, November 7, 1914, in an editorial, says: 'Omaha, the seat of the brewing interest where the wet sentiment predominates, voted against suffrage by only a few hundred majority. Fremont, a wet city, voted strongly for it, and a number of dry counties went against it.' Lincoln, a wet city, voted for suffrage by over 700 majority.

"In Missouri 68 'dry' counties voted against suffrage while only 6 voted for it.

"In Ohio prohibition was defeated by 87,000, while suffrage lost by over 182,000. Speaking of Ohio, Miss Florence E. Allen, in the Woman's Journal of October 24, says: 'Seven hundred thousand women in Ohio want the ballot.' There are in Ohio (according to the census report of 1914) 1,398,341 women of voting age; according to Miss Allen more than half the women in the State want the ballot, and yet the vote was so large against it, and the sentiment seems to have increased largely within the past two years. In 1912 suffrage was defeated by 87,000; in 1914, by over 182,000. The returns show that many of the 'dry' counties voted against suffrage.

"In April Springfield, Ill., voted on prohibition. Four thousand five hundred and seventy-six women voted for the saloons, and 4,301 against them, a majority of 275 women voters in favor of the saloons. In Ingham County, where Lansing, the capital of Michigan, is located, and where men only have the suffrage, saloons were voted out.

"The suffragists have always claimed that the reason why none of the woman suffrage States had been voted 'dry' was because there were so many more men than women in those States. Two years ago Colorado voted 'wet' by about 40,000; this year by 10,000 dry. As the same proportion of men and women still exist, it must have been the men and not the women who caused that State and the other three to join the dry column. The women of Colorado can not claim the credit. The proportion of women to men in Colorado is much greater than in the three other States that voted 'dry.' At any rate, if they voted 'wet' two years ago and 'dry' now, it was not the women's vote that made the State 'dry,' but the general public sentiment which was worked up for prohibition, the same as the sentiment for prohibition in Virginia was worked up, where men alone vote.

WOMEN VOTE FOR SALOONS.

"In Santa Monica, Cal., December 2, 1913, at an election on the liquor question, the saloons won by nearly three votes to one not to sell under restrictions, but it was voted that liquor could be sold all night and on Sundays. Santa Monica had 286 more women than men over 21 years of age in 1910.

"In Pasadena, Cal., a 'dry' city for many years before women had the ballot, the sale of liquor was legalized about one year after women were given the franchise. Pasadena had, in 1910, 2,688 more women than men of voting age.

"In Colorado Springs, Colo., where the sale of liquor was prohibited for many years, women voted a few years ago on the question and liquor selling was legalized. Colorado Springs had 813 more females over 21 years of age than males."

—

[Clipped from the Macon Daily Telegraph, dated Wednesday, December, 1914.]

IN COLORED AMERICA.

"In the city of New York exists a National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People of the United States. It was organized in a small way in 1909 and has been steadily growing.

"Prof. W. E. B. Du Bois, formerly of Atlanta, editor of the Crisis, is prominent in this national association. Reading of this association in the Crisis, it is a matter of regret that its method of procedure is not along the lines advocated by Booker Washington. Washington is eager for his race to preserve race identity, finding a great work to build up pride of race, and for the education to be along industrial lines.

"But this national association has for its purpose advancement along political and social lines. Very prominent in the platform is, 'The abolition of all caste distinctions based on race or color.' The association has its colored lawyers 'to secure rights of the colored people, to "win Jim Crow" cases, segregation cases, and disfranchisement cases.'

"In the call for a national conference in 1914 for the political and social uplift of the negro are many prominent white women and white men. This call was signed, first on the list, by Jane Addams, Samuel Bowles (Springfield Republican), Dr. John L. Elliott of New York, William Lloyd Garrison of Boston, William Dean Howells, Florence Kelly, John E. Milholland of New York, Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst of New York, Louis F. Post of Chicago, Oscar Garrison Villard of the New York Evening Post, with many others.

"The conference, in pursuance of this call, was held in New York. It was celebrated by a feast, if I understand the Crisis, and seated at the table are the negro men in large number, each with a white woman by his side as guest, I suppose. It is social equality done to the taste of Du Bois, William Lloyd Garrison, and Oscar Villard. A large array of whites, men and women, mostly women, are looking on approvingly. Under the large photograph of this social scene is the device, 'Social Life in Colored America'—'A Dinner at the Loendi Club, Pittsburgh.'

"Any one wishing to verify this story is referred to the Crisis, August number, 1914. The Crisis also comes out editorially for equal suffrage.

"This question of woman's suffrage will come up very soon to be voted on in Congress. The Crisis of August, setting forth 'Social Life in Colored America,' should interest those southern Congressmen disposed to woman's suffrage and adding 2,000,000 negro women as voters.

"One queer thing about the photograph, negro men and white women intermingling on terms of social equality, is that the negro men have not negro women as partners, but white women, thus repudiating pride of race and refusing to preserve race identity.

"When we place the suffrage of negro women under Government enforcement it will be idle to imagine we can invoke State laws to nullify it. We have been duly warned that it will not be permitted—that the same Federal decree providing nationwide woman suffrage will revivify the dead letter of the fifteenth amendment, which means that both negro men and negro women will vote en masse under Federal permission and protection. The women suffragists of the North have proclaimed such to be their purpose, and it has been announced on the floor of Congress.

"Now, when the fifteenth amendment has been revitalized and the ballot conferred on 2,000,000 negro women in addition, what will our farmers' wives and daughters have to face? There will be political night meetings of negro men and negro women. These will arouse a spirit of trouble and demoralization. These night meetings will breed discord, and result in that white women's problem that drove farmers to town and reduced us to the tenancy system. Under our white primary system negroes quit politics and the country life became safer. Farmers returned to the farm. Shall we invite the old conditions when the farmer's wife and daughter dared not travel the public highway without escort? When they were, indeed, prisoners within their own homes. Of these things the women's committees that plague Congress know nothing and care less. But Southern Congressmen know, and should protect our women on the farms, without police protection, from the return of those days when the farmer's wife sat in her home with fear and trembling—her vine and fig tree being but the crouching place of the brute ready to pounce upon her and take advantage of her helplessness.

"I make earnest appeal to our club women, now our leisure class, and to the women absorbed with a special 'hobby,' who are aiding the national association, to halt and turn quickly to the rescue of their sisters whose lots are cast on the farms without police protection. In days gone by, when negro night meetings were in full blast, thousands of our farmers' wives died the slow death of nervous prostration. They lived in dread. They knew not the awful hour when the struggle would come. The man, their shield and protection, could not always be near. Those days lasted for 30 years.

"Revive the causes, the night meetings with negro women, newly enfranchised, added, and the peril again to our white women on the farm. Back to town would be the resultant—farms left to negro tenants.

"Our very peace, our social order, depends upon no return of those fearful days to our women. These flippant city girls, singing airily 'Votes for women,' know not the disasters they invite by this reckless movement.

"Oh, the white woman's problem! What is it? Go ask the farmer's wife. She has no police protection. Of recent years she has lived in comparative safety, been able to go out into the sunshine and breathe the bracing air with some degree of freedom. But the success of this woman's movement of the National Suffrage Association, with all that it involves, will deny again the public highway to the farmer's wife, and force her and her daughters again to be prisoners within their own homes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves his time, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the good women of the United States have no representation on the floor of this House—which they will have in the near future—I on their behalf congratulate this House, and thank the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules for bringing in this resolution. I am supremely proud to be a Member of this House at this time, and I feel highly honored by being allowed to open the debate in favor of this resolution, because it is the first time in the history of this Government that this question has been presented for a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. The consideration of this resolution marks therefore an epoch in the advancement of civilization, and I feel that the cause of good government everywhere is to be congratulated because this House has taken up this question. This is a question of whether we will submit this subject to the people of this country as a national matter. It makes very little difference what our vote may be here to-day. The fact is that this is the beginning of the end of the opposition to woman suffrage throughout this country. I am sorry to see some of the gentlemen on the floor of this House attempting to make political capital or to make this a party or political question. It is not in any sense a political question.

Let me call the attention of my good Republican friends to the fact that during all the many years and years that they had control of this House no resolution of this kind was ever brought up for consideration. The national Republican Party has never indorsed equal suffrage. The judiciary committee of that party has never in 40 years reported to this House a resolution of this kind, so that it comes with ill-grace for either party to point its finger at the other. I have had an equal-suffrage constitutional amendment resolution pending before committees for the past six years, and the good women have been appealing to that committee for nearly 40 years, but no committee ever reported out this resolution.

No matter which side has a majority of the votes to-day, the fact is that the resolution is here, brought in by a Democratic committee, and it is before the American people, and we as their representatives must go on record on this great moral reform.

I am not going to discuss equal suffrage to-day. I have spoken at length on this subject before. As a matter of fact, we Representatives who come from the States where they have equal suffrage know what we are talking about. We talk from knowledge. Every man who will make a speech against this bill to-day comes from a State where they have not tried it, and has never lived 30 days in a State which has equal suffrage, so he will speak from prejudice and misinformation.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield for a brief question only.

Mr. SUMNERS. Do you not believe it was better for the people of Colorado that you determined that question in your own State, rather than wait for the Federal Government to determine it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No, sir; I believe the general welfare of the entire Republic is superior to the wish or whim of any State in this Union. We settled that question in this country many years ago.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What proportion of the women in the State of Colorado take advantage of the ballot?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Just as large a proportion of women vote in the State of Colorado as men, and they vote fully as intelligently.

The present world movement for the enfranchisement of women shows that under the influence of advanced civilization the nations of the earth are becoming ready for universal suffrage and the conception of society which it implies. Feminism is a world movement. It is a part of the eternal forward march of the human race toward a genuine democracy. The whole history of the development of civilization is merely the story of broadening the channel of human liberty and opportunity. All over the world woman is doing and thinking more effectively than ever before.

The women of this Nation have little by little been taking more interest in public affairs, been reading more and becoming more intelligent and better posted, and each day is assisting a

little more than the day before in solving the great problems that are to-day affecting the world. To say that she is going to take a backward step is to brand one's self as an imbecile.

I look upon the recognition of women as citizens as being an act of simple justice; and I can not appreciate either the logic, common sense, or honesty of refusing to grant an act of simple justice to women merely because they are women. The present civilization will not much longer permit the physically stronger half of the human race to ignore the plain rights of the physically weaker half. The reasons why women should vote are the same as why men should vote, the same as the reasons for having a republic rather than a monarchy.

The natural right of a woman to vote is just as clear as that of a man and rests upon exactly the same ground. The woman's rights movement is a feminist evolution. Women should vote because they are women. To have a voice in choosing those by whom one is governed is a means of self-protection due to everyone. Democracy is not a matter of sex any more than it is a matter of race. The disfranchisement of women is a brutal usurpation of power, a relic of primitive barbarity when might made right, which has become unworthy of a chivalrous modern manhood.

In future years we will look back and marvel at the supreme effrontery of the male population arrogating to themselves all the wisdom, honesty, and patriotism for so many generations after generations. Posterity will be amazed when it reads the history of the many centuries that women were disfranchised.

The enfranchisement of women is a constructive measure. It is the next logical step in the political evolution of this country. No opportunity should ever in our country be closed to any human being who has the capacity to work therein. It is a disgrace to this country and to this enlightened century to longer disfranchise the patriotic and intelligent womanhood of this Republic. There never was a time in the history of the world when the mass of women was so intelligent, so right living, and public spirited. Anna Shaw, Jane Addams, and Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, and thousands of other noble women, who have for nearly a lifetime been working in this splendid fight for womanhood and humanity, are entitled to the encouragement of our commendation and active support. I glory in the fact that they have enough zeal and patriotism to trample under foot the sneers of some of the members of both sexes and to carry on their magnificent work to victory. The world has never enfranchised as patriotic a class of people as the American women are to-day. Patriotism is not confined to the male sex. Let us be big enough, broad-minded enough, humane enough, and honest enough to treat the women of our country as fairly as they are being treated in China. Let us be men enough to give the women a square deal. Let us show to the world that we believe in the Declaration of Independence. Let us evolve our male oligarchy into a twentieth-century democracy.

Ordinarily the light comes from the East, but in the matter of the enfranchisement of the best half of humanity, I am proud to say, the light is coming from the West. Eastward the woman's star of empire takes its way.

There is no more possibility of the right of equal suffrage being taken from the women of any State that has tried it than there is of returning to negro slavery in this country. One is just exactly as likely as the other. The human race is not going backward.

The highest requisites for voting are intelligence and morality, and our women have more of both of these qualities than the men have.

Throughout the civilized world wherever women have been given the right to vote they will continue to vote.

THE WOMAN'S MOTTO IS "ONWARD."

The women of the world will continue to advance. The man or woman who tries to stop them will be justly relegated to oblivion. You politicians had better remember those three statements, because you will have occasion to reflect upon them. This is an age of individual liberty, and the male sex is not humanity, but only half of it.

There will be no backward movement in the fight for equal rights. Not one foot of ground that has been gained will ever be surrendered. And the people who try to make a little temporary notoriety by an attack on the sex are doomed in the end to disappointment, defeat, and ignominious humiliation. The continued disfranchisement of women is a relic of antiquity that belongs to other days. Purblind politicians and people who cling to prejudice in spite of facts as plain as the noonday sun may keep on fighting and misrepresenting the good women of the suffrage States, but they are becoming ludicrous relics of the age of feudalism.

In every civilized country on the globe the women are fighting for their rights. They are gradually winning everywhere. The day is soon coming when they will take the place belonging to them—squarely beside the men in the settlement of all public matters. It is a great moral reform.

There will never be any surrender of any of the rights she has secured. There will be no retreat sounded. Their slogan is "forward, march." And the whole world will rejoice and be benefited when they achieve their ultimate victory.

Just as sure as the night follows the day this enlightened Republic will extend the right of franchise to women in the very near future, for three basic reasons, namely: First, because it is absolutely right; second, because wherever tried it has proved an unqualified success, and third, because it is not only expedient but the industrial, political, and social conditions of this country are rapidly making it imperatively necessary for the preservaton of humanity.

It has been adopted throughout the West; it will be in the North within 6 years; in the East within 10 years; and lastly in the South within 15 years.

And let me say to you, my genial friends from the sunny Southland, whether you like it or not, you will have equal suffrage in your States within the next 10 or 15 years, and your innate gallantry will be such that you will look back and be ashamed of yourselves for having opposed this humane measure for so many years. I believe you will then be ashamed to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1915.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 53 minutes. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the people of the American Commonwealth which was the pioneer in the modern movement for equal suffrage, whose women have been voting for two generations, this occasion is to me one of peculiar interest and satisfaction. Like the shot fired at Lexington, the act of the Wyoming Legislature 45 years ago, amid the snows of a little mountain town on the crest of the continent, has echoed around the world. Since then, and largely as a result of the causes then set in motion, the idea of equal suffrage has spread widely over the earth. In our own land 21 States have granted their women partial suffrage, in 11 States and 1 Territory women now enjoy full suffrage rights, and more States are on the way. In due and logical course of events we are now to pass upon the question of giving the American people an opportunity to determine whether the rule of equal suffrage shall become the law of the Nation.

There is some difference of opinion as to the character of the duty that devolves upon a Member of the House in voting upon the submission of a proposed amendment to the Constitution. One view is that we are not justified in voting to submit an amendment unless and until we are convinced that the amendment proposed, if made part of the organic law, will beyond all question advance the general welfare. Applying that view to the question now before us it becomes our duty to seek and consider the facts and the evidence on which we may safely rely and wisely judge. When facts established by experience are available no wise man will take counsel of his fears and misgivings, follow the promptings of ancient prejudice, or rely upon theory and speculation. In such a case he will, if he act wisely, seek the testimony of those who speak with confidence from knowledge and will enlighten his understanding with the lamp of human experience.

If the unanimous testimony of experience and the convincing logic of successful demonstration is to be our guide, there can be but one opinion as to the benefits to government and society through the granting of the franchise to women. From every American State, from every foreign people that have invited their women to participate in government, through the medium of the ballot, the testimony is all but unanimous, emphatic, and enthusiastic of the benefits and improvements to government and society which have followed and attended this extension of the franchise.

Go where you will in the lands of universal suffrage—among the free and hardy Norsemen; in the pioneer States of this Union; in the advanced and progressive Commonwealth of Australia; and you will find but one opinion, and that enthusiastically favorable. The new and feeble notes of disapproval in any or all of these regions are of lesser volume and consequence than those which voice the opposition to any one among our most cherished and firmly founded institutions. Civilized society under free government has for generations been advancing steadily toward the practical application of the great truth penned by Jefferson, that all governments derive their just

powers from the consent of the governed, by granting participation in government to all citizens who are subject to the tax burdens of government, and who must render obedience to and seek protection under the law. The only limitations in this advancing movement of enfranchisement, save the one of sex, have been directed to the exclusion of convicted criminals, the mentally deranged and incompetent, the grossly ignorant. We now seek to disassociate from these categories of crime and misfortune the daughters, the wives, and the mothers of men.

Not all extensions of the franchise have been granted wholly as a matter of right, but largely in recognition of the principle that the aims of good government are best accomplished through the participation in government of all law-abiding citizens; that no one class is fully competent to govern other classes wisely or justly.

We seek to invite into participation in the duties of government the most virtuous and law-abiding half of mankind. We seek to enfranchise those who, by reason of the nature of their duties and responsibilities, in the care and nurture of innocent and defenseless childhood and youth, have the keenest, liveliest, and most compelling interest in the maintenance of good government.

The stupid and threadbare argument that the exercise of the elective franchise will have an unfavorable effect upon the character of women, expose them to undesirable contact, destroy the finer fiber of the sex, and put in jeopardy their natural charm has been utterly refuted by the experience of every State and nation which has enfranchised its women. If political methods anywhere are brutalizing and contaminating, they ought to be remedied in the interest of all the people; and the most effective remedy is to be found in the enfranchisement of women. [Applause.]

If there are women anywhere so enslaved of drudgery, so engrossed in frivolity that they have neither the time nor the inclination for the brief duty of casting a ballot, enfranchisement will afford a blessed occasional respite for the one and a new and higher occupation and inspiration for the other. If some fortunate women are so happily content under present conditions that they do not desire the ballot, that fact does not constitute an argument against allowing those women to vote who desire so to do. The experience of every suffrage State is that practically all women, when granted the franchise, value and exercise the privilege.

Twenty-four years of political experience, eighteen as the only representative of the people of a suffrage State on the floor of this House, qualifies me, I believe, to speak understandingly of the effects of woman suffrage. We have not solved all the problems of government in Wyoming. We do not claim to have become perfect in legislation or administration, but our experience has at least demonstrated beyond controversy how utterly without foundation are each and all of the stock arguments against the exercise of the elective franchise by women.

We are, and have been, of the frontier, and some of our communities and people have been considered by the hypercritical to be a little rough and ready—almost wild and woolly—but in that 45 years no woman, to my knowledge, has ever been annoyed or insulted or received any but the most courteous treatment in the discharge of her political duties. [Applause.] If there have ever been any family disagreements over politics, they have never reached the public ear. If any woman has neglected her family, Dame Gossip has not reported it. In grace and charm, in devotion to duty, no women on earth excel those of that Commonwealth where for two generations women have voted regularly.

During this period the women of Wyoming have quietly and modestly exercised a constant, helpful, and beneficial influence on legislation and administration. After 45 years of experience there is no division of opinion on this question among us. Our people would as soon think of surrendering their charter of statehood as of depriving their women of the ballot.

We are told in high and influential quarters that this is a question for the States and not for the Nation. That seems to be the favorite pretext just now for the sidetracking of great questions. The Nation has seen fit to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Nation may with equal or greater propriety prohibit discrimination on account of sex. It has been said that the charter of the black man's rights was shot into the Constitution. Be that as it may, we seek to give the people of the States an opportunity, in a peaceful and orderly way, to write into the Constitution the charter of woman's rights. In so doing we are following constitutional precedent, and, except as a matter of personal opinion or preference, no one is justified in saying that the question is one for individual action in the States rather than for concerted action by the States.

A reasonable uniformity throughout the Nation of qualifications for suffrage is not only desirable but, as affecting large bodies or classes of citizens, it is highly important. Approximately 4,000,000 full-fledged women voters would lose their political rights if they moved from their present abode into other parts of the Union. The number of voters so situated is constantly increasing, and each one of them constitutes a convincing reason for remedying this anomalous condition by constitutional amendment.

No proposition of amendment to the Constitution in half a century has been so long, so earnestly, so widely, and so persistently urged as this. With some temporary setbacks, the suffrage movement has been steadily gaining in campaigns within the States and in winning the support of the thoughtful, intelligent people of all parts of the Nation. The question is nonpartisan, nonpolitical. The movement is widespread and steadily advancing. Its ultimate triumph is as certain as the swing of the tides, as inevitable, if mankind is to advance, as the triumph of truth.

I am not one of those who adhere to the theory that our last doubt as to the wisdom of a proposed amendment must be resolved before we vote to give the American people an opportunity, in a constitutional way, to pass upon it. In my opinion, it is our duty to give the benefit of the doubt to a general, long-continued, earnest, and persistent demand and appeal for an opportunity to test the sentiment of the Nation on a question of large and growing importance.

From whatever angle we view the matter, it is our duty, in my opinion, to vote for the pending resolution. If anyone remains unconvinced by the manifestly satisfactory experience and uniformly favorable testimony of the people of the States and countries where woman suffrage has been tried, such doubts as may remain should be resolved in favor of the very widespread and active public sentiment which favors the submission of this question to the test of adoption fixed by the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall offer the following amendment to the resolution:

Strike out of line 4 the word "legislatures" and insert the word "conventions," and at the end of line 6 and the beginning of line 7 strike out the word "legislatures" and insert the word "conventions."

The purpose of this amendment is that when the people vote, if they are permitted to, on this question at the election, they shall have no other issue presented except this one. It will free the matter of all complications.

I ask to have the amendment pending, so that when we come to the proper time it may be proposed. I shall offer it so that the question when submitted shall be free from all complications and no other question shall be involved, so that the voter can express his sentiments on this proposition alone.

If it is submitted at an election where members of the legislatures are elected, other issues will become involved, and the people will be interested in them and therefore will not have the opportunity to get the fair expression of the people on this subject for that reason. The legislature elected to act on this question will, naturally enough, have other questions before it for action, which more than likely will have influences in the way this question is disposed of, and affect the result.

If this question is submitted to elections in the several States as the question to be settled at such elections as proposed by this amendment, then the naked question is presented for determination and none other, and it will therefore elicit in this manner the real conviction of the voter, and hence be settled by the real expression of the voter uninfluenced by any other question.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment for a great many reasons, some of which I shall not be able to discuss for want of time.

I am opposed to it because I do not want Montana, Utah, and Colorado to have it in their power to cram woman suffrage down the throats of the people of Texas.

I am opposed to it because it would thrust the ballot into the hands of millions of ignorant negro women of the South and force unsought political burdens upon millions of home makers throughout the land who are at present more profitably employed than in running after politics. I still adhere to the old-fashioned belief that the hand that rocks the cradle wields a better and a stronger influence upon the Nation than the hand that writes the ballot. To my mind training voters is more important than casting votes.

A nation that has good mothers to mold the boys will never want for good men to make the ballots. I wish to speak against

this amendment on behalf of the millions of American mothers who are detained at home on more important business. No doubt some of these absent mothers are busy extracting splinters from the toes of future Congressmen, hearing the lessons of future supreme judges, boxing the ears of future generals, buttering bread for future Senators, or soothing with a lullaby the injured feelings of future Presidents.

We are told by our suffrage-seeking sisters that in dealing with this question we should put chivalry aside. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is unthinkable and impossible. Men without chivalry would be masculine monsters. Such a man would not be fit to be the husband of a ward heeler. If men had put chivalry aside they would have thrown the women overboard when the *Titanic* went down and helped themselves into the lifeboats. But, thank God, they yielded to the noble sentiment of chivalry and went, with manhood unafraid, to the bottom of the ocean. But we are told by these fair advocates of woman suffrage that the ballot would give woman more influence. Impossible, sir; impossible. No good movement was ever able to go forward without the aid of womankind, and no bad movement was ever able to make progress when she threw her influence across its path.

Mr. Speaker, there never was a sterner Roman patrician than Marcius Coriolanus. As a candidate for office he refused to exhibit his scars to the common people because, he said, "They blushed to be remembered." Well, the common people banished this unbending standpatter, and he forthwith went into the camp of the Voscians, and, at the head of an army, brought Rome to her knees. The Romans sent the male relatives of the stiff-necked old sinner to try and soften him up, but he kicked them out of his camp; and then they sent the oldest inhabitants and most renowned citizens, but the result was the same; and then they tried him with the priests and preachers, all to no purpose. Coriolanus was unappeased. His army was at the gates of Rome, and all seemed lost. Just in the nick of time some woman had sense enough to suggest that they send his mother and wife to intercede for Rome, and they did. Well, these women took the irate old Roman off his high horse in short order, for men never get wicked or willful enough to stand out against both mother and wife.

You know, when one of these horrid men get ugly, and his friends can not get him to go home, and the policeman fails to bring him to his senses, why, the unfailing remedy is to call in his real boss, who takes him by the ear and leads him into gentle captivity. [Laughter.]

I am told that the sexes love opposites, and I am afraid that a race of manly women will call forth a race of womanly men. Such a race of women would be too stern for the tender offices of motherhood without being ferocious enough for the camp of the Army, and such a race of men would not be fit to fill the vacancy in either place.

No wise person ever expected a genuine woman to stand her ground when her home was invaded by a mouse, but all the world expects a man to defend his fireside against all such articles as tomahawks, scalping knives, battle axes, and bayonets.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no rivalry between men and women. There is no occasion for it in a healthy state of society. God purposely made them different and for different lines of activity. He gave strength and courage to man and upon woman He bestowed grace and beauty. To man He gave strong reasoning powers and a keen sense of justice; to woman He gave unfailing intuition and kindly sympathies. He fortified man with courage to go into the frontier forest and hew down trees and subdue savage beasts and men; He fitted the woman to preside over the home and sanctify it with motherhood. This same wise Father gave man to the world to write her laws and fight her battles, and by the side of this thundering Mars he placed gentle Venus to bind up his wounds and kiss away his sorrows.

I have no doubt that if women handled the cleaver at the beef stalls we would get cleaner steaks; but what man wants to court the butcher? [Laughter.] No doubt women would make excellent peace officers; but what man wants to marry a policeman? [Laughter.] It may be that the entrance of pure women into dirty politics would have a cleansing effect upon the politics, but I can not believe that it would have that effect upon the women. And in a case of that kind we had better have soiled linen than soiled laundresses.

The leaders of this movement talk about votes for women as if it was a great boon, when as a matter of fact it is a burdensome responsibility. There is a growing tendency upon the part of all classes of voters to refrain from discharging their duty to vote, and this tendency becomes more aggravated with the increase of the number of elections and the new and strange problems the voter is called upon to solve. We will at no distant time be driven to compulsory voting unless our rampant reformers can be induced to leave their nostrums off the ballots of the people. If we force the ballot upon the women of this country when not 20 per cent of them desire to assume the burden, it stands to reason that they will decline to vote unless we follow it up with a law to compel them to vote.

You take the great farming class, Mr. Speaker, who furnish our least corruptible and most patriotic voters. It is growing more and more difficult to induce the farmer to lay aside his work and go to town to cast a ballot as big as a saddle blanket and brim full of problems which Solon, Socrates, Solomon, and Billy Sunday all rolled into one would not have the temerity to tackle. If it is difficult to get the farmer to attend the elections and cast his ballot, how will it be with the farmer's wife, that royal maker of soldiers, statesmen, and citizens? Not one in ten of these noble women would take to politics or exercise suffrage. Indeed, if you write woman suffrage into the Constitution there would be more women vote in the city of New York than in the Southern States combined, unless the 2,000,000 negro women of the South decided to go into politics.

Because some women want the ballot will not justify us in thrusting it upon the vast majority who neither desire nor will avail themselves of the opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is no reflection upon the intelligence of the women that they are not as well qualified by nature, by custom, and by preparation for the business of government as men are. No more is it a reflection upon the intelligence of men to say that they are not as well qualified as women for the still more important business of governing the home, training the youth, and mothering mankind. It is no reflection upon the intelligence of the wisest layman voter to say to him that he is better fitted to make laws through representatives than directly. And one of the reasons for that is that the great body of men must devote their energies and talents to their several avocations and have not time to specialize in the business of lawmaking. So it is with woman suffrage. Women are already fully engaged in the world's most important work; men are utterly incompetent to take woman's place in this her natural sphere, and it would be turning back the wheels of progress to foist upon women a new set of minor duties the discharge of which would inevitably lower her standard of efficiency in the vastly more important field in which she is so happily preeminent and so preeminently qualified.

Mr. Speaker, the man and the woman mind are essentially different. This organic difference has been accentuated by centuries of training and practice along different lines. The mind of man rather runs to prosaic reasoning, while the mind of woman is given to poetical idealism. It is inevitable that woman's natural bent of mind should incline her to socialism, and nothing would set socialism up in business as quickly as woman suffrage. The Socialist Party recognizes this, and as a result are almost to a man for woman suffrage. And I can think of nothing worse that could happen to this Republic than a reign of socialism, unless it would be woman's abdication of her crown as the queen of the American home.

But some of our suffragette friends tell us that men have made a failure with this Government, and that therefore women are needed as voters. I deny it. This Republic is not a failure. On the contrary, it is the greatest success in all the time and tide of human things. Perfect, no; but by the test of comparison, and there is no other standard by which to measure it, this representative democracy established by men who won their right to build it upon the field of battle, is the nearest approach to perfection of all governments this old world has ever seen. In no other government of any age was there ever so great a measure of human liberty, and in no other government has woman occupied so exalted a place and exercised so deep an influence as in these United States.

Without the aid of your mothers, women of America, our fathers could never have wrought this wonderful fabric, and without your help we can not hope to maintain it. But we need the same kind of aid your mothers gave to our fathers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful that it is not given to all women to have homes and husbands and children. Some are compelled to wage the hard battle of life single handed. I know that thousands of women, brave and true, are driven to struggle in the busy marts of trade, in factories, stores, and workshops. Many of them receive pitifully small wages from the hands of pitiless masters. But men have the ballot, and are they better off? Thousands of men are constantly without work, and many stalk empty handed to the bread line. Men, too, are underpaid. Millions of men brave the sea for a pittance and dig deep into

the bowels of the earth shut out from the light of the sun. If voting would cure the evils of poverty or mollify the exactions of the taskmaster, why do not men vote themselves into Utopian bliss. I am persuaded to believe that the lot of man, notwithstanding his monopoly of the ballot, is fully as hard as that of woman. In good truth we can not banish the troubles of the world by statute. If women could draft a bill that would cure the ills that beset them, they could pass it through a legislature of men with lightning speed, quicker, no doubt, than they could pass it through a lawmaking body of their own sex. There is not a Member of this Congress who would not give all that he possesses to be the author of a law that would add to the happiness of womankind. The trouble is that we men do not know how to make the world perfect by law any more than you good women do, and the only reason any of the women think they could do that impossible thing is because they never had a chance to try their hands. That this is the case is amply demonstrated by conditions in those States that have female suffrage. Women are not better protected in Montana than in Nebraska, and in double-suffrage Colorado there are still strikes, bloodshed, and strife, and the soldiers from other States are needed to keep the peace. In good truth, my dear sisters, you can not better serve your Government than by keeping to the tasks nature has fitted you for, and in the discharge of which you have been so splendidly successful. Incidentally, you can also promote the cause of good government by not interfering with your brothers in the discharge of the task which God and immemorial custom seem to have appointed them to.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious question. Eleven States, I believe, have already adopted State suffrage for women. I know the kind of stuff candidates for President are made of and that political parties are made of. They are just common clay, and sometimes the commonest kind of clay. And I warn the country now that those of us who are opposed to adding this new burden and responsibility to the womanhood of America must be up and doing. Our candidates for President and national platform builders will stampede at the demand of the double-suffrage States unless we raise our voices in protest and give courage to candidates and politicians. Candidates and the builders of platforms are also made of common clay, and, in fact, sometimes a lot of uncommonly bad clay is worked into the construction. Politicians are so keen to give the people all that the people want that sometimes in their fear and excitement they give the people a dose that the people do not want. I believe this woman-suffrage agitation is likely to prove a case in point. It therefore behooves every man and woman who sees danger in this movement to sound the alarm.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the mothers of this great country to turn a deaf ear to the shouts of the suffragettes. Their song is that of the siren to tempt you from your homes and God-appointed spheres of life. We need you in the home, mothers of America, to train the youth of the land and shed your tender influence over all the world. In your exclusive dominion you have made free government possible, and while you are content to reign there you can make it perpetual. You are not defenseless, as these agitators tell you, for your sons are in the camp and in the Cabinet, behind the guns and in the Congress. Your kindly care has made them strong and brave and true. They are your refuge in the day's mad strife and conflict, and you and your home is to be their refuge when the evening's gentle shadows draw a truce. I have no taunts or gibes for the erring sister who is clamoring for suffrage; I may even admire the masculine vigor with which she howls against her imaginary wrongs. But I love to turn to that other more gentle and, in my opinion, more useful woman described by the Psalmist:

> She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; and her husband also he praiseth her. Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all.

God save her from the cavil of the street and keep her for the councils of the home. [Applause.]

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the arguments that have been made by the proponents of this resolution, and up to this time not one argument has been advanced by them for making woman suffrage a national question. Since the establishment of the Government suffrage has always been regarded as a matter of State concern, and well is it that it has been so. The States are the best judges as to the qualifications of electors for the welfare of their institutions. The framers of the Constitution believed it was best to leave the solution of internal matters to the determination of the States. Scan the Constitution from the first article to the end and you will find no limitation whatsoever on the States as to the determination of their internal policies, except in two particulars—that of forbidding the States to establish anything except a republican form of government and that of forbidding them from granting titles of nobility.

In the frontier days of the Western States many of them granted suffrage to domiciled residents who only had declared their intention to become citizens. It was good policy where most of the inhabitants were recent immigrants to grant them the suffrage and thus permit them to express themselves on matters pertaining to the State's welfare, as they were the State's real citizenry. If old, settled New England, who knew not the policy and the polity of the Western States, had the determination as to the qualification of suffrage for the Western States, they, perchance, would have said that full citizenship should be required before a person should be an elector.

Some States have granted limited suffrage to women. For years in Wisconsin we have had limited woman suffrage, permitting them to express their views on matters pertaining to school affairs, and yet we find but a meager fraction of the women exercising this franchise. If the women of Wisconsin decline to avail themselves of this limited suffrage as to school affairs, which certainly must be of deep concern to every woman, what reason is there for the people of Wisconsin believing that with unlimited woman suffrage the franchise would be exercised more generally. If a majority of the women of my State favored woman suffrage and I believed that they would exercise it, I would not withhold the suffrage from them. But I contend that it should be left to the States, each in their own way to determine the extent to which suffrage should be granted to the people of the State, and not force, by national amendment, upon an unwilling electorate the right of suffrage. Yet by this constitutional amendment you would foist upon States, whose men, whose women are opposed to the exercise of the privilege, that which they do not want.

The State government is supreme as to its own management and guidance and should be so continued if our fabric of Government as a Federal Union of self-governing States is to be maintained. Suppose after the trial of universal woman suffrage in a State it would develop that but a very small fraction of women were exercising the ballot and that they were opposed to its exercise. Is it to be contended that the State is without authority to withdraw the suffrage from a class declining to exercise it? It can be easily conceived that the women of one class may only wish to avail themselves of it, and yet that might not be conducive to the best interest of the States to allow the representatives of a class to have a preponderating influence in the affairs of a State, and virtually force women of another class, who do not wish to have suffrage, to the polls in order to have real equal suffrage by all classes.

It is a problem in my State, and it must be a problem in other States of the country, to have the electors exercise the franchise generally at elections, but you are here proposing to withdraw some of the responsibility and divide it with the women.

In Wisconsin we have had woman suffrage submitted to a vote of the people. Only 14 out of 71 counties registered their approval of it. Fifty-seven had clear majorities, many of them twice and a few three times as many against it. A total majority of more than 70,000 against it. There is no objection to Illinois saying that they should have woman suffrage, and if perchance Wisconin or any other State through its men and women are opposed to having woman suffrage, why impose it upon us who believe it is not well for the polity of the State to extend the franchise? Why, if after a trial of woman suffrage it was demonstrated that but one-tenth of the women of the State, and that of a separate class, should exercise it, would you not believe it should be within the rights of the State to withdraw the right of suffrage from this one class of women who perchance would exercise it? Yet if we had national compulsory woman suffrage a State would lose its right to determine its policy and withdraw the franchise from women, even though nine-tenths of the women in the State were opposed to its exercise. Certainly the framers of the Constitution enacted wisely when they left all matters pertaining to the internal policy of the States to the States themselves.

Furthermore, if Congress has the power to determine that women shall have the suffrage, then the corollary follows that the Congress, through constitutional amendment, has the power to withhold suffrage from women. We who are opposing this on the ground that it is a State issue, and a State issue alone, are not seeking to withhold the exercise of the franchise from women in those States where there are a large number of women who are in favor of its exercise; but we say to you gentlemen who favor suffrage not to impose it upon those States where a

great majority of the women are opposed to it. I believe that a majority of the women of my district and the women of my State are opposed to the exercise of woman suffrage, but we have no complaint if the women of Illinois are in favor of its exercise. That is a matter of their own concern. I represent a large constituency, where the rights of suffrage are esteemed as highly as in any other constituency, and yet I believe it is better, after these 125 years of satisfactory rule, to retain the old idea that suffrage should be determined by the States. Until the proponents of this proposition can advance some reason for taking it out of the realm of State affairs and making it the football of national politics, then I say this resolution should be defeated.

The only purpose that can be gained by projecting this matter before the Nation is to make it a partisan question, and suffrage should never be considered as a partisan question. Advance one reason, you advocates of the resolution, why as a Nation we should adopt this policy, advance one reason wherein the States to-day are not complete in the exercise of their powers to determine the qualifications of suffrage, whether of men or whether of women, and I will withdraw from my position. The Constitution in the first article provides:

And the electors in each State shall have a qualification requisite for electors to the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

We do not quarrel with you because you grant women the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, but we say you should not impose your ideas upon us who take a contrary position.

It is a latter-day principle that States are not content to shape their own internal policies, but wish to enforce their ideas as to internal government upon peoples and institutions who may be opposed and unsuited to their adoption. This is certainly the case as to woman suffrage. If the women and the people of a State want women to have a vote, let that privilege be granted, but preserve to the States which are opposed to woman suffrage the right to determine their own policy. Until the protagonists can show some reason why we should change the fundamental fabric of our Government and depart from its established policy since its foundation of leaving suffrage to the States, we should adhere to the old tried principle of local self-government, of reserving the qualifications of its electorate to manage and control that Government to the respective States. [Applause.]

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 45 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, when in election after election, year after year, in State after State, a million or more voters have by their ballots expressed themselves in favor of equal suffrage, and when the opportunity to amend the Constitution of the United States is sought by so many hundreds of thousands of our people as have petitioned the Congress for this suffrage amendment, I think it is my duty as a Representative in Congress to vote to give the whole people the opportunity of amending the Constitution in the only way permitted them by the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of battling for woman suffrage in California before its adoption there. I had the pleasure of making a hundred short speeches in its favor in the California campaign of 1910. The amendment was adopted by a majority of about 3,000, and for the past four years woman suffrage and equal suffrage has been on trial in California. To-day it is my firm belief that if placed on the ballot again the men and women of California would give it an overwhelming majority. Yes; I confidently assert, for I believe it unquestionably true, that if woman suffrage could again be submitted to the men alone in California it would carry by a majority many times greater than in 1910. [Applause.]

The men of California who are posted and unprejudiced know that better laws are made; that the welfare of women and children, and men, too, is more carefully looked after; and that the political life of the whole State is cleaner and of a higher standard, because the women vote in California.

Our polling places are no longer to be found in stables, in rooms adjoining and really parts of saloons, or in other objectionable places. They are in schoolhouses, clean business rooms, or in tents specially set up for the purpose on sidewalks throughout the residence section of the cities. The disorderly crowds around voting booths have disappeared, and any woman can now visit political headquarters on election night without hesitation or the fear of insult, as in the days gone by. It is a wondrous change, and all for the better.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, do not let anyone make you believe that women in California do not vote in as large number as the men. Competent authority there has stated that at the recent election the percentage of women who voted was larger than the percentage of men. And I am sure we are almost unanimously agreed that the women cast the more intelligent ballot. There were 48 proposed amendments to the State constitution voted on in California at the last election. Generally speaking, the better amendments were adopted, and largely because our women voted. All over the State they gave an unusual and more intelligent study to the changes proposed. Meetings were held afternoons and evenings in halls and schoolhouses and in hundreds of homes. The proposed amendments were always discussed. The audiences were largely women, and the speakers were men and women well posted on either side of the various amendments. When election day came the women knew more than the men about the proposed changes, and they voted their convictions. The result was in most respects satisfactory to our people.

The claim has been made here to-day and is often made elsewhere by those who do not favor equal suffrage that voting by women would lessen the respect men have for womankind. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is no man here to-day who loves and respects his wife or mother less because she voted last November. I am loath to believe, and do not believe, there is one Member of this House who really fears any loss of womanliness in his household when women everywhere are permitted to vote. If our own women are not now and are never to be adversely affected by the voting privilege, why should other women be? The women of California are as beautiful, as accomplished, as entertaining as are their sisters in every other State of this Union. They make as winsome sweethearts, as lovable and loving wives and helpmates, and as good and God-fearing, home-loving, and home-making mothers as are to be found in any section of our country or in any part of the world. They are not less attractive as sweethearts, they are not less appreciative as wives, and they have gained rather than lost as home-loving and home-making mothers because of the right and opportunity to vote. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe in woman suffrage. I fought for it when I believed it was right and thought it was best, and now that I know it is right and know it is best I shall continue to battle for equal suffrage. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, on the last day of December I wrote a score of letters to as many well-posted men and women in California. I asked for opinions concerning woman suffrage. To-day the replies began to arrive, and I am sorry all will not get here before this debate closes. The following are at hand:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *January 11, 1915.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Since its adoption in October, 1911, equal suffrage in California has been put to the most thorough and severe test; every conceivable sort of election has been held in the past three years; and women have been called upon to exercise their new privilege and perform their added duty not alone in the usual fashion but in various primaries, including one for presidential preference, in local-option elections, and they have been compelled to pass upon laws and governmental policies presented to the electorate by the initiative and referendum. The women have met the test, and equal suffrage in California has fully justified itself. In 1911, by a very narrow margin, the amendment carried. Were it again to be submitted, the vote in its favor would be overwhelming.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 4, 1915.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEPHENS: You asked me for my views on the practical working of woman suffrage in California, and in what particular and to what extent I think it a success.

My answer is, that in addition to equal suffrage being a mere act of justice and in no sense a favor, it has justified itself in its practical working far beyond the expectations of conservative minds. Immediately upon suffrage being extended, the women of California began with remarkable industry to acquaint themselves with the duties of full citizenship. Everywhere social circles were formed and women especially fitted and qualified became teachers, instructing the less well informed regarding civic duties and responsibilities.

In less than four years from the adoption of suffrage in California the women have set an example in the use of the franchise that has stimulated a remarkable activity among men to more fully understand the problems of government, and has particularly stimulated an interest in moral and humanitarian problems. I am candid in saying that in my judgment, upon all questions relating to the welfare of the people of the State of California as affected by governmental issues, the average intelligence is just as high among the women as it is among the men.

The women as a rule came to the use of full citizenship almost entirely free from the bias and prejudice of partisan and self-seeking politics, and consequently their interest and energy have been devoted chiefly to develop and carry forward such measures as will promote bet-

ter social conditions. They interest themselves in such questions as pure-food laws, better hours for women, better wages for women, child-labor laws, all questions that relate to the morals of the community.

The women of California are not office seekers. They are home makers. By this I do not mean that they live in seclusion. They organize clubs, social circles, promote schools, hospitals—everything that will contribute to the intelligence and well-being of the community and that will fit women for intelligent administration of home, as well as surrounding the young people in particular with better conditions as they go out from home.

In short, the result of woman suffrage in California has so approved itself that in my opinion, if submitted to a vote again it would carry with overwhelming majority.

Very truly, yours. A. H. NAFTZGER.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 5, 1915.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: I voted for woman suffrage in California. I did so with great reluctance. My hesitation was based on experience had in a State where woman suffrage obtained and upon certain theoretical objections which to me seemed entirely valid. Nevertheless, I believed that as a practical expedient under conditions existing in this State, the giving of women the franchise would be beneficial to the State's highest interests.

In the above expectation I have been in no way disappointed, and the experience of California with the holding of the franchise by women has been such as to completely change my attitude on the subject. I should now, in case the matter were newly presented and I were to have an opportunity to vote upon it, vote favorably to the measure with vastly more confidence than four years ago, when I was inclined to oppose it.

In California women have accepted the franchise as a great responsibility and are meeting its obligations with fidelity and conscientious devotion to duty which, in my judgment, far exceed that shown by men at the present time. First of all, and continuously since suffrage was obtained, women have engaged in a serious study of civic affairs affecting local and State governmental interests. They have met in clubs for this purpose and sat under the instruction of trained teachers, both men and women; have had discussions of their own on countless occasions when matters of public interest were before the people; and, more important than all, they have been willing to bide the arrival of the proper time before they themselves shall be candidates for public office. Recognizing their lack of acquaintance with details of governmental procedure, there has been no scramble for position thus far. I can not learn that there has been any lack of interest in domestic affairs and those which from time immemorial have been counted woman's special prerogative.

What they have done they have found time for by foregoing certain social opportunities and privileges the loss of which has been a benefit to them and to society generally. Women, generally speaking, have voted wisely on all public questions. It has been impossible to stampede their vote in the interest of any hysterical cry. They have shown the same ability to decide a question on its merits and to vote independently as men have displayed. It seems to me that, in California at least, the granting of suffrage to women has been an unqualified success.

With present knowledge as to how women would use the ballot, I am confident that if the question were again submitted to the male voters of the State, as it was four years ago, the result would be practically unanimously favorable to the measure.

Sincerely, yours, J. F. MILLSPAUGH.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 5, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Woman suffrage in California is a success because it has done justice as between man and woman.

Incidentally our elections are cleaner, political meetings are better attended and more decently conducted, there is a greater spirit of political tolerance, more appeal to reason and less vituperation, more studious investigation of men and measures. Radicalism has gained nothing; in fact, women in their voting are more conservative than men, they have got to be shown. On questions of direct legislation their tendency is to vote "no" or not at all, unless they feel pretty sure of their ground. In the final analysis the enfranchisement of women has made very little difference in the political complexion or alignment in this State. The average woman votes very much as does the average man. It is true that the number of voters has about doubled, but the interest in elections has increased about in proportion.

All of this, however, is mere commentary and aside from the big question involved. Future generations will look back only with amused amazement at a time when one-half of the citizens, simply because through accident of birth they were thrown into one sex, withheld from the opposite sex a voice in the Government which dominated the life, liberty, and property of both.

Until in this Nation we have universal suffrage, the men of the Nation can not have political self-respect.

If the proposition of woman suffrage were again submitted in California after four years of trial, in my opinion, it would carry overwhelmingly instead of by a bare majority as it did before. It has been given a thorough trial. All the scare there was in it has been dissipated. It is here to stay. It is a dead issue. It is a part of the status quo.

Yours, very truly, MEYER LISSNER.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 5, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Answering your favor of December 31, asking for my views in regard to the practical workings of woman suffrage in California, I would say that my attitude on the suffrage question has always differed materially from that of most others. I voted against it because I felt that woman's mission was so sacred and her influence on future manhood so potent that I deprecated any necessity for her to waste her strength on politics.

The ability of women to wisely exercise the franchise I always conceded, and had the women been given the opportunity, and had they expressed themselves as desirous of the right, I would have voted for it; but it has always been my opinion that a free and fair expression given by the women would not have been in favor of it.

From my observation as to the results of granting the franchise to women in California, I have been impressed with the painstaking efforts shown by the women in making the necessary investigation to enable them to vote right. In this I believe they have exercised greater care than the average man.

Had the question of woman suffrage been submitted to the male voters of California at the general election held in November last, I believe it would have carried; but had it been submitted to the vote of all electors, both male and female, I would not feel so sure of the result.

With my very kindest regards and best wishes for a most happy and prosperous New Year, I am,

Sincerely, yours, STODDARD JESS.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 7, 1915.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Woman suffrage in California has been a huge success. If put to a vote now, instead of carrying as it originally did by a majority of 3,000, it would be approved by an enormous vote. Many conservatives who were formerly violent opponents are now its ardent supporters, won over by the wonderful discrimination shown by women in their votes on both candidates and measures.

At least 10 wise and important measures passed in the last legislature would undoubtedly have failed except for the support of the women. Among these might be mentioned the joint guardianship law, bastardy law, age-of-consent law, mother's pension law, eight-hour law for women, the red-light abatement law, and the white-slavery law.

Yours, very truly, JOHN R. HAYNES.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 7, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Woman suffrage is working well. The women are accepting the responsibility. They are voting in large numbers and with a ready discrimination. It looks now as if men are going to accept the responsibility of the franchise more seriously since women also have votes, and there is apparent a better tone in all that relates to political responsibility.

Yours, very truly, A. J. WALLACE.

—

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 6, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Replying to yours of the 31st ultimo, I am forwarding you herewith a copy of a speech I made at the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Washington, D. C., June, 1913, on the subject of women officers and equal suffrage. I do not know of anything that I could say at this time that would more properly express my views on the question of equal suffrage than is contained in that speech, except to state that California has proven the feasibility of equal suffrage and that criticisms heard of the principles at that time have practically ceased to exist at the present time.

Yours, very truly,

C. E. SEBASTIAN, *Chief of Police.*

—

PARAGRAPHS FROM CHIEF SEBASTIAN'S SPEECH, REFERRED TO IN LETTER ABOVE.

In speaking of the relation which woman suffrage bears to the pursuit of criminals, and to crime in its entangled ramifications, and just how votes for women in California has reduced crime and facilitates methods of apprehending violators of the law, I may surprise you when I present to you a list of the laws passed by our legislature at its recent session, each act affecting women and children. Had it not been for the interest our women voters displayed in these laws, many or all of them would have died in the committees.

There has been a remarkable decrease in the number of crimes of violence in our city since suffrage was granted. Since women have had equal rights with the men at the ballot box they have displayed a deeper interest in questions concerning the social evil, and are keenly alive to the necessity of seeking ways and means to lessen its spread, while endeavoring to ascertain how to eliminate it from the list of moral and public problems.

Women are not, as many men suppose, partisan in politics. They are for a principle, and if they are aligned with any party, and it abandons the principle the women are supporting, they follow the principle, and cut loose from the party. Machine politicians, as a rule, are opposed to suffrage. This is because they can not control or ascertain how the women are going to vote.

One of the terrors of the antisuffragists—the "bad woman"—is no longer a terror. We never have heard of her as a political factor in California. Women seldom appear as office seekers. When they do, though, they are amply qualified, and stand an equal chance of election, as their sisters exercise a very discriminating thoughtfulness in marking their ballots. They do not vote for a woman just because she is a woman.

The following is a list of the laws the woman's organizations in California "mothered" and induced our last legislature to adopt:

The health certificate law, requiring a certificate of freedom from venereal diseases of all men before obtaining marriage licenses.

The minimum wage law, creating a commission to investigate the conditions of industry of women and children, with power to invoke a minimum wage in industries paying less than a living wage.

The red-light abatement and injunction law, placing the responsibility of disorderly houses upon the owners and lessees rather than upon the inmates, and providing for the prohibition of such houses. The referendum may be invoked against this law. More than 40,000 signatures have been attached to referendum petitions in San Francisco.

The joint guardianship law, giving women equal rights over their minor unmarried children.

The juvenile court law, separating dependent from delinquent children.

The extension of the eight-hour law for women to include workers in apartment houses and nurses in training.

The age-of-consent law, raising the age from 16 to 21.

The State Training School for Girls, providing a separate institution for girls, with the most approved correctional methods and thorough vocational training.

The mothers' pension law, granting aid to needy parents in order to keep the children at home rather than have them committed to institutions.

The teachers' pension law, granting pensions of $500 a year to teachers who have been in service 30 years.

The net container law, specifying that packages shall show the amount of net contents.

The weights-and-measures law, providing for a complete standard of weights and measures and regular inspection of dealers.

The Roberts bill, prohibiting the destruction of any foodstuff fit for human consumption.

The State civil-service law, bringing practically all State employees under the merit system.

The creation of State housing and immigration commission to prepare for the coming of immigrants with the opening of the Panama Canal.

In the matter of prison reform all sentences except for murder are made indeterminate; strait-jackets and cold showers are prohibited, and arrangements are made for the payments of wages to State's prison convicts and for assistance to discharged prisoners.

The milk-inspection law, providing for strict regulation of dairies.

The white-slave law, prohibiting traffic in women between counties.

The tuberculosis law, providing for the reporting of all such cases.

Amendment to the liquor laws, prohibiting the sale of liquor between 2 and 6 a. m. This applies principally to San Francisco.

The workman's compensation law, requiring compulsory compensation for injuries and establishing a system of State industrial insurance.

The water-conservation law, establishing a water commission with authority over all water in the State. Conservation is a subject in which the women of California have taken very keen interest.

The psychopathic parole law, providing for the parole of persons mentally abnormal but not dangerously insane under the custody of psychopathic parole officers.

The billboard law, limiting billboards to 10 feet in height and prohibiting spite fences of more than 6 feet in height.

The bastardy law, requiring fathers to help support illegitimate children.

The passage of a law providing for the sexualization of inmates of insane asylums and certain convicts.

The creation of mosquito-control districts.

The requirement of the wife's signature to legalize the assignment of a man's wages.

The amendment to the child-labor law raising the age limit of child workers from 12 to 15.

The Woman's Bulletin, published in Los Angeles, has this to say concerning these laws:

"This record shows in the most concrete form possible why women need the ballot and how they use their power for the conservation of humanity and the preservation of the home."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of California, where the beneficial results of equal suffrage have been so clearly demonstrated in the letters read by my colleague [Mr. STEPHENS], as the author of the resolution I had the honor to introduce in the State Senate of California which paved the way for the womanhood of California to express their opinions at the polls, it is extremely gratifying in the closing hours of my service in this House to have the privilege of expressing by words and vote my hearty approval of the legislation now under consideration, paving the way, as it does, for national equal suffrage.

Mr. Speaker, there are Members of this House in full accord with me on this question who will vote against the pending resolution because of existing local conditions, and, Mr. Speaker, there are Members of this House opposed to equal suffrage who will vote in favor of the pending resolution, also because of existing local conditions.

We have had presented to us to-day the same old shopworn, venerable-with-age arguments, and we have heard voiced on this floor certain prejudices once of lusty strength, but now happily disappearing and being relegated to the discard in the many enlightened, progressive communities, where chivalric men love justice supremely and women truly. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, for 14 years prior to the year 1911 in the State of California we had this struggle which is now going on in the Nation, during which time many earnest men and women in my State sought our lawmakers and asked them at each biennial session of the legislature to pass a resolution placing this question of equal suffrage before the voters of my State, and at each biennial session they were met with the arguments that are presented on the floor to-day, namely, that the women did not want the ballot, and if they had it they would not use it. In 1911, by grace of the direct primary law, the voters of my State nominated and elected a legislature responsive to their wishes, a legislature that met at the State capital imbued with the idea that they were sent there to enact into law the people's will; and at that session the constitutional amendment was submitted to the people and later adopted by a substantial majority. That the women of California did want the ballot and that they would and did exercise the right of franchise is shown by the vote cast at the last general election, which was the greatest in the history of the State by more than 200 per cent.

In November last 228,946 more votes were cast for governor than at the elections of 1906 and 1910 combined, and the women who were opposed or thought they were opposed to assuming this responsibility were among the first to register and exercise their newly acquired privilege, and the women not only voted but they used discrimination, intelligence, and rare judgment in doing so. To their votes is accredited the passage of many of the public-welfare measures, notably among which is the red-light injunction and abatement amendment, an effective measure of ridding cities of commercialized vice; the antiprize-fight measure; the blue-sky law, which puts out of business dishonest investment companies; and many others of like nature. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] stated this morning that this is a live question on both sides of the Atlantic. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. We used to be told that because women did not engage in war they ought not to vote, and yet recently we are officially informed by the press that no lesser personages than the lord mayor of London and a member of Parliament, the right honorable Henry Chaplin, are organizing and approving a woman's volunteer reserve, which, to use the lord mayor's own words, "is to provide a trained and highly efficient body of women whose services can be offered to the State, if required, for signaling, dispatch riding, telegraphing, motoring, and so forth, and to arm them for their own defenses in the last extremity."

Women have the intelligence, the perseverance, and the honesty of purpose to assist in the uplifting of the State. They have a strength that should not be cast aside in the struggle for better things. They are the complement of men, and in the purest sense their coworkers. In this belief I earnestly ask the consideration of the following reasons why the proposed resolution should be adopted. The reasons why women should vote are the same as the reasons why men should vote, the same as the reasons for having a republic rather than a monarchy. To vote is simply to express one's opinion. A ballot is the instrument used. Speaking generally, the only real qualification governing its use is intelligence, for without intelligence one's opinion on any subject is worthless. Equal suffrage would increase the proportion of educated voters.

The high schools of every State in the Union are graduating more girls than boys, often twice or three times as many. Eighty-five per cent of the teachers in the public schools of the United States are women. The teaching of civics is obligatory. Is it fair to expect a woman, without that last sign of civic responsibility, the ballot, to possess such comprehending and practical knowledge of public affairs and machinery as would make her an inspiring teacher of civics for boys who already feel their importance as future voters and officeholders? Is she in a dignified position to do so? How can she teach the great truths of democracy—that it derives its authority from the eternal rights of nature; that a nation includes all its social elements and forces; that a true national representation therefore must include all these; that if one of these forces is neglected the desire of this neglected force to be represented will inevitably lead to the necessity for a radical change; that the very purpose of the existence of the nation is the progressive development, happiness, and activity of all its social elements and forces—how can she teach these truths and explain the nonrepresentation of women to clear-sighted boys and girls? Women are conscientious, and it would create a large reserve vote for civic righteousness. Those elements of the community who are least controlled by the dictates of conscience are always found among the opponents of equal suffrage. She is interested directly in good government; bad laws and the nonenforcement of good laws directly affect her in all of her relations, as homekeeper, wage earner, and man's coworker. Property rights should be represented on the same basis for men and women. It is fair and right that those who must pay taxes should have a voice as to the size of the tax and the way it shall be spent. The inalienable rights of person as they are affected by legislation must be preserved to woman, and no one can fully represent her in framing laws which deal with them. Representative democracy without equal suffrage is impossible, because it is only through this form of government that people who are subject to laws may have a voice in making them. Restriction of the franchise tends to encourage aristocracy, while equal suffrage will encourage democracy. Women all over the United States have accomplished much civic work without the ballot.

Many of the laws and reforms of the present day relative to the welfare of the child, the protection of women and of public health and morals have been inspired and secured by women, but they have had to arrive at this result by getting some one else to do the work for them. That is what an appeal to a city council or a State legislature means to a woman without a vote. She must get some one to adopt her views and do the work for her. Women should have the right to express their opinions on public matters in a straightforward, simple, direct

manner, and they should receive such consideration as every citizen desires. Women can take part in public affairs in a womanly way, and it is because she is a woman that her counsel and opinions are valuable. She is the happiest among women who is blessed with a home and a family. If women vote, it will not destroy the home. It only means a short time, once or twice a year, to go to the polls and deposit a marked piece of paper, and during these few minutes she wields a power that is doing more to protect her home and all other homes than any other possible influence, and she need not neglect her household nor her children in order to do it. Almost any woman has enough time to go to the polls, and enough time to inform herself so she can vote intelligently. It has been said that to enter the political arena woman must give up her home interests. This fear is only imaginary. On the contrary, she will stick closer to her home after having reached the goal of her ambition. Her personality, enlarged by the proofs of her extended activity, will raise the standard of home higher than ever. Having become an individuality herself she will respect the individuality of her husband and children. There will be fewer misunderstood husbands and more understanding wives. The home, far from suffering, will gain by woman's extended sphere of activity. Women in their homes are responsible for the health, cleanliness, and the comfort of their families. Many of the industries which women formerly controlled in their own homes have become matters of city and State administration, so it is not fair to hold women responsible for the cleanliness and healthfulness of food and the prevention of disease unless she has a right to an opinion about these matters, now that they are public questions.

The solution of the problem of cities, which involves insanitary housing, poisonous sewage, infant mortality, impure milk, juvenile crime, prostitution, and drunkenness should have the help of minds which have in the past attempted to care for children, clean homes, to prepare foods, and isolate the family from moral dangers. Economic conditions have forced women to support themselves and others. They have been carried by necessity into all the professions and industries. These relations are constantly affected by restraining or remedial legislation in which women have a right to be heard. Woman suffrage never has failed where it has been granted. No State or nation has ever repealed it when once conferred. Suffrage can not now, when considered in its broad aspect, be called an innovation. In more than half the States in the Union women have the school ballot, and their votes occasionally turn the scales in a school election. It is highly significant that the women who are doing either volunteer or paid social work all over this country are almost unanimous in their belief that they could do their work better if they could vote. The women who are doing valiant work on civic committees and playground commissions, those working for a proper milk supervision, the probation officers, those on the housing commissions, all the noble women who are giving time and consideration to philanthropic work, these women know actual conditions; they come in contact with realities. Jane Addams feels that she could do her work better with the ballot. So does Florence Kelley, Ella Flagg Young, and the other hosts of women who are devoting their lives to the welfare of women and children and the uplift of the race. All the arguments against woman suffrage have been answered by the operation of equal suffrage in New Zealand, Australia, Finland, and the 11 States of our own Nation. Hon. W. P. Reeves, agent general for New Zealand, after commending the good influence of woman suffrage in this country, said:

> And this widens women's lives, brightens their intellects, makes their lives fuller and more useful to the country and none the less charming in the domestic circle.

Charles Edward Russell said:

> I have seen a good many New Zealand households, and they seem exactly as well ordered, as bright, cheerful, and happy as any other households anywhere on this celestial globe.

J. B. Connally, United States consul at Auckland, New Zealand, wrote:

> The late election refutes the charges made by the opponents of female suffrage that women are incapable, owing to their inexperience in political affairs, to exercise the privilege intelligently. They have fully demonstrated their unmistakable capacity in this respect, beyond the possibility of a doubt, by their keen appreciation of the issues involved and the sensible discrimination they have displayed in the selection of candidates.

The Right Hon. Sir Joseph Ward, Premier of New Zealand, said:

> In my opinion, the results of enfranchising the women of New Zealand have been wholly beneficial. The statement that the power to vote renders a woman less attractive or less companionable is utter nonsense. * * * It enlarges their mental horizon and inculcates tolerance. * * * A proposal to establish a sex line in politics would now be laughed at.

I have heard it contended that woman suffrage would bring to the polls a mass of unreasoning voters who would become the prey of unscrupulous politicians. But unscrupulous politicians, however bad, are not fools. They have given a higher estimate of the ability and virtue of women voters than many good men and women. Almost to a man they do not want women to vote. And who ever heard unscrupulous politicians complaining that ignorant or vicious people are allowed to vote? Unscrupulous politicians are more concerned lest women will vote for morality and decency than that they will vote at the bidding of bribers, tricksters, and grafters. Conceding, as we must do, that the ballot is a moral force—that morality has entered our politics—the moral force of women is crippled by the denial of the ballot; and hence that denial retards the advancement of truth and justice. It was only after strenuous efforts that California restored the government of this State to the people. But in these conditions I find a reply to many opponents of woman suffrage who affect to distrust the ability and integrity of women in the exercise of the franchise, and assert that women are sufficiently represented by men and that women can rely upon men to right their wrongs. I think it is notorious that the most persistent objections to woman suffrage have come from that element which has given public-utility corporations power over the people.

Summing up the matter, if there were no question of manhood suffrage or womanhood suffrage, if all citizens of this Republic were confronted with the task of government, and the suffrage had not as yet been conferred on any of them, would there be any hesitancy in awarding the privilege to men and women upon some basis of equal qualification?

The world needs woman's influence in public affairs and women need the influence of a larger world, a larger responsibility, than they have been allowed to feel. Only with men and women developing and progressing side by side can we expect an approximation of that spendid destiny which awaits the arousing of all citizens to the exercise of the privileges and responsibility of cooperation in a government for all the people by all the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he made a mistake against him of four minutes a while ago. He has used only 9 minutes instead of 15. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, woman suffrage is another of the questions which the younger States of the Union are passing up for acceptance to the older and more populous States. The Legislature of Pennsylvania has partially indicated its purpose to submit this question to a vote of the people of the State. Thus far, apart from the preliminary step taken by the legislature, we have had no real expression from the body of the people of the State upon the subject, and we can not have until further action is taken by the legislature. It is, therefore, impossible at this time to say definitely whether Pennsylvania approves of the wisdom or desirability of woman suffrage. We are not assured that a majority of the women themselves desire it. Some of them oppose it bitterly upon the ground that it will tend to degrade rather than exalt the womanhood of the State. Women who hold this view contend that in America no such social or legal inequalities as are said to prevail in England and other European countries exist. There is also a considerable feeling amongst the women opposed to suffrage that the high place which American women now hold in the esteem of manly men may be prejudicially affected by forcing upon all women, regardless of their domestic relations, the responsibility that would be imposed by the voting power. While I recognize the "right" of mothers, wives, and single women, if they so desire, to inject themselves into the maelstrom of politics, even though the exercise of that "right" may tend to lessen the sacred preference which is already accorded to them by all true Americans, I do not believe I am authorized as a Representative to impose such responsibilities upon them now nor until at least a majority of the people of Pennsylvania have indicated that such a course shall be pursued. I shall therefore vote against the resolution. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I first became a friend and advocate of woman suffrage when I was 16 years of age and lived in Louisiana. The citizenry of the State was engaged in a terrific fight with the old octopus known as the Louisiana State Lottery. Many said they were opposed to gambling and vice, but under all the circumstances they were favorable to the State constitutional amendment submitting to the people to

grant a new character to that institution, which was offering a very great sum as consideration therefor.

The women of Louisiana, from one end of the State to the other, organized to save the State from the ignominy of a favorable vote on this proposition. I remember quite well my mother was prominent at my home in the Woman's Anti-Lottery League of Calcasieu Parish. I was one of the boys who volunteered to carry the various posters. In that campaign the glaring outrage against democracy under which one-half of the citizens could have no direct voice in a great moral question became apparent. To the everlasting credit of the male electorate of the State an amendment was rejected, but the lottery was killed only by the act of Congress passed in 1890 forbidding the use of the mails to lotteries.

POSITION ON SUFFRAGE IN WASHINGTON STATE.

It took no deliberation on my part in the State Senate of the State of Washington when the proposition of amending the constitution of that State came up for consideration. I not only voted for the submission, but I worked earnestly, personally and with my newspaper, for its passage, with the result that my county was the banner county in the State, proportioning the vote for the amendment with the population. If woman suffrage was so desirable and just in Louisiana and in Washington, why would it not be desirable everywhere under the Stars and Stripes? It is now the accepted rule in 12 States—counting Illinois—and Alaska.

The suggestion has been made here to-day that woman has only to rely upon the stalwart oak that stands beside her and have faith in the chivalry of men. The record of this country and the record of the world does not sustain that doctrine. Go back a little over 250 years ago and witness the "chivalry" of that age. In that particular time, according to the very best of authorities, cited and compiled by Matilda Gage in "Woman, Church, and State," within a 300-year period, there were 9,000,000 women burned at the stake and otherwise tortured to death by "chivalrous" men for the alleged crime of witchcraft, in order to get rid of women who used some intelligence and who became useless for "chivalrous" men. The "chivalrous" men put them to the torture, they manufactured all kinds of instruments of torture; among them the witches' bridle, which they put upon them and suspended them in cells until they would confess that they were witches. They administered every kind of torture to women in that day, did these "chivalrous" men, because they had absolute power, because they were clothed with absolute authority—the result that always prevails where any particular class or any particular set of men, or women for that matter, are given supreme and absolute authority over others. You say that was in the olden times, away back yonder. But did not the same things occur at Salem? Did not the same kind of procedure prevail there when women were executed by Cotton Mather and his "chivalrous" followers? You say that is ancient. What about the Mann white-slave act and the traffic it was designed to stop? What about men who get up in public places and proclaim for a reservation in every city of this country and for one here in the city of Washington for those who are the victims of that kind of procedure, conditions such as would fasten white slavery on about 300 women in the city of Washington, for instance. You talk about "chivalrous" men, but I tell you right now that there is no such chivalry as will justify one set of people having supreme authority or power over another set.

They tell us that all kinds of awful things are going to happen. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] wants to save women from themselves. We who come from the suffrage States are here to tell you what we know, not what we think. The gentlemen from California rise here to testify; the gentlemen from Washington are here on this floor to testify. You take their testimony on industrial questions, you take what they tell you about rivers and harbors, you take what they say about other matters that are pending here before Congress as authoritative. Why not consider what they tell you about this particular thing? They come from Montana, Kansas, Oregon, Arizona, Illinois, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Colorado. Those Members here on this floor are able to tell you by actual experience. Why, do you tell me that the women of Mississippi and Louisiana are more degraded than the States on their borders because they have granted conditional suffrage to women in the States of Louisiana and Mississippi? Do you tell me that the women of the State of Kansas are more degraded than the women of Missouri because the women of Kansas have the suffrage? Can you suggest to me that the women of Illinois are more degraded than the women of Indiana because the women of Illinois have a larger and broader right to vote than the women of Indiana? Such an argument as that fails at the mere suggestion of it. The proposition of the home is the master argument for equal suffrage, because women are interested in the making of laws which affect the home. You can hardly make a law here that does not affect the home. Anything that affects the price of commodities affects the home. We are living to-day in what the President of the United States calls a progressive age, and the cause of woman suffrage advances as the age progresses. [Applause.]

In further extension of my remarks under the rule I desire to say:

In this great Republic you can not take from a citizen, whether male or female, when he or she crosses a State line, the right to contract, to sue and be sued, to equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, with all that those terms signify. All the thousand and one things guaranteed by the Constitution are coterminous with the Federal jurisdiction. A prohibition against women riding on street cars or being granted these constitutional rights on an equality with men or other citizens of their own sex would violate the Constitution. But the parent right of all, the right to share in the governing of the land, the right to grant or withhold "consent" to be governed this way or that, some of the States are permitted to withhold from one class of citizens.

If the courts of Washington State give a money judgment to a woman of that State for a few dollars, she is guaranteed the right to proceed on that judgment in any other State, within restrictions common to all, and obtain execution against the debtor in any other State to which the debtor may remove or where the debtor may have property. It would be unconstitutional to refuse this right to a woman on the same terms as it is allowed to a man, unless such discrimination be hedged about with some interpretation of the doctrine of husband and wife or parent and child.

You say "consent of the governed" is a foundation stone of this Republic. Yet if a female citizen of the State of Washington moves to the State of New York she suddenly finds that her right to vote on presidential electors and Congressmen and to give or withhold her consent by means of the ballot has been lost. The Government is still democratic, so called, but she, a citizen and a taxpayer, if she be one, loses her right the minute she crossed from one State to another. Why is the right to vote considered so trivial that it can be withdrawn from one-half the citizenship at will? Oh, you can not take it from the blacks; the Constitution protects them. You can not take it from the railroad men, nor the farmers, nor the laborers, nor the males, but the females are not protected by the Constitution. And here to-day we hear all kinds of protests against a Federal amendment protecting women in the Federal Constitution to the extent that the negro race or the various classes are protected in that instrument.

There can be no logical objection to universal suffrage in a democracy. Indeed, a democracy is inconceivable without universal suffrage. To state it is to state a paradox. Exclusive male suffrage involves a male aristocracy which rules one-half the population without their consent. Under those conditions democracy is the wrong term. To quote from Uncle Josh at the circus, "There ain't no such animal."

If such a situation advanced the common good, if the one-half under subjection were unfit for self-government, the situation might be excusable. The want of democracy would find justifiable explanation, but where those held under subjection are the most advanced in morals and education, are the mothers and sisters of the ruling aristocrats, there can be no possible excuse.

Will any gentleman here say that Louisiana and Mississippi have degenerated to a lower plane morally, intellectually, or in any other sense, than their border States because women are allowed partial suffrage in those two States, but are denied it in the surrounding States? Is Arkansas superior to Oklahoma, because the Arkansas electorate has never permitted the mothers, wives, and sisters of the electors to vote on any subject, while Oklahoma has? Is Kansas inferior to Nebraska because in Nebraska the women have only partial suffrage and in Kansas they have equal suffrage with men? Is Illinois lower in the scale than Missouri, or Ohio than Indiana? To ask these questions is to answer them. In all history the more degradation we find heaped upon the women the darker and blacker the period. The Roman matrons were most respected before the Empire began to decay. The Victorian reign gave to women the greatest consideration and furnished a period of English history unsurpassed in grandeur of accomplishment. The Progressive movement in America recognized the noble women who had fought the battles of their sex and of the race in the years that had gone, and brought to light such new leaders as Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House. In the midst of this rennaissance a dozen States declare for suffrage; a Children's Bureau is

established in the Federal Government with a woman at its head; and a dozen more States find a majority in their legislatures to submit equal-suffrage amendments, and here we are to-day in the Congress of the United States discussing a Federal amendment.

The distinction and dignifying characteristic of this period of American history is greater recognition of women. In the midst of this period who care what Solomon thought a thousand years before the Christian era and surrounded as he was by his many wives and numerous white slaves. Solomon lived in a different age and struggled with different problems. Or who is going to revert to that faithful band of early Christians who lived nearly 2,000 years ago, when the world was out of joint, and ask them and their leaders to tell us the economics and the right and wrong of the situation as it is presented to-day? In that day they were subjected to possible personal slavery or extinction every hour. What did they know about equal suffrage in America under a form of Government never dreamed of? The Jews and early Christians were waiting, some of them, for the Roman legions to come and destroy them and their cities. Others were gazing momentarily into Heaven expecting deliverance from their unspeakable woes by the second coming of the One whom we reverently recognize as our Lord. What could they know about the ballot in America, or whether the women of to-day should speak in a church or go with head uncovered or teach or exhort? It is easy enough to quote scripture. The devil demonstrated he was an expert at that. But the real Christian is not to be influenced by isolated paragraphs not designed to provide for us a rule or conduct.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

Those who oppose equal suffrage on its merits contend that women are possessed of certain resources which the ballot would take from them, and that the ballot would impose upon them liabilities which they now escape.

1. They say that woman as the gentler sex has always enjoyed the chivalrous love and protection of man; that if the right of suffrage were granted this splendid asset would be lost and woman would be compelled to assume the task of studying public issues.

2. They say that woman is now the exalted queen of the home, and under suffrage she would be dethroned from this point of advantage and supremacy.

3. They say that now woman is considered a sort of sacred depositary of individual morals and the most exalted ideals, whereas under suffrage she would lose her natural refinement and her gentle manners, she would become masculine—would be unsexed.

CHIVALROUS LOVE OF MAN.

This beautiful chivalry has been an enticing theme for the poet and the songster. Oh, the plumed knight when knighthood was in flower. Lucky and happy the maiden locked in yonder tower, with iron gratings over her window, who was adored by the knight who, in armor clad, sat upon his dashing charger warbling madrigals in impassioned serenade. But how about the thousands upon thousands of plain, ordinary women who needed and whose hearts demanded the ordinary consideration that should be accorded to an individual?

Suppose we turn back the page of history, say, about 250 years. Here is a record of a "chivalrous" proceeding of that day, which I will just jolt out upon you as an illustration of how the thing worked, from official records in Scotland:

	£	s.	d.
For 10 loads of coal to burn the witches	3	06	8
For a tar barrel	0	14	0
For towes	0	06	0
For hurdles to be jumps for them	3	10	0
For making of them	0	08	0
For one to go to Tinmouth for the lord to sit upon the assize as judge	0	06	0
For the executioner for his pains	8	14	0
For his expenses there	0	16	4

About this time the persecution of witches raged in Scotland with great violence. The "witches' bridle," an instrument of unspeakable torture used on the women, is thus described:

Iron collars, or witches' bridles, are still preserved in various parts of Scotland which had been used for such iniquitous purposes. These instruments were so constructed that by means of a loop which passed over the head a piece of iron having four points or prongs was forcibly thrust into the mouth, two of these being directed to the tongue and palate, the others pointing outward to each cheek. This infernal machine was secured by a padlock. At the back of the collar was fixed a ring by which to attach the witch to a staple in the wall of her cell. Thus equipped, and day and night waked and watched by some skillful person appointed by her inquisitors, the unhappy creature, after a few days of such discipline, maddened by the misery of her forlorn and helpless state, would be rendered fit for confessing anything in order to be rid of the dregs of her life. At intervals fresh examinations took place, and they were repeated from time to time until her "contumacy," as it was termed, was subdued. The clergy and Kirk sessions appear to have been the unwearied instruments of "purging the land of witchcraft," and to them, in the first instance, all the complaints and information was made. (Pitcairn, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 50.)

TO THE TERROR OF ALL ANCIENT FEMALES.

Another instrument of torture for females was known as "the spider." It was an iron machine with curved claws for tearing out a woman's breasts.

Blackstone, in his Commentaries, makes the following comment on the laws:

By statute 33 of Henry VIII, chapter 8, all witchcraft and sorcery was to be felony, without benefit of clergy. This act continued in force till lately, to the terror of all ancient females in the kingdom.

Martin Luther said:

I would have no compassion for a witch. I would burn them all.

John Wesley, in 1768, according to Matilda Gage in Women, Church, and State, page 261, declares the giving up of witchcraft to be in effect giving up the Bible. The author continues:

Such was his low estimate of woman that he regarded his own wife as too sinful to conduct family prayers, although to Susannah, equally with John, is Methodism indebted for its existence.

Under an English statute to "abolish diversities of opinions" no man was permitted to give his widowed mother or orphaned sister a home in his house without permission of the authorities. Under the statute of laborers (5 Eliz., ch. 4) it was enacted that unmarried women between 12 and 40 years old might be appointed by two justices to serve by the year, week, or day for such wages and in such reasonable sort and manners they shall think meet.

Women were the chief sufferers under witchcraft persecution. Men believed in the inherent wickedness of women, that sin had come into the world through Eve. Strong intellect, unusual beauty, or marked deformity or extraordinary sickness in a woman were proof of a league with the devil and of witchcraft. An ordinary average woman, not so pretty as to promote jealousy, was reasonably safe until gray hairs came to indicate the end of her physical vigor and her usefulness to chivalrous men; after that she could well live in torture and dread. Brave indeed was the woman who would stand for bettering the conditions of her sex. The antis of that day relentlessly pursued those who did have the courage of their convictions, proclaiming that only a few were protesting, "the great majority are satisfied."

The clergy—Protestant and Catholic—joined with the Government authorities and with eminent medical authorities in persecuting women as witches. The execution of a wizard very seldom occurred. When it did occur it was generally for alleged complicity with or for aiding some witch. It is stated by eminent authority that during 300 years 9,000,000 victims, nearly every one of them women, were burned, hanged, pressed to death, or otherwise cruelly executed for witchcraft subsequent to the year 1484.

Chivalrous love of man for women. The record is the same, as is always found where one sect is give supreme power over another. Human beings are individuals. The same love of individual freedom found in man is found in woman. We are born of a common mother. How could brothers and sisters fail to have aspirations and ambitions in common?

But it was not alone in England and Europe that these atrocities against women were practiced. Who has not heard of the Rev. Cotton Mather and Salem and Boston executions for witchcraft? Oh, they were chivalrous in those days to women.

The Massachusetts colony caused a law to be enacted ordering women suspected to be stripped naked and carefully examined by a male "witch pricker" to see if there was not a devil's mark upon them. A wart or mole would be found and that fact would be proven at the trial as a conclusive proof of guilt. Pure and noble women of unusual power of intellect were persecuted in those days. Women that stood for bettering women's condition. They had visions, they dreamed dreams.

There were antis in those days as now. They said, "Why agitate to better the condition of women? They do not want these burdens. They are satisfied." Mrs. Anne Hutchinson was persecuted to her death for no other offense than for having views of her own which she dared preach to men. She had an intellect towering far above the men of her day, but the anties gloried in her downfall. They ridiculed her just like they ridiculed Dr. Anna Shaw, Mrs. Antonette Funk, Miss Alice Paul, and others who are devoting themselves to this work to-day.

SIMILAR TREATMENT TO-DAY.

Members may say that is an old closed chapter. I hold that it shows what women have had to contend with, and that fairness in considering her present power and capabilities demand a consideration of these awful chapters of her past his-

tory. And then how it does tear up this "natural-chivalry" argument.

Suppose, however, we open at a more recent page of concurrent history, "White slavery." Why was the Mann white-slave law enacted? Was it only bad women that suffered in supplying victims for the "necessary" lust of man? Was not that wholesale trade, which is still carried on, accompanied by a punishment of woman for the gratification of "chivalrous man" about as gross persecution as the tortures administered to the witches? Big men defend the maintenance of districts and hundreds of women there as white slaves to please chivalrous men. They have landlords who contribute to campaign funds, and it is better to conserve the revenues of their landlords at home than to break up the districts under the Kenyon red-light law and scatter the evil. Read the report of the vice commission of Chicago and study for a while the means used to capture and lure good girls into these traps, and then probably you will revise your views so far as depending on the chivalry of men is concerned.

WOMAN'S STATUS IN THE HOME.

The home argument is the master reason why women should vote. If they are queens in the home they should have a voice in framing rules under which they must exercise their sovereignty. It is very hard to think of a law that does not affect the home. The price of food, the quality of the milk, the rate of rent—all these things affect her directly. Are not the women interested in the enactment of pure-food laws? Under legislative enactments designing ones have put profits above honesty. They have poisoned food to make dividends. They misbranded drugs, patent medicines, and every form of household necessities. Tomato catsup was composed of putrid ingredients. Frozen and desiccated eggs were placed on the market. Black olives were manufactured of decomposed substances. Ice cream was treated with boric acid. Coffee was poisoned with lead chromate. Flour was bleached with nitroperoxide. Olive oil was mixed with cottonseed oil. Flavoring extract was diluted with wood alcohol. Spices were combined with foreign material. Milk, skimmed and watered, was sold at full price. Peas, chicory, and cereals were mixed with the coffee. Flour and shells formed a part of chocolate and cocoa. Cane sirup was diluted with maple sirup. Candy was finished with shellac coating. Habit-forming drugs were sold under pretense of curing disease. Yet women have no interest in legislation.

Women, you say, are queens of the home. They would lose that valuable privilege and honor if they were to vote. Do you suppose a mother is not more interested in pure milk for her baby than in being cajoled with the empty title of "Queen"? If pure milk can only be had by proper sanitation rules and health regulations, does not common sense suggest that those who best understand and most earnestly desire pure milk should have a voice in who makes the rules? The individual who can not understand that ought to go to some governmental authority and surrender his citizenship and admit that he does not understand anything about representative government or the power a group of individuals possess by being a part of a constituency. The suggestion that the ballot would dethrone a "queen" is as silly as it sounds.

But they say women would be unsexed if they had the ballot. They were still women after 9,000,000 and more had been tortured to death as witches. The white-slave traffic prospered all those years until an awakened sentiment compelled the passage of the Mann Act and abatement laws in several States, and the suffrage State of California led in the enforcement of the Mann Act, but the women survived it all. A more ridiculous argument could hardly be suggested. Women brave all the hardships of pioneer life; they survive the horrors of war, panics, hard times, poverty, and all that, but to vote once every year or two would make them masculine. One who does not live in a suffrage State and a suffrage home can not understand how unspeakably senseless the suggestion is. Still men make it sincerely, and the antis talk about it as though they believed in it as sincerely as the antis 250 years ago in Europe and later in Salem believed in the witchcraft persecutions.

Antis; why, when the Chinese women revolted against being decreed soulless and having their feet bound and all the other heathern practices perpetrated against them, there were antis who wanted to stand pat. They said the vast majority of Chinese women were satisfied.

There are 30,000,000 Moslem women in India. About 29,999,000 of these women are "satisfied" and only 1,000 are trying to better things. There are about 1,000 antis or standpatters who deplore the tendencies of the other thousand to inspire new ideas which involve new responsibilities on that vast sleeping "satisfied" multitude living in harems and under subjection and ownership to a degree that blights the intellect and checks all progress.

SUBORDINATION OF ONE SEX TO THE OTHER WRONG IN ITSELF.

John Stuart Mill thus summarizes the whole proposition:

The principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side nor disability on the other.

AN ECONOMIC QUESTION.

Why is it that the American Federation of Labor is for suffrage? Why are the workers, both North and South, in favor of letting women vote? It is simply because they are compelled by economic conditions to work side by side with the women. Every woman worker in industry takes the place of a man worker. And these men who toil know that women must be taught to appraise rightly their own individual worth and responsibility. I recently visited Jacksonville, Fla., and I found there the State Federation of Labor of Florida for equal suffrage by official resolution. The same story is told in practically every Southern State as well as Northern State. This is a great economic question and demands settlement as such. There is only one ultimate settlement of the proposition. Women are as sure to win the ballot as representative government is to endure.

I was in the State of Texas recently. I talked to college instructors, to public men and women, to laborers and mechanics, and I found a strong sentiment for suffrage. The Houston Chronicle, of Houston, Tex., recently published the following editorial:

THE SUFFRAGE CONVENTION.

The forty-fifth annual woman suffrage convention is now in session at Washington, D. C.

Needless to say, it is the greatest gathering of its kind ever held, and marks the climax to a series of achievements which woman, as a political factor, scarcely would have dared to dream of 45 years ago.

What would motherly Mrs. Washington think, and how would the recalcitrant niece of Andrew Jackson rejoice, to see this great assemblage of women deliberating within the very shadow of the dome of the Nation's Capitol and planning a descent upon Congress with a mile of petitions demanding a constitutional amendment for equal suffrage?

Truly the world is moving forward at a tremendous pace. No wonder that thinkers and philosophers shudder when they behold the rapidity with which movements and reforms shape themselves and come into being.

Within the past 150 years manhood suffrage has become a recognized factor in world politics. Most of the great nations have already adopted it, and those still lagging behind have given up all hope of permanently checking the tide of popular rule and are only seeking to temporize and delay.

Within the past 50 years womanhood suffrage has made itself felt in almost every quarter of the world.

Those who count themselves still young can remember when it was scorned and scoffed at as merely a madcap scheme. To-day it is greeted in a far different tone. Its opponents profess to fear its effect upon the race. First ridicule and then alarm—these are the ever-present weapons of the conservative.

Little by little its opponents grow few in number and less in strength. Little by little the opposition is shriveling up.

Occasionally a Tillman or a Watterson wails forth a warning from the twilight zone, but he is usually an old man who dotes on the past and longs for the times and traditions of his childhood.

In the meantime the woman-suffrage movement grows apace. Already it has accomplished its purpose in 10 States of the Union; already it has become a factor to be reckoned with in the politics of the Nation.

Presently the suffrage leaders will present their reams of signed petitions to Congress. The next national political conventions that meet will be obliged to grapple with the great question thus prominently thrust forward. Condemn it they may, but ignore it they can not.

The sarcasm of Greeley, the warnings of Watterson, and the tirades of TILLMAN die away. The world remembers such women as Elizabeth, Victoria, Lucretia Mott, George Eliot, Frances Willard, Julia Ward Howe, and the example of how they lived and what they accomplished is too much to be overcome by the ridicule of writers and orators.

However opinions may differ as to its effects upon politics or sociology, no one who has given serious thought to the subject can fail to realize that the woman-suffrage movement has come to stay; that it is deeply rooted in the soil of progress and development, and that it will grow and continue to grow until the whole civilized world is made to feel the power of its inherent strength.

At the front door of the statehouse in Richmond, Va., I recently addressed an audience estimated at more than a thousand on the subject, and I found a hearty response in that city. The child-labor problem demands not only the resolutions of women's clubs, but their vote. The Federation of Women's Clubs in this country realizes the fact, and that organization is for equal suffrage.

There is no reasonable argument against equal suffrage. Opposition to it is more or less temperamental or psychological. All of a sudden men see what fools they have been in opposing it, and they are its most ardent supporters ever after. It is not a State-rights matter at all. The southern Members are not opposed to this amendment for that reason at all. The simple truth is they have not become enlightened to the facts of the case. Civilization has marched right on by them in this particular regard. That it is not a political trouble with them

is shown by the fact that the Methodist Church South will not allow women to vote in or become delegates to the church conference, while the Methodist Church North takes the opposite view. Of course, we can hardly expect a people who will not allow women to vote in the church to allow them to vote in the State. The trouble is they have not waked up on this point. But the South, which is so progressive on many other matters, will wake up on this. There are notable exceptions to the rule now.

It is not only a fact that women do not get fair and honest—forget chivalric—treatment in industry when comparing pay and other conditions with the pay and consideration given men, but the same rule prevails in the civil service of the Government and in the Government departments. Recently I compiled some figures on this feature, and Agnes E. Ryan, in the Woman's Journal, of Boston, related and commented on my findings in that journal as follows:

DISCRIMINATION—SPECIAL HANDICAPS TO WHICH WOMEN ARE SUBJECTED IN EARNING A LIVING UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE BOTH AT THE CAPITAL AND IN THE COUNTRY AT LARGE.

Everybody knows that it is harder for a woman to earn a living than it is for a man. In the first place, fewer positions are open to women, and, in the second place, women usually have to work for smaller pay than do men for the same kind and the same amount of work.

It is generally supposed that where the civil-service rules apply to positions, whether they be in the same departments at Washington or in the country at large, women are not handicapped by the mere fact that they are women and not men. Such seems to be the case, however, although it is not certain whether the handicap comes from being women or merely from being voteless.

The facts and figures have been brought to our attention by Hon. J. W. BRYAN, Representative at large from the State of Washington. They are compiled from figures printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12. They show the number of men and women who were examined for work in the departments at Washington during the year ending June 30, 1912, and the number of men and women who passed and who were appointed. The second table shows similar figures which apply to the country at large.

IN DEPARTMENTS AT WASHINGTON.

	Examined.	Passed.	Per cent.
Male	7,552	2,557	34
Female	2,615	1,146	44

	Passed.	Appointed.	Per cent.
Male	2,557	560	22
Female	1,146	121	10½

IN DEPARTMENTS OUTSIDE OF WASHINGTON.

	Examined.	Passed.	Per cent.
Male	46,297	26,311	56
Female	4,551	3,425	75

	Passed.	Appointed.	Per cent.
Male	26,311	6,495	24
Female	3,425	782	20

From these figures it will be seen that although about four women to three men passed the examination for work under the civil-service rules in Washington, when it came to getting positions men were appointed in the ratio of more than two to one. In the country at large seven women to five men passed the examination, but in appointing candidates to positions the men were favored in the ratio of 24 per cent to 20 per cent.

Representative BRYAN comes from a State where equal suffrage is in operation. He brought out these figures in a speech in Congress regarding "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia." An attempt was being made by Mr. BRYAN and others to establish an eight-hour day or a 48-hour week for women. In this connection he said: "I am certainly in favor of this eight-hour law for women workers. We have it in my State of Washington, and it works well." [An equal suffrage State.]

Regarding employment for women in Government positions, Mr. BRYAN said: "I recently made an investigation of the opportunity for women to gain employment offered by the Government as compared with the opportunity offered to men. I notice the census of 1910 showed that in post offices in cities of 75,000 or more population in the United States there were 1,646 male clerks and 12 female clerks. Such a contrast proves conclusively that opportunity is not equal between the sexes in these offices. To begin with, the examinations are all conducted by men, under rules provided by men. Then it is especially provided that femininity may be held a bar to service in almost every department of governmental activity. Color is not to be a bar, but no female can get a job in the average Government position unless the particular boss in charge wants a woman. Thus any woman who holds such a job does not have to thank the Government for her job, like the man clerk, but generally she is under obligation to some man for waiving the sex bar.

"Salaries of men and women are not equal. Women invariably are paid a lower salary, especially in Government service. The following is an illustration of advertisements issued by the Civil Service Commission in seeking stenographers and others:

"'SEC. 276. Stenographers and typewriters who are competent and willing to accept the usual salaries offered—men $900, women $720—have much greater prospects for appointment than applicants for other clerical positions. The supply of male eligibles willing to accept the usual entrance salary is not equal to the demand. An excellent opportunity is therefore open to competent stenographers and typewriters from States which have not received their full quota of appointments.'

"So we see a discrimination as to amount of salary as well as to sex. Recently, out of 368 examinations, 314 of them were closed to women."

One would have supposed that the very principle of civil service would have forbidden this discrimination against women if they were allowed to take the examinations at all. It seems, however, that in getting a position under the civil service a woman meets a fourfold handicap—she may not take the examinations; she may not pass; she may not be appointed when she does pass; she has to accept a lower salary than does a man for the same position even if she is appointed. Truly the woman's road is a hard one if she works for the Government under civil-service rules. We leave it to our readers to answer whether these or similar handicaps apply to women in earning their living in other walks of life.

And does it not all come of being a woman, which, being interpreted, means being voteless?

AGNES E. RYAN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in the debates during this session of Congress I have listened many times to Members who have had a great deal to say about intellectual integrity. I have listened, during the debate on the prohibition amendment and during this debate on the suffrage amendment, for some signs of that intellectual integrity on the part of those who oppose these resolutions. We are told here time and time again that equal suffrage for women imposes an additional burden upon the women's shoulders. We are told that it violates the sacred precincts of the home. We are told that it destroys that wonderful thing that they call "chivalry," when as a matter of fact those who make those arguments know that they are absolute, unmitigated nonsense. They may use them for consumption on the floor of this House, but in private conversation and in the cloakroom and in their offices they do not use any such kind of buncombe. [Laughter in the galleries.] They frankly admit the facts when they discuss the suffrage amendment to the Constitution; as, for instance, when you ask a Member how his district is on suffrage nine times out of ten he will tell you whether it is wet or dry; and that shows the influences—and the real influences—that are at work on this question of equal suffrage. As a matter of fact, these high-flown dreams of chivalry and protection for woman, as I said before, are absolute nonsense, and the men who make that argument must know that it is nonsense.

The women of the country to-day who are demanding equal suffrage the most are the women who need it the most. They are the women who by reason of our industrial conditions have been forced out into the world and come in contact with intolerable conditions that drive them to come to Congress in the hope of finding some remedy under the law so that they may live, just the same as men are driven to seek some remedy so that their conditions of life may be remedied.

Now, another stock argument that is made here is that this is an unconstitutional way of providing equal suffrage. The Constitution provides that this is exactly the way in which the Constitution may be amended, and it sounds strange to my ears that any Member of Congress should stand up here and say that the National Government is settling anything when the Congress votes to submit this question to the people as provided by the Constitution. The National Government is not, and Congress is not, endeavoring or attempting to settle anything. Congress is doing what they have always admitted they ought to do. They are submitting to the sovereign States of the Union for amendment of the Constitution a provision that an overwhelming mass of citizens have petitioned for. That is the issue. Aside from the merits of the suffrage question, that is the issue that confronts the Member of Congress who casts his vote to-day, whether he is willing to submit a constitutional amendment to be adopted according to the provisions of the Constitution when an overwhelming mass of the citizenship of the country petition for that submission.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The people of my State rejected woman suffrage by 182,000 last fall. Do you think that they are demanding that we force it upon them by Federal act?

Mr. MACDONALD. They say, also, that the people in my State, Michigan, rejected suffrage by a respectable majority.

As a matter of fact, the liquor interests stole the vote in Michigan. [Applause in the galleries.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know anything about Ohio, but it may be so there.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not try to stop the gentleman from speaking. He was trying to stop the people in the galleries from applauding. They are here by the courtesy of this House, and they must neither applaud nor show their dissent. If they do, the Chair will clear the galleries.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I understand you say the liquor interests of Michigan stole the vote away from the ladies the last time the matter was submitted?

Mr. MACDONALD. I think I did not say that.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It was lost by 96,000 in Michigan. Do I understand you say the liquor interests defeated that proposition the last time it was submitted?

Mr. MACDONALD. If I said that, I made a mistake. I meant when it was submitted in 1912.

Now I would like to say, in answer to the gentleman from Ohio——

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

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know anything about the conditions in Ohio, but I know that the interests that opposed suffrage are much better satisfied to take their chances in controlling the machinery of elections in the States than they are to have the question submitted for adoption as a national amendment to the Constitution.

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

Mr. MACDONALD. Because they are intrenched in most of the States to a greater or less degree, and in many of the States, as has been demonstrated in Michigan, they are able to stifle the real expression of the people and prevent the honest record being made of the vote.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You admit that you do not know anything about the conditions in Ohio. Do you not think it would be safe to trust the people with suffrage there in their own State?

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know about the conditions in Ohio. If the required number of States in the Union voted to amend the Constitution, I do not know why Ohio should not take the same treatment as is provided for the rest of the States by the Constitution. Ohio could not stipulate when she came into the Union as to how the Constitution should be amended, and it is not for a State to determine how the majority of the States shall rule in regard to the amendment of the Constitution. They say this is a State matter.

Mr. GORDON. That is what I say.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes; but who shall say that the people of the United States shall not amend their Constitution when they take the way to amend that Constitution which the Constitution itself provides? And what right has Ohio or any other State to say that they will not agree to that?

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming mass of citizens of this country have petitioned the American Congress simply to submit, in the way required by the Constitution, this question; and the question you have to answer is, Are you going to say yes or no by your vote?

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

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, while I indorse the proposition that the privilege of voting should be extended to women on equal terms with men, and while I have no doubt that ultimately the women of the United States will be given the ballot, I feel constrained to oppose the adoption of the pending resolution.

As a believer in the principle of local self-government, I have a strong conviction that those functions which can be performed as effectively by the States as by the Federal Government should be left with the States. Subscribing as I do to this doctrine, it is my firm opinion that as far as possible the States, each for itself, should retain the power to prescribe qualifications and administer regulations for the exercise of the voting privilege.

If conditions relative to the character, intelligence, and capacity of individuals, classes, and races were the same, or approximately the same, in all of the States, it would be possible without danger to delegate this power to the Federal Government, but it is a matter of common knowledge that such conditions vary widely, sometimes even within the same State.

It has ever been a contention of the Democratic Party that the regulation of the ballot is and should remain a function of the State governments. At a caucus of the Democratic Members of this Congress the following resolution was adopted by a record vote of more than 2 to 1:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this caucus that the question of suffrage is a State and not a Federal question.

Notwithstanding the widespread publicity given the measure under consideration, I have received but one request to support it, and that came to-day in the form of a telegram signed by five of my constituents. This would seem to indicate that the men and women of Alabama concur in the belief that the regulation of the franchise should remain a State function.. For these and other reasons I can not see my way clear to support the pending proposition, a proposition that has for its object a transfer to the Federal Government of a portion of the heretofore reserved power of the States to fix and regulate qualifications for voting.

However, I believe in the principle of suffrage for women, and great as is my faith in the doctrine of local self-government, if I thought that in the matter of citizenship the women of our country could secure recognition equal with men only through an amendment of the Federal Constitution, I would waive my objections and in the absence of an expression from my constituents support such an amendment. If further consideration of the subject should lead me to that conclusion, I shall not hesitate to follow reason and conscience. [Applause.]

As a friend of the movement looking toward the enfranchisement of women, I shall take advantage of this opportunity to discuss the subject of equal suffrage from the viewpoint of those who believe that the matter should be determined State by State.

NEW MOVEMENTS OPPOSED.

Historic record and personal experience teach us that every new movement has been opposed, and, strange as it may seem, the most strenuous opposition has come frequently from those who in the end have reaped greatest benefits. Ridicule and persecution have been the weapons employed. In many instances the advocates of new ideas have been grossly persecuted, sometimes even unto death.

It should not be surprising, therefore, that the effort to secure the ballot for women has been and still is opposed by people of intelligence, character, and influence—even by women themselves. While such opposition is a cause for regret, there is encouragement in the fact that, although every proposed advance in civilization has been resisted, whatever has been founded in truth and justice has prevailed ultimately. [Applause.]

A WORLD MOVEMENT.

The past century has been characterized by several worldwide movements, notably those looking toward universal democracy and universal education. While these movements have been the natural fruits of the germs of aspiration and growth implanted in the human soul by Almighty God, they have been nurtured and hastened by that other and greater movement, all-comprehensive in scope, which was inaugurated some 2,000 years ago when the angels sang "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

One of the most hopeful results of the spread of education and democracy is that which reveals itself in the gradual emancipation of woman.

In ancient times woman was accorded no rights except the right to bear children, to keep the home, to do the drudgery, to make a living for the family, while the lord of creation, man, devoted himself to idleness or to warfare. At the beginning of the Christian era, even, she was not permitted to take an active part in church affairs, could neither speak nor teach, was commanded to learn in silence and to look shamefaced. Choice in marriage was denied her, and she was little more than a beast of burden—a slave to the husband.

Not until well within the Christian era did woman's condition improve materially. Even under the common law of England and that of America the wife's property became the property of the husband, she was forbidden to make contracts, and her earnings belonged to the husband. Only a century ago most of the trades and professions were closed to woman, the benefits of education were withheld, and in all things she was regarded as man's inferior.

Under the march of civilization these old, barbaric, and oppressive laws and customs are passing away, and in most countries, our own especially, woman may enter practically all of the vocations and avocations; may inherit, own, and dispose of property; may marry or not, as she chooses; may attend church, school, and college on equal terms with man.

TEST OF CITIZENSHIP.

Woman's emancipation has progressed to the extent that she is accorded almost every privilege enjoyed by man. In the United States there remains but one material or fundamental exception, and that relates to the ballot. Except in 12 of the States, she may not vote. Why may she not vote? Because of physical infirmity? No; she performs successfully arduous physical duties. Because of mental weakness? No; she wins highest honors in our schools and colleges. Because of lack of moral character? No; she possesses more than her share of morality. Because of deficiency in patriotism? No; she is heroic and self-sacrificing in time of war. Because of exemption from taxation? No; her property bears the same tax rate as man's. Because of relief from obedience to law? No; for violation of the law her punishment is the same as that of man. Then, why may she not vote? Solely because she is woman.

The right to vote is the most potent, and should be the most highly prized, of civic prerogatives. It is a right that can not be safely exercised when its possessor is steeped in ignorance or wickedness or superstition, for he is then at the mercy of passion or prejudice or designing men. Intelligence and character are the essential qualifications; these are possessed in equal degree by men and women.

Is there any reason why sex should be a greater barrier against voting than against conducting a business, or managing a farm, or working in a factory, or editing a paper, or writing a book, or clerking in a store, or teaching in a school? If there is no sex in taxation, no sex in legal punishment, no sex in business or industry, no sex in education, why have sex in the ballot? Why not make intelligence rather than sex the supreme test of citizenship. [Applause.]

GROWTH OF MOVEMENT.

Either full or limited suffrage has been extended to women in many foreign countries, and the subject is under consideration in every civilized nation. In 11 of our States full suffrage has been granted; partial suffrage has been conferred in about 25; and in all, except those that have acted, equal suffrage is a growing issue.

When it is remembered that only 75 years ago women could not vote anywhere except, to a limited extent, in Sweden and a few other countries of the Old World, the present status of the movement is both remarkable and encouraging. No other fundamental reform of modern times has advanced more rapidly. A movement that progresses so rapidly must be based upon something more than mere sentiment. Upon what is the movement based? I answer: Upon developing reason and conscience; upon the eternal principles of right and justice; upon the civilizing influences of the gospel of love and light and life.

Woman's emancipation, like other civil developments, has been evolutionary. Primitive man had no organized society. In ancient times only a small minority of men voted. The majority were half citizens or slaves. Full citizenship was limited to the few and was difficult to attain. Even in colonial days the voting privilege was exercised only by those men who could qualify as to birth, religion, and property.

WOMEN ARE QUALIFIED.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted the women of America were uneducated. Only a small percentage of them could even read and write. It did not occur to the founders of the Republic that the time would come when every State would maintain at public expense a free-school system open to both boys and girls, when women would be admitted to high schools, colleges, and universities upon equal terms with men, and when women would be as well or better educated than men. That time has come, and our women are qualified for the ballot. No country has ever taken into its electorate a body of new voters so well prepared as are our women.

Women should have the ballot, because they are qualified and many desire it; because they are required to pay taxes and obey the laws; because they suffer from bad government; because they know the needs of women and children; because they would be the better able to serve the public welfare; because about 8,000,000 women are engaged in gainful occupations, and their health, as well as that of future citizens, is endangered frequently by evil working conditions which can be remedied only through legislation; because governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

According to our theory of government the people are the rulers. This should be true in practice as well as theory. All who bear the burdens of government should, so far as they are capacitated, share in its privileges.

We can never have an ideal democracy so long as half of the people who are qualified for suffrage are irresponsible and inadequately protected. [Applause.]

GOOD FOR MEN.

We should have equal suffrage for what it will do for man as well as what it will do for woman. Cooperation upon equal terms in the solution if common problems—in the bearing of general burdens, in the meeting of public dangers—broadens and strengthens and uplifts all who participate.

Wherever men and women work together upon equal terms we find harmony, mutual helpfulness, efficiency. This is true in business, social, and religious life. That it is equally true in political affairs is attested by reliable reports from every State and country in which women vote.

GOOD FOR STATE.

Votes for women would be good for government. Woman's help is needed in the solution of pending problems. Vital issues press upon us. Never in the history of the country have we been confronted with so many perplexing problems, so many threatening dangers.

These problems have developed under man's domination; man has not been able to solve them; man alone can not solve them. The situation calls for all of the intelligence, character, and patriotism of which both sexes are possessed. "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety."

That woman suffrage is good for government is thoroughly established. Mrs. Julia Ward Howe took a census of the ministers and editors of the suffrage States, asking whether the results had been good or bad. The replies of Episcopal ministers were favorable more than 2 to 1; of Baptist ministers, 7 to 1; of Congregational ministers, about 8 to 1; of Methodist ministers, more than 10 to 1; of Presbyterian ministers, more than 11 to 1; and of the editors, more than 8 to 1.

The consensus of opinion among these reputable men is that equal suffrage has proved to be good—good for women, good for men, good for the home, good for politics, good for the State. Similar testimony comes from every foreign country in which women vote. We accept such evidence in other matters, why not in this?

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

What are the objections urged against suffrage for women?

If it be claimed that the majority of women do not desire the ballot and would not vote, I answer that right and justice can not be estimated in numbers; that a majority of the men seldom vote; that if any number of qualified women desire the ballot it should not be denied them; that in a democracy all people qualified by intelligence and character should be not only permitted but encouraged to vote.

If it be claimed that good women would not vote, I answer that good women do vote wherever permitted. For more than 20 years they have voted in Colorado, a State alleged by students of government to have the most advanced code of laws in the world for the protection of women and children.

If it be claimed that women who vote must do police duty and go to war, I answer that men unfit for such services vote; that some kinds of police duty could be performed by women; that in time of war taxes and nurses are as necessary as arms and soldiers.

If it be claimed that women who vote must be allowed to hold office, I answer that all men do not hold office, though I concede that most of them would not object; that many offices could be as well or better filled by women; that man's greed for monopoly in officeholding should not be permitted to stand in the way of political and social justice.

If it be claimed that women have enough to do without voting and that voting would interfere with woman's work, I answer that the same could be said of men; that voting requires but little time and could be done on the way to or from the market; that it does not interfere with man's business.

If it be claimed that equal suffrage would double the number of the ignorant, the criminal, and the foreign voters, I answer that more girls than boys attend the schools; that women are as well educated as men; that but one criminal in twenty is a woman; that the number of native-born women is ten times as large as that of foreign-born.

If it be claimed that it would increase the cost of elections, I answer that the voting privilege should not be valued in dollars and cents. It might as well be claimed that the number of male voters should be reduced in order to lower the cost of elections.

If it be claimed that women are represented by men and can make laws by indirect influence, I answer that law enforcement is as important as law enactment and both can be had better

by direct than by indirect influence; that men would not be willing for women to represent them at the polls; that government without the consent of the governed is undemocratic and tyrannical.

If it be claimed that woman's special sphere is the home, I indorse the proposition, and answer that politics has to do directly and vitally with the safety, the efficiency, and the happiness of the home; that many of the functions of the old-time home have been transferred to the market, the bakery, the dairy, the packing house, the laundry, the factory, the water and light plants, the public school, and the various departments of government, all of which are regulated by laws, whose wise enactment and efficient enforcement depend directly upon the exercise of the voting privilege. Without the ballot it is evident that woman is powerless adequately to protect the family and develop the home. She should have every right, privilege, and power necessary to enable her to make the most of her special sphere—the home—that ancient, sacred, and noblest of human institutions. [Applause.]

THOSE WHO OPPOSE.

Who opposes the proposition to extend the ballot to women? Those who oppose it may be divided into these groups:

First. Numerous good and intelligent people who have not investigated the subject. In this group will be found a majority perhaps, of the men and women of the country; but this group is growing smaller day by day, and will ultimately disappear.

Second. A small percentage of those who have investigated the subject, but with preconceived opinion and deep prejudice. Misconception and prejudice do not always yield promptly to reason and conscience. This group, too, will grow smaller as the years go by.

Third. Those who do not believe in democracy; those who place property rights above human rights; those who are beneficiaries of special or illegal privilege.

Fourth. The forces of vice and crime, of ignorance and prejudice, of selfishness and injustice.

COMPLETE EMANCIPATION CERTAIN.

Women are intelligent, conscientious, and independent. If enfranchised, they will vote intelligently, independently, patriotically. The result will be a revolution in many of the untoward conditions and tendencies of the times. Surely our women, in the matter of citizenship, should no longer be classed with infants, imbeciles, lunatics, and criminals.

When one with clear mind and open heart considers the matter seriously he comes naturally and irresistibly to the conclusion that this last of the shackles that bind woman should be broken; that against woman's complete emancipation there remains but one argument—tradition—an argument that has its foundation in the darkness of barbarism. Such an argument can not much longer prevail in this day of education and democracy.

We need equal suffrage for what it will do for women, for what it will do for men, for what it will do for the home, for what it will do for politics, for what it will do for government. If the States refuse or fail to grant it within a reasonable time, the privilege may be conferred through an amendment of the Federal Constitution.

I trust that the day is not far distant when Alabama and each of the other States will provide for the enfranchisement of women who are capable of meeting the qualifications exacted of men. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BROWN] five minutes.

Mr. BROWN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a layman I hesitate to address myself to any resolution by which it is proposed to amend the Constitution of the United States. Yet I feel constrained to do so, because some Members of this House have coupled an amendment providing for national prohibition with this proposed amendment providing for the extension of suffrage to women. I do not see that the proposed suffrage amendment is in any way similar or bears any relation to the prohibition amendment. On the contrary, in its constitutional aspect, it is very similar to the amendment recently adopted by the States and made a part of the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct election of United States Senators.

Does this suffrage resolution seek to invade the principles of government on which the Constitution of the United States is based and as it was established by our fathers? Out of mere reverence for our institutions, created though they were by men who understood the science of government more than any other group of men then or since, we ought not, as I conceive, to refuse to make a very candid examination of any proposed changes in our Constitution. If this proposed amendment should bring about any fundamental, or even incidental, change in our present form of government, I should be the first to raise my voice against it; but I conceive that this proposed amendment will, on the contrary, tend to adapt the fundamental principles of our Government to the conditions of our twentieth century existence. Breathing in every word of our Constitution is the ultimate desire to accomplish clean, efficient, and faithful public service, and I can imagine no better way of realizing these aspirations, of adapting these fundamental principles to present conditions, than by extending the suffrage to women. We must have the real power and the real responsibility of government remain precisely where the fathers placed it—with the people. Only by making requisite changes can the framework of our Government be maintained in its original integrity.

Political freedom has been variously defined as the right to pursue the highest ends without fear, and as the control of those who make a profession of politics by those who do not. At the present time almost one-half the Nation is disfranchised.

Let us remember that this proposed amendment, if it be passed by Congress, does nothing more than compel one-quarter of the States, in the event that three-quarters of the States ratify it, to admit to suffrage exactly those persons of the female sex who of the male sex by State law are now permitted to vote. Some States have a poll tax, some an educational test, before admitting males to the suffrage. These internal matters would not in any way be interfered with should this amendment be adopted by Congress and ratified by three-quarters of the States.

At the mature age of 31 years, having grown up in an atmosphere of nearly perfect equality between men and women, I find it hard to picture the time when women were classed by men with idiots, imbeciles, or morons; intellectual children. I glance at the record of public high schools in the United States for the year 1913 and find that of 1,134,771 students, 55.77 per cent were girls and only 44.23 per cent were boys. I notice there are 8,000,000 women in the United States to-day engaged in gainful occupations. And yet the most casual survey of the gradual changes in the laws with regard to the tenure of property and the guardianship of children in the civilized countries of the world gives ample proof that women in 1776 were considered as intellectual children. In the times when our Constitution was written the average household was sufficient unto itself for rough food, shelter, light, heat, and clothing. To-day the poorest tenement in the city of New York has plumbing, running water, gas, and a stove. Its milk and food are inspected by a Government official, and its light and water are bought from the Government or companies under its supervision. Whoever has seen the garbage and ashes of a million people undisposed of for even two days by reason of a blizzard or a strike will realize that healthful existence without efficient government is impossible. I believe the time has come when it is absolutely essential that those whose lives exist at the sufferance of a complex civilization should have a direct part in the machinery of government.

I often wonder if the opposition to extending the suffrage to women is not instigated by fear of what women may do to those in charge of the political machinery of this Government, especially in its smaller subdivisions, rather than by reasons of abstract justice. Personally, I have no fear of what the right of women to vote may do to those who are honestly endeavoring to be faithful public servants. This matter has passed beyond the experimental stage in those States and countries in which women now vote. Can it be that the men are afraid that women will usurp their prerogatives? It would seem to me that the 8,000,000 women now engaged in gainful occupations in the United States is a sufficient answer to this objection. In the professions, in the arts, in the sciences, and in the commercial world we men are in admitted competition with the other sex. The only special privileges remaining to us are to drink, to swear, to fight, and to vote. And while it is true that women can not fight for their country in the first line of defenses, they can and do play a part equally as important in caring for the sick and the wounded; and in this occupation, when called for, there is as much work as for the soldier, and no glory at all.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining part of my remarks I shall follow the thought of the Hon. John Stuart Mill as expressed in a speech delivered in the British Parliament on May 20, 1867. By many persons even to-day Mr. Mill is considered one of the greatest of political economists, and I have no apology to offer for following his thought, but only for such paraphrasing as the lapse of 48 years requires.

He argues that to deny the suffrage to any citizen of a country which has a government such as ours it is necessary to allege either personal unfitness or public danger. Can it be main-

tained that women who manage property, conduct business, pay taxes, are responsible heads of families, teachers, mothers, are incapable of making intelligent decisions at the same polls where now public questions are determined by male citizens? Or is it supposed that if they were allowed to vote they would revolutionize the State, subvert any of our valuable institutions, or that we should have worse laws or in any single respect worse government by reason of their suffrage? No one thinks anything of the kind. If women were accustomed to fight with guns for their rights, how long would the present practice of taxation without representation, an idea repugnant to every citizen and one of the chief causes of the war which has resulted in the political freedom of the United States, have been possible without a revolution?

The chief objections urged against woman suffrage would seem to be that politics is not women's business, and would make them neglect their proper duties; that women do not desire the suffrage, and would rather not have it; that women are sufficiently represented through their male representatives, and have power enough already.

Politics, it is said, is not a woman's business. Now, except for those who make their living out of politics or those who have been elected by the majority of one-half the people to serve all the people, I do not think that politics is a man's business, either. The great majority of male voters have their own business, which engrosses nearly the whole of their time; but I have never heard that the hours occupied in going to the polls every year, even if we throw in the time spent in reading current political literature in the newspapers and elsewhere, has made them neglect their various professions. It is the very principle of constitutional liberty that men can and do come from their offices, their shops, their factories, and their farms and decide how they will be governed and by whom they will be governed.

The occupations of most women are, and are likely to remain, principally domestic; but the idea that these occupations are incompatible with taking an interest in national affairs or in any of the great concerns of humanity is absurd as the fear once sincerely manifested that if those who work for their daily bread should be taught to read there would be no more work done in the world.

Perhaps it is thought that the ordinary occupations of women are more antagonistic than are men's occupations to any comprehension of public affairs. Perhaps it is thought that those who are charged with the moral education of the future generations of men must be unfit to judge of the moral and educational interests of a community. I believe that women in the main are far better fitted at the present time than are the majority of men to legislate wisely with regard to the public health, public schools, and the quasi public buildings or tenements in which poor people in cities must live. I wonder what percentage of the children of the United States receive their first lessons in civic duties and patriotism from women? It is extraordinary to me how much women know about these matters when society has informed them that it does not expect them to concern themselves with public interests. It seems incredible to me that men should prefer to spend their lives in close communion of thought and feeling with wives who are studiously kept inferior in mental thought to themselves and whose earthly interests are forcibly confined within four walls.

We are told that women do not want the suffrage. It is a very hard matter really to discover whether they do or not. Long centuries of habitual, because enforced, neglect of public questions naturally disinclines them publicly to express their wishes on this point. Clearly those who do not want the suffrage will not use it, or if they do they will vote as their male relatives advise them, so that there will be no perceptible change in the expression of opinion as a result of the exercise of the suffrage by such women as these; but I believe the public would gain enormously from those who, whether their numbers be many or few, would experience the stimulus to their faculties and the widening of their sympathies which suffrage seldom fails to exert over any considerable body of persons that is admitted to a share in it.

Finally, it is said that women have power enough already through their male relatives and connections. We now come to that fundamental difference between direct responsibility and indirect responsibility which played so large a part in the adoption of the constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators. Women have a tremendous power to-day, but they are responsible to no one. They can agitate anything, they can involve great political parties in their programs of legislation without having any direct responsibility therefor. The creators of these United States suffered greatly to get away from an irresponsible government. Undoubtedly the suffrage would give women more power than they now possess, but it would also make them directly responsible for the use or abuse of that power.

Mr. Speaker, the powers of government are now so varied and so numerous that they must be in large measure delegated to agents and employees. But the people may select their political servants who make and administer their laws, and it is our duty to place this power in constant, direct, immediate touch with all the people—not one-half.

This amendment is not hysteria. It is a determined effort on the part of the American people to make free government what free government in the last analysis is destined to be—popular government. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, my vote is "aye."

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if I were a member of the lower house of the Louisiana Legislature, I should unhesitatingly vote for proposed amendments to the constitution of that State similar to the Hobson and Mondell resolutions; that is, if the opportunity offered itself, for I do not believe that one who is intrusted by the people with the duties and obligations of a public position should make the unpardonable mistake of supposing that it is not the will of the people but his own will that is to be considered.

My deepest ambition is to vote for the continued preservation of the integrity of the individual States, and by no process of reasoning can I ever be swerved one jot from this determination.

The Mondell resolution, like the Hobson resolution, involves a question which intrinsically belongs to the States, and in my opinion can be alone wisely and justly determined by each according to the views of its people. Therefore I shall vote against the pending measure.

Mr. Speaker, the training, predilections, temperament, and the needs of the people of one Commonwealth may be utterly at variance with the people of another. I further take it that every liberal man will concede that a particular law may be adaptable to one State and wholly unfit and inapplicable to another. Therefore, I firmly believe that each State should possess the unrestricted power to impose its will, and its will alone, upon its citizenry.

The framers of the Federal Constitution, as we well know, in their wisdom reserved to each of the several States its separate, distinct, and political individuality. Each has the right to express its will and wish and shall do so independent of and uninfluenced and unimpeded by any other State. Under this system we have happily witnessed the phenomenal growth and development of the several States, and our faces are still set toward the future. We, too, have observed that nothing ever occurs to either mar or impair the comity and amity existing between the States, or to interfere with the well-defined relations existing between the States and the Federal Government.

Now, if we have not grown tired of the serenity of the waters upon which we are rapidly navigating to an influence and power unrivaled by any nation in the world, we shall diligently keep separate and apart the Federal and the State governments; the Federal Government employing those powers delegated to it by the Federal Constitution and, on the other hand, the States exercising all the functions and prerogatives of sovereignty without interference by the Federal Government, lest some unpleasantness, more undesirable than a fiscal disturbance, may some day come to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed, as a matter of principle, to rescinding in the slightest degree the separate sovereignty of the States and shall vote accordingly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] five minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the question before this House now is not whether or not we as citizens favor woman suffrage. It is not whether the States will or will not, ought or ought not, to adopt the amendment when submitted. The only question for this House to determine to-day is whether or not that part of the Constitution providing the method for its amendment shall be exercised, shall be put in operation; whether or not the people shall have an opportunity as States to amend the organic law which they as States adopted, and by this method only can alter, amend, or abolish.

I was not in any Democratic caucus that declared this to be a State question. I do not say there was not one; but if there was, I happened to miss it, and therefore did not participate in it, and am not bound by it. I would not have agreed to any such caucus, for I do not think the question of the suffrage to be given by the States or withheld by them is or should be a party question.

Why did the Committee on Rules bring in the rule just adopted, providing for a vote on this resolution, when a majority of the members of that committee were opposed to the adoption of the resolution, and when they believed that less than the required majority would vote for it? The Rules Committee is a creation of this House and has no powers except those delegated to it by the House, and it exercised the only function or power it had, which was to give its creator the right to act for itself, and it accordingly brought in the rule that made this resolution privileged. Now, this House is the Rules Committee when it comes to amending the Constitution, so far as the States are concerned.

The States can not vote on this question unless Congress gives them the opportunity, and we are now sitting as a rules committee to say whether or not the States shall have on this proposed amendment the opportunity to accept or reject it. Believing, as I do, that the States will not at this time by three-fourths majority vote for or adopt this amendment, yet, like the Rules Committee, I shall vote to submit it to the States, who alone can determine for themselves in a constitutional way whether or not this amendment should be adopted. We have no more right to withhold from the States the privilege that is given them by the Constitution than the Rules Committee has to withhold from this House an opportunity to exercise the power vested in the House. The Rules Committee possesses nothing but delegated powers. We, as Members of this House, have nothing but delegated powers. It makes no difference to you how I shall vote in Tennessee should this question be submitted to a vote in that State, and in discharging my duty here it makes no difference to me how Tennessee will vote. I am willing to trust the wisdom of the States in the exercise of their reserved powers. But they say it will increase the negro vote in the South.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Not just now. I have only five minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has been yielded to very liberally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SIMS. I beg to say to my friends from the South that the negro men can not be discriminated against on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude by reason of a constitutional amendment. But do they vote in proportion to numbers in equal ratio with the white men? If the negro women should vote no more numerously in proportion to numbers than do the negro men there is no danger of negro domination even if this amendment should be adopted.

The right to vote is not natural or inherent. It is political and must be conferred by Government. This amendment only provides that it shall not be withheld on account of sex. Is sex the only all-wise means of determining whether the privilege of the ballot is to be conferred or withheld from citizens of the States?

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

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

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I represent a State which, while it granted a limited suffrage to woman many years ago, is opposed to granting full suffrage [applause], a State which in the last three sessions of the legislature refused to grant even municipal suffrage to woman, a State which in the last constitutional convention refused to grant full suffrage to woman. Also I am a Democrat, with some regard for the old doctrine of State rights, but I vote for this resolution without hesitation, without doubt, and with a certainty that it is in accord with my principles. I shall vote for it, Mr. Speaker, because I believe not only in the suffrage but I believe in this way or any other way, State action or National, to secure it. [Applause.]

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the qualifications of voters in this country has been left, with one exception, to the States from the beginning of the Government, and that that action has worked well; but I state that the qualifications of voters for national offices is a national question whenever the Nation sees fit to make it such. When four-fifths of the people of this country decide that in this free land sex shall not be a disqualification in any State in this Union it should and will be the law.

I was sorry to hear the leader of the Democratic Party [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his speech say that he spoke not only for himself but he spoke for the Democratic Party in opposition to suffrage and national suffrage. I deny him the right to represent me and thousands of other Democratic men in office and out of office on this question. It is not a local question. Qualification, if you mean by that disqualification on account of sex, is not a local question. The gentleman from Alabama said the Members of the House acted without knowledge of local conditions. There are no local conditions in sex. I know this, and everybody knows it, that the average woman in this country possesses about the same brain capacity and moral character as the men, and I know that the women of Alabama are as well qualified and fit as the women of New Hampshire or of any other State.

Now, just a word about the suffrage itself. If elections were merely a fight between certain gangs of men for office, and that seems to be the view that some of my brethren hold, it would be a dirty game, and there would be no reason why women should enter into it. Politics is a dirty game when carried on by dirty men, and not otherwise. [Applause.] But politics is something far different. The activities of the Government, both State and National, are largely devoted to-day to matters of social welfare and domestic questions, many that used to be settled in the home, questions in which women are interested and well informed. We pass laws concerning the raising and health of children. Are women disqualified from voting on such subjects because they are mothers of children? We vote on questions dealing with pure food and pure fabrics; are women disqualified because their "natural sphere" is in the home, cooking and sewing?

Women are in many ways as well qualified as men to vote. For the solution of our great social questions we need all the brains and all the moral devotions our people possess. Women have brains, and of sympathy and Christian charity they have even a larger measure than men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

[Mr. HARDY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, but is it?

One-half the people of the Nation are women. In most States they are allowed no participation in the government, though they are citizens of the Nation in every State, but without the right to vote in most of the States.

Why should not the citizens of the United States have equal privileges in every State?

Is there any just reason to believe that citizens, as such, complying with the State laws, should not be granted equal privileges? But it is so, and should remain so no longer.

The people are supposed to make the laws for the people, but half of the people are excluded from that privilege. The laws of the land are enforceable against all alike, women as well as men. The women are neither above nor below the laws, but are subject in every sense to the laws of the land. This being the case, why should they not be permitted to help make the laws?

We are said to live in a land where every citizen is a sovereign, but do we live in such a land? Sovereignty is not merely citizenship. It consists of the right of participation in and direction of the Government. The sovereign is the master. It can not be said that women are sovereign without the right to vote. Why should not women possess equal sovereignty with men?

This is said to be a representative Government. My understanding of a representative government is that representatives are chosen to speak for the people. If that be the case, should they not be chosen by the people, not by half the people, but by all the people?

Women are engaging more and more in industrial pursuits, and there is a continually growing reason why they should participate in regulating the conditions under which they are obliged to work. The participation of women in the public activities of the Nation should tend toward better moral conditions. Their participation should have a refining influence on the politics of the Nation.

If there were no other reason why women should be given the right to vote, this one would be all sufficient.

Women are the peers of men in every social activity. Why should they not be their peers in the making and enforcement of the laws of the land?

Women are taxed on their property just as men are taxed. Should they then not be allowed to speak for themselves and not through others?

We have reached the dawn of a new day. We have arrived at that hour when the women of America are to bid good night to the day that is gone and to welcome the brightness of the new day, where women in every State of the Union are to be a part of the sovereign power of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, we can not base our argument for equal suffrage upon inherent rights, for there are none. If there were even such inherent rights as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we should have no war conscriptions, nor jails, nor mosquitoes on trout streams.

Instead of inherent rights we merely possess social conventions, which, varying with times and places, represent our wisdom and our folly in the attempt to secure social adjustment.

Here and now we are beset with the great ideal of democracy, of equal rights in the control of our destinies, of government of, by, and for the people, and yet as concerns half of our people, half our own breed, blood, color, and culture, we deny our social creed.

Why should men vote? Is it because they vote intelligently? No; not necessarily, but merely because through the process of voting, whether right or wrong, they tend toward self-government and self-education in the school of experience. Clothe the fact of male government in all the attractive balderdash of chivalry, and it means no other thing than the subjection, the possession, the servitude of women by men and to men.

It means inherent disrespect, studied insult, and a denial of democracy. Some of you chivalrous opponents of equal suffrage will deny my statement. But what of your arguments? You will mention the lovely sheltered life. But chivalry has never granted shelter to most women; it has not been adequate to protect the shopgirl or the working woman. Chivalry has never added to their wages nor saved them from physical or moral wreckage. They have had to protect themselves, although deprived of the chief means whereby men in a democracy can protect themselves—the ballot.

But woman is the clinging vine, man the sturdy oak. Man and wife shall be one flesh, and man is it. These outbursts of chivalry incite nausea.

You do not dare to speak such sacrilege when you remember your mother, you would not presume to talk such nonsense to the woman you have married, nor would you tolerate the marriage of your daughter to a man who would deny her equal rights to personality and character.

Why should you regard the women of other families as being so different from your own kin?

Then that grand old dictum about bearing arms; surely that is a splendid thought in this hysterical, idiotic, man-made world filled with fear and rabies. Men bear arms and women bear children, and since the men with the arms have the power to kill the children born of women, therefore they, the murderers, should rule. Pistol toting, as a qualification for suffrage—it takes a more ludicrous chivalry than that which Cervantes laughed out of existence to countenance such reasoning. I do not believe that even the enthusiastic but inaccurate marksman, the gentleman from Alabama, who so valiantly contends for the clinging vine can seriously urge this theory.

No; there is not one single honest argument to be advanced against the sharing of the responsibilities of government, of social adjustment, with our women, except such as is founded on the belief of their inherent inferiority and their proper subservience to our great, good, our sober, intelligent, clean, and righteous male selves.

I am not worried about that particular convention perpetrated by our ancestors and known as the Constitution. This resolution to amend is a method of bringing that document down to date in one most important particular. I have sworn to "uphold the Constitution without any mental reservation whatsoever" because the Speaker asked me to, and the right to amendment is one of the features of that document which peculiarly excites my admiration. Now when opportunity is offered to amend it, so that the best half of the Nation can work efficiently for the welfare of all the Nation, I am glad to be here to be recorded. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, it almost seems necessary to apologize for pressing the application of fundamental truths to such a question as this. But an argument against suffrage for the women of America can not be made without violating almost every primary principle upon which the Republic is founded.

Our Government rests upon the consent of the governed. "Consent" can not be expressed except by the ballot, and a woman can no more vote by deputy than a man.

A woman is as much entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as is a man. There is no means of securing these or of safeguarding them except by the ballot.

She contributes to the intellectual, material, and moral life of the Nation. She bears her part in maintaining the cost of Government. She contributes to its progress in times of peace and to its defense in time of war, yet politically she is classed with immature children and idiots, with the insane, and with criminals.

She is primarily responsible for the education of her children. Is it just that she should have no voice in the management of the schools?

She is interested in the protection of the home, yet she has no part in making the laws which guard it.

She is interested in clean streets, pure food, potable water, and civic righteousness, and yet the village vagabond who believes that germs are myths, cleanliness a fad, and saloons a necessity is honored with the ballot which is denied to her.

If it were contemplated to found a free State based on liberty, justice, and equality, and if the question of qualification for suffrage was under consideration, and if it was stated that a large class of citizens who are taxed for the support of the Government, a class which were responsible under the law for their acts, which were devoted to our institutions, which were capable of any sacrifices for the common weal, which were clean in thought, pure in morals, and reverent in devotion far beyond the standards of men, which were fully as intelligent and generally better educated than men, would it be thought that as an original proposition it would be just and right to refuse the ballot to such a class?

"But she does not want it and will not use it if she attains it," it is claimed.

That she does not want it is answered by the present demand. That she will not use it is answered by the women in the States where they have obtained the right. But if a single woman demands the privilege, what reason shall be made for refusing it to her? And until you take away the ballot from men who do not use it, you have no right to urge that objection against woman's having it.

If a distinction is to be made on account of sex, it might pertinently be inquired why women should not have the ballot instead of men? They are the majority, and majorities should rule in a free country—not brute force. By every argument men would urge to retain the ballot women are justified in urging to obtain it.

The same objections that are now urged against woman's participation in the affairs of the State were but yesterday urged against her education. About the middle of the nineteenth century Mr. Higginson wrote one of his delightful essays, "Ought Women to Learn the Alphabet?" In that he satirically describes the arguments used against woman's education at the beginning of the century. For a hundred years in Boston the public schools admitted boys alone. About the beginning of the century it was discovered that during the summer months the boys' attendance fell off about one-half. It was thought that perhaps it would lessen the waste of maintenance if during these months the girls were admitted. This continued for some 40 years. Finally it was conceded that it was safe for girls to attend the common schools but not the colleges. It is only during these later years that the reluctant concession is made that women are as much entitled to education as men.

Emerson said:

> We think our civilization near its meridian, but we are yet only at the cockcrowing and the morning star.

It was only after centuries of conflict that women were recognized in the church. It took a long time to establish the proposition that women had souls and were morally responsible. It took still longer to reach the conclusion that she was entitled to any voice in determining the policy of the church and in the administration of its affairs.

To-day religion and worship can not be imagined dissociated from woman and her influence. There is not a church in America that could survive for a year without her aid. The highest manifestations of Christianity, that which is best and purest and holiest, is kept alive and nourished by the hearts and souls of women.

The argument most pressed and of most influence against woman suffrage is that she can not vote without neglecting the home. But on what foundation does it stand? Is the home more engrossing than business? If the man can vote without neglecting his business, the woman can vote without neglecting her home. It is absurd to say that an hour's time once every year will invade and disturb the duties of the home.

If it be said that the time will be taken in informing herself in order to vote intelligently, the same answer can be made as before. And would those who urge that objection admit that they would have her unintelligent and uninformed? If the man can spare the time from his business, so can the woman

from her home. But the time need not be taken from the home. The best preparation will be made there. Preparation for an intelligent exercise of the right of suffrage is not confined to attendance on and participation in street parades, torchlight processions, and grand rallies. Preparation is best made in the home, by the fireside, around the family circle, where the evening paper is being read and the current happenings discussed.

It is believed and argued that by taking an interest in public affairs women will lose some of their womanly qualities. In some way activity has become identified with indelicacy. That is still the Turkish idea. A woman must live a secluded life. She must not be seen or heard. She must think of no one but her husband. She must talk to no one but him. She must worship no other god. How far such a conception of woman's place in the world is from the American idea may be determined by a comparison of the harem with the home.

To the believers in this idea any interest outside of kitchen economy and neighborhood gossip is dangerous for women. And they believe that idea creditable to them. "I adore women," they say. "I worship her as a goddess. If she should mingle in the general affairs of life it would be a sacrilege, a desecration, a profanation."

The strange delusion seems to be prevalent still that if once a woman is made animate she must of necessity rush into every sort of extravagance. They believe that if she becomes interested in politics she will become one of the worst type of ward politician. If she claims a part in the affairs of state she will soon join the ranks of the militant suffragettes. If she tries to remove temptations from the pathway of her children she is pictured in their imagination as a Carrie Nation wielding a hatchet.

It is remarkable how this primitive idea still lingers in immature minds. It is a survival of a prehistoric age when men captured their wives in the forests and kept them in their caves by force. The modern cavalier proudly proclaims:

"My idea of woman is that she is a flower, which I would pluck, press to my heart, and cherish thus forever." He would not want the flower to bloom unseen. He would take it. He would at once reduce it to possession, and as long as it bloomed for him alone, as long as it ministered to his pleasure, as long as it gratified his pride, he would cherish it.

It is a beautiful thing to think of woman as a flower, a thing to look upon and admire—and pluck. But it is still more beautiful to think of her as a sentient, loving, human entity, going about doing good.

In this age and in this land of ours we realize to the utmost degree the duties and the obligations of the home; but responsibility for the fulfillment of these obligations is not confined to wives and mothers alone. The husband, the father can not ignore his obligation. In the self-sacrifice that lifts it and brightens it and makes it holy, hers will be the greater part. But it will be his to look to its support, to insure its protection, to maintain it inviolate as a refuge and a fortress.

So in the larger life. His will be the greater sphere of activity. But as he must help to support and protect the home, so must she assist to protect and support the State. Not negatively, not passively, not by proxy, but affirmatively, actively, and individually.

Many are the thoughtful, calm, and noble women who almost wish that suffrage might not come, so great would they consider its responsibilities. But they know that the same obligation rests on them that rests on men to take up bravely the burdens of their times, to meet with patient care and earnest thought the problems that must be solved, to join with all their fellow kind in the high endeavor to do all their duty in the fear of God and for the good of man.

Some one has said that in the theater of life it is only permitted to God and the angels to be lookers on. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the world moves. It is now nearly two full generations since the States of this Union have removed from woman the common-law restrictions, and yet we have heard some of the last echoes of that archaic system in this debate. Under the rules of common law coverture lost to a woman her legal identity. She could convey no property, she could make no contracts, she could engage in no business, she could neither sue nor be sued. There was but one person in the law, and that person was the husband. Under the common-law doctrine the married woman passed out of existence and the unmarried woman was either a freak or a social criminal. But the world has moved beyond that; and for two full generations in every State in the Union, with more or less freedom, women have engaged in business; they buy, sell, and convey property; they make contracts; they sue and are sued; they pay taxes; they shoulder their full share of the burden of government. When women must use the courts, when they must make contracts and enforce them, when they are liable for their business engagements and their wrongs, when they must rely upon public officials to spend the taxes which they pay, they have all of the political burdens and they are entitled to all of the political rights. There is no other basis upon which political rights can be given. But gentlemen say that women should be excluded and secluded, and that safeguards should be thrown around them, and that if more laws can be found to safeguard the seclusion of women they would be adopted in certain States in the Union. I commend those gentlemen to the laws of the Mohammedan countries. They may find more laws there for the exclusion of women than now exist in some of the American States. Again, it is said that the women must found their rights and political equality upon force. If that were true and an appeal can be made for political rights only to force, thousands of men must be denied political rights. But fortunately political rights are founded upon reason and upon justice, and not upon an appeal to force.

If an appeal to force is the only true basis of political rights, then political rights would not exist, as they do not exist in most of the countries of the world. It is in enlightened countries of the world where political rights are extended upon the basis of reason and not upon the basis of force that such political rights have grown to the highest usefulness in the world. I intend to support this resolution. I believe that while the States have ample power to-day to confer political rights upon any set of electors they choose, yet I believe that this is a homogeneous Nation, a great Nation; and until you prove to me that the civilization of some of the American States is so far below the civilization of other American States as to make a difference in social conditions necessary I shall vote for the broadest form of equality. I can not believe that State rights must be the determining factor in this question or that the States so differ in their social condition and in civilization that some of the States could not stand social equality that would be beneficial in other States. The American Nation is not so different in its constituent parts. Our States are not little kingdoms that can be defended by separate armies. Not a single State in the Union could fortify or defend itself from its sister States, but it is part of one great nation, and all upon a basis of social equality. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the radiant light above me and the profound constitutional logic here below; but in the midst of both of these inspirational conditions I want to reserve the right to keep faith with myself and what I believe to be my best judgment. In every political campaign in which I have indulged I have always declared that I was a Democrat, and yet if I were elected I wanted it to be fully understood that I reserved the right to vote for any and all legislation which I believed to be just, helpful, and effective, regardless of the side of the House from which it might come. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that our constituted party leaders sometimes disagree with me, I am still free and consistent when I take a position in harmony with what I believe to be right. In practically every speech I made in my first campaign I declared in favor of woman suffrage, and my constituents elected me with full knowledge of what I would do if this important question should call for my voice and vote during my official career. And so I am only standing by my out-in-the-open guns when I look you squarely in the face and tell you what I will do.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure but that the enactment of this proposed amendment would be an invasion of the principle of so-called State rights, but, as a business man and not a lawyer, I have never been stampeded by any outcry against enacting helpful legislation lest it might not fully harmonize with opinions of some statesmen who lived more than a hundred years ago. They knew no more of our condition and needs than we do of the requirements of a hundred years hence. So I am not seriously concerned as to this phase of the question before us, for I have an abiding faith that our courts of justice will forever protect the foundation of our Republic from all danger.

This is a question purely of what is best for the largest possible success and happiness for humankind. If man is the sole author and finisher of wholesome public opinion and helpful public policy, then his exclusive right to vote is unquestioned. But I do not believe he is. Instead, he gets most of

his inspiration to favor good law and good order from the wholesome atmosphere of the home—the family circle—and if womankind possesses finer sensibilities, better morals, and more sacred motives than men, which we gallantly admit they do, why not admit their influence to the betterment of public policies? We are always ready to admit that mother knows best what we ought to do, and yet when it comes to the important work of making laws for our protection and our advancement we refuse the help of those whom we regard our superiors in questions affecting home and church and school.

That woman suffrage will fall short of some expectations that it will cure all government sins of omission and commission I am quite sure; but I know it would inure for peace as against murderous war, for temperance as against intemperance, for honesty as against chicanery, and for home and happiness as against the schemes of the wicked.

Men, your best business partner, your best community booster, and your best home patriot is she who stands unfalteringly by you, through storm and through sunshine, through evil and through good report—the wife, mother, sister, or daughter in your home. And let me beseech you that in all your ambitions you do not ignore the patriotic judgment of her whose loyal heart and willing hands have helped you immeasurably. She is the royal diadem of life inspiration and of life worth living, and I am not afraid that she will be degraded by the right to vote. On the other hand, I am willing to invite her assistance for the eternal betterment of social, political, and financial conditions for which all good men strive, and therefore I will vote "yes." [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

[Mr. RAKER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for this amendment. I have a great reverence for the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe that since the eleventh amendment was adopted there have been many occasions in which there should have been amendments to that great instrument. I certainly shall not on this occasion go beyond my conviction of what is right and proper in the granting of franchise even to the best part of God's creation.

The old prophet Isaiah, in referring to what would happen under certain conditions, said:

In that day seven women shall take hold of one man.

And when we shall have granted the right of franchise to the women in those States in which it has not yet been granted, we will see the prophecy verified, where seven women shall seize hold of one poor man. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I would rather place women where the great English author placed them when he wrote these words. Sir John Ruskin, in his lecture "On Queen's Gardens," said:

We are foolish in speaking of the superiority of one sex to the other, as if they could be compared. Each has what the other has not; each completes the other, and is completed by the other. The man's power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer. His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energy for adventure, for war, for conquest. But the woman's power is for rule; not for battle, not for conquest, not for contest. By her office and her place she is protected from all danger and temptation. The man in his rough work in the open world must encounter all peril and trial; to him, therefore, the failure, the offense, the inevitable error; often he must be wounded or subdued, often misled, and always hardened. But he guards the woman from all this. Within his house, as ruled by her, unless she herself has sought it, need enter no danger, no temptation, no cause of error or offense. This is the true nature of power—it is the place of peace; the shelter not only from all injury, but from all terror, doubt, and division.

I read the words of this great author and repeat them for your consideration.

The great English poet, Tennyson, in his poem of "The Princess," after describing an English mother and an English wife, said:

Happy he
With such a mother; faith in womankind
Beats in his blood, and trust in all things high
Comes easy to him; and tho' he trip and fall,
He shall not blind his soul with clay.

It is to this kind of women that I pay reverence, and it is this kind of women that I would protect by my vote to-day from being soiled with the contest of politics and elections.

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason that actuates me in voting against this amendment: Outside of my lifelong conviction and inspiration from those who wrote the Constitution and those who founded the Democratic Party——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman wish more time?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would be pleased if you would yield some to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, we had universal suffrage attempted to be enforced on the States of the section from which I come. Disorder, chaos, crime, and nightmare reigned when we enfranchised the black male, and my soul shudders with horror when I reflect that if this amendment is put upon the States of the South by a vote of three-fourths of the States that nightmare is to come again, that horror is to be upon us once more in those States, because in those days we knew and realized and felt that the black female was worse in her antagonism to the white race than the black male. Therefore, speaking for the white women of my State and of my section, I raise my voice here to-day against this resolution and shall cast my vote against the step that may fasten upon us this horror again.

Mr. Speaker, above all, I do not believe we should change the Constitution. I do not believe there is occasion to do so. I believe that if Georgia or Massachusetts, if Kansas or New York, want to permit the women to vote, they have the right to do so, because we know by the Constitution and by the decisions of the courts the United States Congress has no power to grant to the citizens the right to vote. I have the decisions here, quite a number.

I could not better close this statement that I make with reference to the Constitution than by reading here and calling again to the attention of this House the words of that great author upon that great instrument. It will live and preserve our people and our country and our children in years yet unnumbered and yet to come if we are true to ourselves and true to the principles that it teaches. It can only be destroyed by faithlessness of ourselves or of the people. Said Justice Story in concluding his Treatise upon the Constitution:

Let the American youth never forget that they possess a noble inheritance, bought by the toils and sufferings and blood of their ancestors, and capable, if wisely improved and faithfully guarded, of transmitting to their latest posterity all the substantial blessings of life, the peaceful enjoyment of liberty, property, religion, and independence. The structure has been erected by architects of consummate skill and fidelity; its foundations are solid; its compartments are beautiful as well as useful; its arrangements are full of wisdom and order; and its defenses are impregnable from without. It has been reared for immortality, if the work of man may justly aspire to such a title. It may, nevertheless, perish in an hour by the folly or corruption or negligence of its only keepers, the people. Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit, and intelligence of the citizens. They fall when the wise are banished from the public councils, because they dare to be honest; and the profligate are rewarded, because they flatter the people in order to betray them.

I will not forget my duty, flatter the people, even the ladies and women of our country, in order to betray them and destroy the Government. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, of course it is utterly impossible to discuss this question within five minutes. I want, however, to give my reason briefly for not supporting this resolution. Suffrage is a privilege conferred by the State upon the citizen who complies with certain rules and regulations for the good of the State. I have an abiding conviction that if this Republic and this Federal system is preserved we must leave to the people of the States the right to determine who shall and who shall not vote, because if you transfer the power to the Federal Government to determine that question and leave to the Federal Government the right to control the machinery of these elections, then, indeed, the States become mere geographical lines and the Federal system destroyed. I maintain that the people of Maine understand their local conditions and take more interest in their local affairs than do the people of Mississippi. I maintain also that the people of my State understand their local affairs better than the people of Maine understand them.

I am unwilling to transfer the authority over the suffrage in my State to the Federal Government. I am unwilling to vest that power in the Federal Government, because I believe that all right-thinking men will tell you that the fifteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which was never passed, by the way, in accordance with Article V of the Constitution, was a mistake.

Now, let us ask the advocates of this measure what they would think of the proposition had it been propounded to Congress and the States some 60 or 70 years ago to amend the Constitution so as to provide that no State of this Union should extend the franchise and the right of suffrage to any female in that State or in any of the States? Indeed, you who press this amendment would have thought that was an extremely harsh rule, because the great State of Colorado had seen fit

to confer franchise upon the women of that great State. That does not disturb me in the least, if the people of that State desire them to vote. But if we had said by an amendment to the Constitution years ago that Colorado should be deprived of the right of giving suffrage to the women of that State you would indeed have thought it a hard rule, and I maintain that one-fourth of the States should have the right to reserve to themselves this great right. It is not a question of commerce, it is not a question that involves any of our money rights, but it is a question which involves conferring upon a certain class of citizens the privilege of voting; and I say "privilege of voting," because no man pretends and no court holds that the right to vote is a right known as a civil one, because the baby in the cradle is born with all the natural rights that are conferred upon citizens in this country. The right of suffrage is a right conferred by the State, as I said a moment ago, and as a privilege and not as a right. I am therefore willing for all the States to determine this question for themselves.

What do you gain by the passage of this resolution? Did not Colorado confer the right of women to vote, and can not any State to-morrow, if it desires to do so, confer this right? In many of the States where they do not have woman suffrage, they have, if you please, a referendum of all these questions to the people of those States, and I want the people of each of the States of the United States to determine this question for themselves. It is now right where it belongs, in the States, and no advocate of woman suffrage has any right to complain.

But I am unwilling that you should hurl this matter red-hot into every State in this Union as a Federal question, when it is not a Federal question and could never become a Federal question except for this proposed amendment. My hope and my trust is that in all future time these 48 States may reserve to themselves the right to determine who shall and who shall not vote within their borders. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 34 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this House is to-day considering the most important question, in my judgment, with which we have had to deal during 40 years. Many gentlemen on that side of the House gleefully embrace the opportunity to speak in favor of this amendment on this occasion. Let me remind them that for 16 years the Republicans were in power, and these same women were asking for the right to vote upon this amendment in the House of Representatives, and your party steadfastly refused to let it be considered on this floor.

The Democratic Party has not feared to face the question and to deal with it, as the Republican Party did for years. Your party suppressed much meritorious legislation and many things that should have been considered here, and you went out of power. The Democratic Party is willing to stand the test and cast its votes against the amendment. Without meaning to disparage any Representative, when the time comes that the Democracy can not stand against such amendments as the national prohibition amendment and the Mondell suffrage amendment the mission of our ancient party is ended.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to submitting this question to the respective States, for several reasons. In the first place, I am entirely persuaded that a very large majority of American women are utterly opposed to this amendment and are in entire opposition to woman suffrage.

When this question was laid before the Rules Committee in a seven-day hearing the proponents of the amendment politely but firmly declined to allow the American woman to vote upon the proposition.

Much sentiment has been indulged in here to-day which has not been helpful in the solution of this great problem. Men should face this question resolutely, and they should not let sentiment control them nor should they permit political expediency to determine their attitude upon this amendment.

There are many who believe that woman suffrage, where it has been adequately tried, has failed; and for a brief moment I want to read to you the language of a distinguished publicist of England and a great lecturer, who is soon to be heard in the National Capital. I refer to the language of Cecil Chesterton, Esq. Mr. Chesterton states that opposition to woman suffrage is in no sense one of his strongest convictions. His main reason for disliking it is the strong antagonism to it in England by the overwelming mass of women in all but the upper and middle classes. He feels that it is in many ways purely a domestic question upon which he can not see that he has any right as an Englishman to lecture Americans. But there are certain sides of this question that must be carefully kept in mind, and the line that Mr. Chesterton takes in his lecture is as follows:

> I do not know how you Americans will solve this problem, and it is really not my business to tell you how to solve it, but I would impress upon you this point, that the old idea implied in the voting of the head of the household was not that women were inferior to men—which nobody but an idiot believes—but that voting was to be by families, and not by individuals; and in any arrangement you make you ought to see that the idea of the family as the unit of the Nation is not lost.

So, without discussing the merits of the question of woman suffrage, I have come to the conclusion that the women do not universally desire it. And where it has been tested it has not proved a success. One Representative said that if you give the women the right to vote they will destroy the liquor traffic in every State in this Union. Allow me to reply that they have the absolute and unqualified right to vote in California, and yet recently, by a majority of something like 150,000, they failed to establish prohibition in the State of California.

This is not a question of right, as some gentlemen have said. And while I seriously doubt that if this amendment were proposed to the various States it would meet the desires of those who wish it, yet I say that without this amendment being ratified by the various States every State in this Union has the privilege, under the Constitution of the United States and its own constitution, to grant the elective franchise to women if it so desires.

Let us see about this being one of the natural and inherent rights. Let us not be swayed and carried away by sentiment and political expediency. As an American I love my country well enough not to be willing to scout the idea of State rights and the traditions and history of our fathers who fashioned this Government. We are all Americans. But if we make this departure here to-day and lay our hands upon the sacred rights of the States of this Union to settle this question of suffrage for themselves, we shall have taken from the people of the various States every vestige of power they have to control, not only their domestic concerns, but the affairs of this Republic in its entirety. Permit me for a moment to read from a great authority on suffrage and elections, in order that we may determine the exact basis upon which this question should be argued and settled. This is McCreary on Elections. He says:

> It is unnecessary for the purposes of this work to determine whether the sovereignty in this country resides in the people of the United States as a Nation, or in the people as divided into groups by States. It is sufficient to note that, so far as the right to fix the qualifications of voters is concerned, the sovereignty is in the people of the respective States, by virtue of the provisions of the Federal Constitution, subject only to the limitations contained in the fifteenth amendment, that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

So, Mr. Speaker, even when the fifteenth amendment was added to the Constitution, it was not intended to confer the elective franchise, but it was only proposed as a limitation; and if gentlemen *want to confer the elective franchise*, why do they not fix the qualifications of voters in their amendment and submit it to the various States of the Union?

Mr. Speaker, this great author, proceeding along that line, states further:

> The right of suffrage is not a natural right, nor is it an absolute, unqualified, personal right. It is a right derived in this country from constitutions and statutes. It is, as we have seen, regulated by the States, and their power to fix the qualifications of others is limited only by the provisions of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, which forbids any distinction on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and by the general power of the Federal Government to regulate its own elections.

Why is it that you wish this amendment proposed and sent to the various States? The States have the power to confer this right upon women whenever they see proper. And I surmise that the fact that the friends of this provision have come to this body and have asked this remedy to-day is because they see and know and feel that their efforts have been futile and will be futile in various States of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am not willing that the States of California, Colorado, and Wyoming shall say to the people of Texas how we shall direct our domestic concerns and our affairs in regard to voting and elections. Nor do I have any desire to say to them how they shall deal with those questions when they have them up for consideration.

If you submit this amendment, as I remarked when we had the national prohibition amendment before us, the next request will be for a law to prohibit the States from passing "Jim Crow" laws, separate-coach laws, separate schools, separate churches, and to order and command every locality to suppress its red-light district. The next demand will be to place a Federal ban on the States where the intermarriage of the white and black races is permitted. There is but one safe and wholesome doctrine for us here. Revere the constitutional guaran-

ties of the States and remove not "the ancient landmarks of our fathers."

Ah, Mr. Speaker, we are going too far. I am one of those who believe in the right and ability of the people of the State to govern and control themselves. Notwithstanding I may be regarded as an old-fashioned Democrat, I announce here to-day my devotion to local self-government, State rights, State integrity, and the power of the people to govern themselves, and shall hold steadfastly to that faith.

Why, you may call the roll of Democrats for 100 years and of those who have not believed with the Democrats, and no one until recent years has desired to make this assault upon the doctrine of State rights, if you please to call it that, or the integrity of the various States of the Union.

They say we have the right to amend the Constitution, that this is only a referendum to the people of the States. It is true; we have the right to amend the Constitution, and we have the right to submit the amendment to the people of the various States of this Union.

We have the right when we deem it "necessary" under Article V of the Constitution to propose to the various States certain amendments, and we can propose that the amendment be passed upon by the legislatures of the States or by constitutional conventions. Or if the State shall desire to try the alternative remedy, they can, by vote of two-thirds of the States, come to Congress and ask this body to propose the amendment, and we have the right to propose it to the legislatures or to constitutional conventions.

So the time is not ripe, even if they were wise, in asking that this amendment be proposed to the States. In my representative capacity to-day I am not willing to say and recognize that there is any "necessity" that this amendment shall be proposed.

And, more than that, if it should happen to secure two-thirds, it would not be ratified by three-fourths of the States in 50 years. Yes, you say, you have a right to amend the Constitution, and yet when the Constitution was written and submitted to the convention at Philadelphia a provision was put in it "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate"; and yet these gentlemen would contend that, notwithstanding that was the unanimous contract and agreement, three-fourths of the States have the right to destroy that power which was preserved to the States when we entered into the contract. Could they do that, could they say to the sparsely settled State of Wyoming, by such an amendment, it shall have only 1 Senator, while the great State of New York shall have 5, and the greater State of Texas shall have 10, and Montana shall have but 1? Could you strike out by three-quarters of the States ratifying such an amendment that power and deprive the people of the respective States that inviolate right which was written into the Constitution?

So you will see where it leads. And yet in my own mind I have serious doubts whether as a matter of law or policy or wisdom we should ever attack any of these expressly reserved rights of the States without the unanimous consent of each one of them. I feel quite sure that if the substance of the Mondell or Hobson amendment had been proposed in a convention, or in any State convention which was called to ratify the Constitution as handed down from Philadelphia, not a single State in the Union would have acquiesced in the proposition.

Why, Mr. Speaker, as it was the States were slow about ratifying the Constitution. They halted until the voices of old Sam Adams and Gov. Hancock and those earlier patriots of Massachusetts said: We want certain amendments written into this Constitution in order that the powers and rights of the people of the States therein shall be preserved. Finally these amendments were proposed in pursuance of that suggestion, and were sent to the various States to be made a part of the Constitution. Finally the ninth State ratified the Constitution, with the understanding that the amendments were to come later, and so it happened that New Hampshire was the ninth State to act favorably and make the Constitution effective under the terms of the provisions of that instrument.

But the little State of Rhode Island remained out of the Union, notwithstanding these 10 amendments had been proposed and agreed upon until the election had occurred. Washington was elected, Congress had convened, the Cabinet was appointed, the executive offices had been organized, the first revenue act had been passed by this body and approved by Washington, *and still Rhode Island remained out because she did not believe these rights about which we are debating here to-day had been safeguarded in the Constitution.*

Then North Carolina, that great Democratic State, remained out. The governor and council of North Carolina exchanged felicitations and congratulations with President Washington, a separate governmental entity, and said they were not willing to go into the Union until these other rights about which we are debating to-day had been safeguarded by amendments. Finally the amendments were agreed upon and it was certain they would be ratified, and then North Carolina came into the Union.

Then, Mr. Speaker, why do men want to sneer at the question of State rights? Why do they hide behind the War between the States, from 1860 to 1865, and say that the doctrine of State rights was shot to death with cannon in that terrible conflict, when they know that there is more involved in this question than mere State rights? If it were not a constitutional question, if it were not a legal question, there is back of it a doctrine older than the Constitution and older than this Republic, *and that is the right of local self-government, the right of men to govern themselves in every State in this Union.* [Applause.]

Let me read from one of our great constitutional writers, a publicist who has contributed much to the constitutional literature of this country and other countries. His first great work was The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution, and later he has given to this country another great constitutional classic that should be read and studied by everyone who loves our system and form of government. This is a book entitled "The Origin and Growth of the American Constitution," and is written by Mr. Hannis Taylor, who resides in the city of Washington. I desire to quote brief excerpts from this wonderful work on constitutional history:

> In making the second Constitution the States reserved to themselves very jealously the right to regulate suffrage.

That was the Philadelphia Constitution.

> The National House of Representatives is based upon population, but when its Members are to be chosen the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If a State does not violate the rule of the fifteenth amendment as to race, color, or previous condition of servitude, it may vest the election of the most numerous branch of its legislature in a little oligarchy, qualified, if it so pleases, by very high property or other exacting qualifications. Manhood suffrage in this country rests upon no guaranty that the State may not at any time set it aside.

And so he traced the history of this question and cites the decisions of our courts and reviews the textbooks of law writers, and has stated in the plainest and simplest language the great doctrine that suffrage is a State matter. But he even makes it more luminous than that and shows that the ardent proponents of this measure have the very right now in every State of the Union for which they are contending under the terms of this amendment. He says:

> *Our political system as a whole rests upon the fundamental principle that the right to vote in a State comes from the State, which alone possesses the power to confer the franchise. Only from the fountain of State power can the right to vote for officials, State or Federal, be drawn.*

Who wants to destroy that fountain of State power, and why should it be destroyed? We have determined and settled those questions in the State of Texas to our entire satisfaction. We do not invoke the aid of any other State, nor do we need it, nor do we desire to thrust our notions upon the citizens of other States. He proceeds:

> At the time of the separation the entire electorate of the British Isles—which included, in 1909, 7,615,438 electors—did not exceed 400,000. Every American State was founded on the principle that it alone could confer the right to vote upon the few or the many as its sovereign will deemed best. To-day any American State can so amend its constitution as to provide that no man can vote until he attains his ninetieth year, or that no man can vote unless he is possessed of real property to the value of a million dollars, or it might provide that the right to vote shall be invested in women only.

And who doubts or controverts that proposition of constitutional law? To continue:

> Such a State constitution would not conflict with the National Constitution in any particular whatever. The only limitation imposed by the Constitution upon the sovereign power of the States to regulate the franchise is that contained in the fifteenth amendment, which provides that "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 race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Mr. Speaker, I propounded this query to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and asked him whether or not, when he was speaking of referendums, he was willing to submit a referendum to the various States to repeal the fifteenth amendment, which puts this limitation upon the rights of the States, and he said he would have to think about that for several days. After all the bloodshed, after all the fratricidal warfare had gone on and the fifteenth amendment was written into the Constitution and our people had walked through seas of blood, yet, from his standpoint, he would have to think about it for several days before he could determine whether he would be willing to trust the people on a proposition of that

kind. Mr. Speaker, I trust the people, and it is because of that trust in the people of my State that I am opposed to this amendment. I voted for the amendment authorizing the election of Senators by direct vote of the people because this gave the people of Texas the right and power to elect their United States Senators as they do their governor and State officials and their Representatives. [Applause.] Who would now take that right away from the people and bring it back here to the Federal Government? There are more things in this than gentlemen dream of. Marius and Cæsar, while claiming they were establishing a consolidated government at Rome, undermined and destroyed the liberties of the people; and Augustus, under the plea of serving the people, stole their liberties and rights from them. Let us take warning from these solemn lessons of history. Let us go back to the States. Let us retain this power as our fathers intended we should and settle these local and domestic concerns for ourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] said that I had contended here for depositing "public funds" in Southern States, in order to relieve the distress of the southern people on account of the paralyzed condition of the cotton industry. I did, but let me remind him that when our fathers sat in that convention at Philadelphia they wrote in express language a clause to this effect:

The Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin.

They went further than that and said that—

No State shall emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

Here the States surrendered that power more than 125 years ago, because they believed that the Federal Government should be endowed with the function of controlling the monetary affairs of this Republic. They believed this authority was the one to deal with it for the whole people, and in pursuance of that doctrine and that provision of the Constitution I called upon this body and the Senate to deposit "Government money," "United States funds," the "people's money," coined and issued under this expressed delegation of power in the financial agencies, the National and State banks of the South, in order that it might be available to relieve the distress of the southern people. And I asked nothing new. I did no violence to any provision of the Constitution. I was only invoking the right to preserve our people under the Constitution.

And, Mr. Speaker, while I believe that this body made a mistake, yet we of the South will survive, as we survived the disastrous consequences of the Civil War. We will find a way out of these difficulties. I then reminded my brethren of New England how we went to their rescue when a great fire swept over Salem, Mass. We were bounteous with the people's funds, and used them in their behalf. I said to my friends from the North in the course of my remarks, when the great earthquake shook San Francisco and the western half of this country, and a terrible fire swept over it, we from the South came to your rescue and voted the "people's money" and "Government funds" to relieve their distress. We sent succor, medicines, and aid to that people. When the great flood swept along the Ohio Valley and destroyed many a happy and humble home and brought distress to those people we sent this same money, coined under that provision of the Constitution and issued by this Government, to the banks at Dayton, Ohio, and placed it in their vaults in order that it might bring relief, aid, and comfort to your people. We were not beggars. We invoked only our rights. I am not persuaded that we made any mistake; and notwithstanding these discriminations we here to-day, standing under that flag as American citizens, claim the same right of exultation in its emblems and inspiration as our brothers from Massachusetts, Ohio, California, or any other State. May God in His wisdom and the patriotism of Americans preserve this Union and our proud heritage of State supremacy and State integrity as the corner stones of our liberties! [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE].

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would be unfaithful to the State and constituency which I represent if I failed to support this measure. I not only give it my approval on account of this sense of obligation, but my personal convictions upon it formed after 20 years of actual observation in the State of Colorado where I have long resided lead me to this conclusion. It is impossible in the brief time allowed me for debate to discuss this question in all its bearings. It is among the few great questions of the day that are uppermost in the public mind. No cause ever enjoyed such devoted and earnest adherents, and they have made their appeal to the conscience and intelligence of the Nation. The amendment speaks for itself. It is as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (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 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. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

The amendment raises no question affecting the control of the State over the franchise except the right of the State to disfranchise any citizen on account of sex. It leaves all other qualifications of the voter to be determined by the various States through their constitutional agencies. The State can impose any franchise test it may see fit, but it can not limit the franchise to its male citizens. Both sexes will be obliged to meet all requirements of citizenship imposed by the State, and each State can protect the exercise of the franchise to the fullest extent of its power.

We expect to hear in this discussion that this amendment violates the rights of the States, but there can be no violation of any State right when each State has recognized the right of three-fourths of the States to amend the National Constitution and make such amendment binding upon all the States.

To discuss the merits of the State-rights theory in the light of the experiences and judgment of the past 50 years is in every sense futile and unnecessary. The question was decided through the arbitrament of war, and that clear verdict will never be reversed except through constitutional methods.

We are further impelled to the support of this amendment by reason of the fact that it has behind it a public sentiment that is not confined to any particular section of the country, but is national in its scope and influence. If this measure were supported by only those States which now enjoy equal suffrage, there might be some reason to delay its consideration, but citizens of every State, either by themselves or through organizations, have petitioned Congress to give this amendment favorable consideration. The right of petition is guaranteed to our citizens by our organic law. Congress should recognize this right and give itself to the consideration of measures which have behind them unmistakable public sentiment.

No one questions the constitutionality of the amendment proposed, nor can there be any doubt as to the desire of many thousands of our people representing every section of the country to have it submitted.

I now desire to address myself briefly to some phases of the question which appeal to my judgment. As I see it there are two sources of opposition to equal suffrage. One comes from the selfishness of the male voter who does not desire his prerogative invaded, and the other comes from the privileged group which oppose any further extension of the franchise. We are quite sure that there are interests in this country who would gladly welcome a curtailment of the franchise rather than its extension. The power of this group is being menaced and threatened by every advance in popular government, and to introduce into the electorate another element that would contribute to this advancement would further threaten the power and influence of those who desire to make the Government in some sense subservient to their welfare. There will always be this assertion of supremacy on the part of individuals and groups in our country's affairs. There are those who honestly believe that the functions of government can be best administered by those who have secured for themselves a higher degree of intelligence, who have accumulated control of vast resources of industry and material production, and who from altruistic motives believe that they know what is best for the people. The contests of the future will largely follow the lines of past conflicts. It is quite natural, therefore, that the movement for equal suffrage should meet the opposition of those who desire governmental privilege.

It is a remarkable tribute to the life and vitality of the cause that the successes which it has already achieved have come from forces that might naturally be considered antagonistic. It is an augury of ultimate success that it has won in so many States and that the male voters in those States have surrendered whatever of prerogative they may have enjoyed in the exercise of suffrage in order that this right might be shared with the women of their respective States. The wonder is that there are so few defeats to register considering the character of the oppo-

sition encountered. No cause was ever so handicapped, and its victories justify the righteousness of its appeal.

We may well ask ourselves concerning the causes that have contributed to this success and what justification we have for hopes of continued progress. I believe that the great argument in favor of woman suffrage is that it is fundamentally right and is in accord with the principles of liberty and justice upon which this Government was established. Our Nation came into being in order to demonstrate the power of the individual citizen, and our entire governmental system lives, moves, and has its being in his will and character. The declaration that all men are created equal and have certain inalienable rights was the rallying cry of Revolutionary days. It meant relief from tyranny and oppression and a larger employment of individual powers in the affairs of government.

We have little information given us concerning the duties imposed upon the citizen in the early days of the Republic. The records of that time largely deal with the proceedings of our national legislature, and we have a very comprehensive supply of data concerning the discussions of our public men. It would be interesting to know to what extent the citizen entered into any participation of the franchise rights which he enjoyed. There is no question but that he was satisfied to leave the affairs of state to the protection and guidance of the men who had founded the Nation. We have no record of any contests before the people that in any way resemble the popular movements of our day. The fact that the President and Vice President were chosen by Congress would remove from the public mind a chief subject of discussion and controversy. Conditions of travel, the difficulty of communication, the lack of widely circulated newspapers, and the isolation of the various sections of the country contributed to this submergence of individual interest. In less than 100 years a wonderful change has taken place; the steamboat, the locomotive, the telegraph, the daily newspaper, and the growth of population all combine to produce a different type of citizen. He is now fully informed of events transpiring in the Nation and in the world. He is brought into association through the press with the views and opinions of citizens in all parts of the country.

The means of travel are so easy and agreeable that all sections of our country are made accessible and convenient. During the past quarter of a century there has been a great obliteration of sectional characteristics and the character of our population is becoming more complex by reason of constant and regular movements of our people from State to State. Our standards of living are affected by those of our neighbors. The newspaper, the magazine, the public library, and the lecture platform all minister to the information and intelligence of the voter. He has come to feel that he is a direct agent in the matter of Government and that he possesses all necessary power to mold and influence the activities of Government. He is not only jealous of this right, but he is conscious of his power to demand a strict performance of duty on the part of his representative. Such has been the evolution of the voter during the past century. With the abundant privileges he now enjoys would we be justified in asserting that he is any less a citizen, any less qualified to exercise the prerogatives of citizenship now than he was when the Constitution was adopted and the Nation came into being?

One of the stock arguments employed by the opponents of equal suffrage is that based upon the assertion that because women can not discharge all duties laid upon the male citizen she should not be given the ballot. The fathers of the Republic might have justly contended that, owing to certain unfavorable conditions already enumerated, it would be unwise to grant a general franchise to all male citizens and that only those who lived in the largely settled communities and cities should be given the right to vote. They would naturally be kept informed as to the affairs of Government, and having opportunity to hear public matters discussed and debated by men of station and influence they would naturally be in a position to render a more intelligent verdict than citizens not so situated. There are many reasons which could have been urged to justify giving the franchise to a portion of the population and rejecting others. There never was a day in the history of the Nation when the electorate could be said to be individually qualified to act up to the highest measure of citizenship. There is still much to be done through religion, education, and the operation of economic policies to improve the qualifications of the citizen. We are raising the standard constantly and as our national problems increase with our growth and development there is a louder call for a more intelligent and patriotic citizenship.

In the light of these facts, what justice is there in the denial of the franchise to woman? Is her measure of intelligence, her capacity for mental expansion, her patriotic devotion to her country, and her ability to understand the functions of citizenship less narrow and restricted than the male voter of our day? She fearlessly challenges a comparison of her qualifications on these lines. Would there be any lowering of the standards of citizenship in placing the ballot in her hands?

There is great temptation to engage in an extended recital of the achievements of woman in all lines of human endeavor in order to justify her right to the ballot. History provides a rich storehouse of information of woman's part in the governments of the world. From its earliest dawn to the clear day of twentieth-century progress woman has played an active part in controlling the affairs and destinies of nations. Statesmen of all nations have paid homage to her ability and power. Each successive period in the world's history has been marked by her achievements in art and literature. There is not a field of human endeavor in which she has not played her part, yet in our country, which emphasizes as supreme the right of the individual to control the Government, she is prevented from exercising this right merely because she is a woman.

Opponents of equal suffrage do not deny woman a place in the affairs of States and nations. They recognize her value in molding public opinion, in preserving the character and sacredness of the home, in guiding and developing childhood, and in administering philanthropic and humanitarian agencies. They further contend that any enlargement of her field of activity and usefulness would mean the neglect of duties that are paramount and essential. If this statement is founded upon fact, surely in States of our Union which have enjoyed equal suffrage for so many years there would be clear evidence of this fact, but the contrary is true. The women of our equal-suffrage States are more keenly alive to their duties in the matter of home protection, the guardianship of children, and the welfare of society than they were before the ballot was given them. Women feel that the State has committed to them certain peculiar responsibilities in the matter of humanitarian legislation and many of the reforms which have to do with the safeguarding of the home, and the elimination of social evils can be largely traced both directly and indirectly to their influence as voters.

The minds of men naturally work upon lines related to the virile and sterner forms of national activity. They are apt to overlook and give little heed to the demands of society for legislation that will affect the environment and life of the individual. The advocates of equal suffrage fully believe that the direct influence of woman will be exerted through the ballot to extend this field of governmental activity. We are not to lose sight of the fact that woman is just as capable as man to diagnose the ills of the body politic. Her moral faculties are just as strong, if not stronger, and in times of national emergency she could be counted upon to respond with the same devotion to the needs of her country as her male fellow citizen. Opponents of equal suffrage claim that the influence of the female voter in equal-suffrage States has not been evidenced by any marked decrease in crime or any marked improvement in social conditions. Statistics do not bear out this assertion. We know that the greatest advancement in popular government and in the development of humane legislation has been made in equal-suffrage States. It is not fair to expect that the introduction of woman to an active participation in the functions of citizenship would make an immediate or radical change in the character of legislation. It is a singular fact that the equal-suffrage States are largely those among the last to be admitted to the Union. These States have had serious and important problems of local development to solve. They have been working out their own future with limited resources of revenue, and it is worthy of remark that, notwithstanding these new conditions and important problems, the States have attempted to solve problems of a sociological character through the medium of legislation. The fact that the equal-suffrage States have marched steadily forward along all lines of material and social advancement is a proof positive that woman is as fully qualified as man to use and enjoy the right of suffrage. If there has been progress and social uplift in States where equal suffrage prevails to even a moderate extent, considering the brief time that woman has had the ballot, surely we may expect a larger degree of progress and advancement as she becomes more qualified to exercise her right.

We should give the ballot to woman because it will add to rather than detract from her usefulness to society and the Nation. Neither the State nor the Nation has taken any step to relieve her from the pressure of industrial life. We not only expect her to fulfill all the obligations that rest upon her by reason of her sex, but we compel her to endure the strain and stress of mental and physical competition with the other sex in order to support herself and those who are dependent upon her.

If the Nation is not willing to provide for her release from this burden, she should at least be given the franchise in order that she may use it, as far as possible, as a means to alleviate and remove oppressive conditions of toil and environment. The social requirements of our time, the changing standards of living, and the instability of economic conditions are all contributing to the weakening of the home and the breaking up of family life. The social life of our great cities may well give us pause as we think of its effect upon the rising generation, and thoughtful men and women may well concern themselves in considering what type of citizen is to be the product of our present American city population. The vulgarity of wealth, as expressed in so much that is unseemly and unnatural, menaces the character of our citizenship. We have made such remarkable progress in the acquirement of wealth that we are losing out of life the beneficent effect of toil and effort, and there is a loss of what some one has aptly called the true American spirit. In these days when the foundations of other nations are being undermined should we not all the more give ourselves to the work of strengthening anew the basic principles of our national character? To this work we must not only summon the strong and earnest men of the Nation, but the loyal and consecrated women as well. There can be no segregation of effort; it must be mutual and sympathetic. From this unity of thought and purpose there will be such an outflow of influence and energy that our citizenship will be made strong and courageous and the future glory of our Nation assured. [Applause.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, before most of these fair women who grace the galleries around us to-day were out of pinafores, and while they were yet thinking of their dolls rather than of the boys, I was a believer in and an advocate of equal suffrage.

When yet in my teens my study of government led me to the conviction that man's rights and woman's rights are coequal; that one has no right which the other does not equally have.

Mr. Speaker, rights are not bestowed; they inhere; they exist in the nature of things. They may be denied or held in abeyance but they never cease to exist; and woman has always had the right to vote. She has it now. But thus far the society of which she forms a part has failed generally to recognize this right and to admit its exercise.

It has been said on this floor to-day that suffrage is a privilege. I deny this. I assert that suffrage is an inherent and an indefeasible right. It is the citizen's weapon of defense in a society which has exchanged the rifle for the ballot. And woman has the same inherent right to self-defense that man possesses.

But while I believe and have always believed in woman's equal right to the suffrage, I do not believe nor have I ever believed that recognition of this right should come from the Federal Government. It ought to come from the same source that has accorded recognition to man's right. When my wife shall secure the elective franchise I desire that she shall do so on the same terms that it came to me.

However, Mr. Speaker, this might not be worth quarreling about if it were merely a question of whence the recognition should come. The main point is that the recognition is due. And my prime objection to the proposal now before us is that it is another step away from that idea of local self-government which lies at the base of our free institutions. Not long ago I stood on the floor of this House in protest against another proposal to remove government a little farther away from the people and to concentrate it here in Washington. I hope never to see the day—I hope the day may never come—when we shall have a Little Father in the White House as Russia has had a Little Father in St. Petersburg. Yet all the tendencies are in this direction to-day. There is a steady concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government. Its activities are being enormously widened; its powers enormously increased; its grip upon the daily life of the people enormously strengthened. For one I am unwilling that this tendency should be still further stimulated by the adoption of the pending proposal.

Mr. Speaker, while I am an advocate of equal suffrage, and while I believe with all my heart that woman's rights are no whit less than those of man, I am still just a bit doubtful whether this issue would ever present itself in a social state where a really normal life were possible. It seems to me that this issue is pressing to-day only because of an economic pressure of which this is a vague expression. Women within the last 30 or 40 years have been forced by this inexorable pressure out of the home into the mill and the factory, away from the fireside into the struggle for employment, out of the realm in which they had reigned as queens into the marts of trade. I can not think that woman has deliberately forsaken her natural sphere. She is in the hard competition which this generation is witnessing not of her own volition; not because she would rather battle for wages than rock the cradle; not because she has changed her instincts and taken on impulses foreign to her sex, but because the natural breadwinner has failed; because she is compelled to enter the struggle in order to live; because the normal life is denied to her, as it is to the young man who would be a suitor for her hand if he, too, were not caught in the vortex which sweeps them apart.

I have not the time, Mr. Speaker, to enter at length into this phase of the question. But we can not intelligently consider the matter of suffrage if we do not take into account the economic factors involved. That suffrage could ever become a really burning issue in a country where equality of opportunity obtained I do not believe. It is only in a society where opportunity has been monopolized and where competition for jobs is so keen and remorseless that wages sink to the point where they afford but a bare subsistence that we find woman clamoring for the ballot. She clamors for it because she really needs it. She needs it in the same way and to the same degree that the man needs it; she needs it for offense and defense; she needs it in the awful struggle into which she finds herself irresistibly drawn; she needs it in fighting back the wolf from the door; she needs it in her effort to beat back the forces forever assaulting her at her toil and at every turn in her narrowed and narrowing life. She may fancy that with it her problem will be solved. But why has not the ballot solved the problem which equally confronts the man? How has it come that the ballot has done so little for the lord of creation who finds himself condemned to involuntary poverty in the very midst of advancing wealth?

Under normal economic conditions—under conditions where self-employment were possible—it seems to me that in the division of labor the man would naturally assume the responsibilities of looking after such outside affairs as the business of government while the woman was devoting herself to the inside affairs of the household. There could be nothing said in derogation of her right to look after outside affairs if she choose. She might cut down trees, plow and plant fields, paint houses, lay brick, run locomotives, drive cattle, mine coal, man furnaces, do anything and everything she pleased to do. That would be her concern, not that of man. But in a normal society would she want to do these things? Would not all her natural instincts and impulses operate to keep her out of the rough and tumble of these unwomanly employments? Would not these instincts and impulses operate to keep her very near the fireside and about the functions which her nature imposes? Can anyone believe that woman deliberately gives up these instincts and impulses because she prefers the desperate struggle involved in the battle for bread?

But all this is neither here nor there in the present discussion, except as it is suggested by the hopes which obviously lie back of the demand of women for the ballot. They would not be clamoring for this recognition if they did not believe that with the ballot they would be able to ameliorate the conditions which press more and more heavily upon them. These conditions are economic. They are not political. They are not social. They are not moral. They are the very same conditions which press more and more heavily upon men. And we do not have to employ magnifying glasses to see that the ballot has not greatly helped man thus far in dealing with those conditions. With the ballot he has achieved religious freedom. With it he has achieved political freedom. But with it he has yet to achieve industrial freedom. And when with the ballot he shall have scored this achievement also, is it at all certain that any necessity will remain for putting the ballot in the hands of his wife and daughter? May he not in this last conquest in the fight for freedom so emancipate his helpmeet that she will no longer feel that she is being cheated of a divine right?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this rule, and I shall vote against this resolution. I believe that woman's suffrage is a question that should be considered and settled State by State, and I also believe that in any State in which the women of that State desire the ballot it ought to be given to them. I say this, if the women of the State of Georgia should desire the ballot, they should have my vote, but, sirs, there are questions and conditions in certain of the States in this Union that should be given a most careful consideration, not only by this great body but by the women throughout the broad limits of this land. I do not believe one State should force upon another State a law which would be detrimental to the happiness, to the peace, and to the prosperity of that State, but I believe that in the event this resolution were adopted by this House and approved by three-fourths or the

States of this Union it would create a condition of affairs in the Southland that would destroy the happiness, peace, and prosperity of that section.

In any State where the majority of white women desire the ballot, in my opinion, the voters of that State will cast their votes for woman's suffrage. In any and every State where woman is opposed to woman's suffrage, I believe that State will and should refuse to adopt it.

Georgia has not, and should not have, the right, and God grant she may never have the power, to force upon Wyoming a measure which would disrupt her socially, politically, and morally. What Georgia should not inflict upon Wyoming, Wyoming should not inflict upon Georgia. Let Wyoming manage her own internal affairs, which she understands. Give Georgia the same right.

I trust and believe this great, thoughtful, just, and patriotic body will acknowledge this right of the States by refusing to pass this resolution.

In the name of the women I oppose this resolution, and in this declaration I bespeak the voice of the women of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWDLE]. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWDLE. Mr. Speaker, I approach this subject with some trepidation and emotion. My lovely, loyal wife, who charitably puts up with much in me, believes in suffrage for women, and a beautiful, devoted sister, living in Canton, Ohio, believes in it. My sister has asked me to content myself with voting my views merely. My wife would not have me oppose the movement, but has made no request of me as to speaking. All this, Mr. Speaker, troubles me. I would gladly say nothing; but I have obligated myself to a large number of ladies, and I can not without stultification retreat. The plight in which I find myself requires that I speak circumspectly—that I weigh my words—for I do not care to wound the feelings of those women with whom my lot has been so happily cast by the Lord's providence and my own good judgment. [Laughter.] I have therefore carefully reduced my argument to notes. My own trepidation is also augmented some by the fact that some years ago, when this question commenced to be discussed, I found myself for a brief period favoring it. Since then I have given it careful consideration.

In the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union we consider everything but the state of the Union. I do not mean its state as regards its importations of catgut or whether our gelatin or tallow industries are paying dividends—things usually considered by that committee. I mean the moral condition of the people of the Union. These things are rarely considered by Congress.

That man brave enough to face the facts of our national life knows that all is not—yet—well with the Union. Many things in our social-national life touch with somberness the philosophy of the epoch. Things are not exactly what the fathers promised. Some men are fearful. They see many statesmen lulled or threatened into quietness. Positions are often taken with reference to their vote-getting influence. Fear about second terms often makes legislators forget their duty in the first. The moral outlook in this Nation is engaging the attention of many thoughtful men. And the Democratic Party is expected to correct in a year the work of a half century.

Our whole Nation stands in great need of resolving itself into a committee of the whole house on the state of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice the position of an unnumbered multitude of good women of America relative to the suffrage movement. A multitude of women whose voices are not heard in the streets; who do not seek the rostrum of political debate; who, though life is not exactly what some of them would have, do not defame their husbands and brothers because they have been unable to declare the kingdom of heaven to be at hand; women who are not ashamed of their sex lot, though it disqualifies them from many functions allowed to men. These I represent. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that the interest of women in the affairs of state has grown greatly and that they now ponder deeply matters political. I have not believed the claim. But since coming to Washington I have secured some data upon this subject—and Washington is certainly a most intelligent city, quite aside from its congressional population. [Laughter.]

It must be evident that the best evidence of a person's interest in a subject is his reading. I determined accordingly to make a series of observations in the street cars of Washington, at an hour when a goodly number are usually coming down town to work or shop. I selected the Mount Pleasant car, coming in over Connecticut Avenue, a line which at its outer end picks up an intelligent middle class, with a few Congressmen without fortune, and which later picks up the wealthier Senators who live in the expensive apartments bearing signs "Servants and tradesmen to the rear." [Laughter and applause.] This miscellaneous collection of intelligence becomes complete at Connecticut Avenue and R Street [laughter], and there I always took the count. My plan was to then count the number of adults in the car, the number of men, and the number of women, and then to count those who were either reading or carrying newspapers. The results of my observations were surprising. A table follows:

Date.	Men.	Women.	Men reading.	Women reading.
May 20	17	15	12	None.
May 21	19	8	8	None.
May 22	8	6	3	None.
May 23	14	16	8	None.
May 24	19	18	11	1
May 25	16	18	10	None.
May 26	6	14	1	None.
May 27	17	4	2	None.
Total	116	99	55	1

This is a striking score: Fifty-five to one in favor of the old man as a newspaper reader—almost a shut-out. [Laughter.] Of 99 women, 1 was reading. This does not testify to a magnificent interest in the world's affairs.

But I was not content with this. I accordingly determined to test this matter among a more cosmopolitan crowd. I observed a bright Jewish newsboy at Pennsylvania Avenue and Fourteenth Street, where all classes ebb and flow. I asked this boy to bring to my office at the end of the week a report showing the number of papers sold, morning and evening, with the number sold to women of the total sales. The report of this little merchant follows:

Date.	Sold to women.	Sold to men.
May 26	11	366
May 27	9	350
May 28	12	372
May 29	11	301
May 31	13	271
June 2	9	352
June 3	6	332
Total	71	2,344

These papers were sold from 3.30 to 6 o'clock in the evening. The score stands 2,344 to 71, or 33 to 1, in favor of the old man as a reader of the evening paper in a crowd streaming by in which the sexes were pretty evenly divided.

Now, on those same days Isaac sold papers between 6.30 and 9 in the morning, and here is his report:

Sold to women: 6, 8, 6, 7, 11, 10, 11; total, 59.

Sold to men: 67, 72, 71, 76, 71, 68, 71; total, 496.

The score stands 59 to 496, or 9 to 1, in favor of the old man in the matter of newspaper reading in the morning among the men and women of the class which makes no pretensions, does a lot of hard work, and has little to show for it at the end of the year. Let me summarize the conclusions to be drawn from these tables and state the sex ratio of readers in simple terms for ready recollection.

1. As an evening-paper buyer in this capital, women buy 1 paper to 33 bought by men.

2. As a morning-paper buyer, the score stands 9 to 1 in favor of the fellow whose intelligence in managing the State needs feminine aid.

3. As a morning street car newspaper reader, the readers among men are 1 to 2. But among women the ratio of readers in the morning cars is 1 who reads to 99 who do not read.

4. A strong boy could print all the daily papers required by the intelligent ladies of Washington.

It is thus evident that women generally are not interested in politics—for which the saints be forever praised—for I do not like to think of the day when papa's purse will be called upon to contribute to two opposing wigwams. One is a plenty. [Laughter.]

Should it be said that eight days' observation of a sex's reading habits is not enough to justify a conclusion, I simply reply in the language of De Quincey, I think, "One need not drink a flagon of wine to sample a cask," and I think a single day's observation would determine the herbivorous habits of sheep.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the women of this smart Capital are beautiful; indeed, their beauty is positively disturbing to business,

but they are not interested in affairs of state; they are not interested in politics; and, so far as I can judge, they are getting their information on these subjects from the source commended by Saint Paul, for which I do heartily commend them. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio will suspend for a few moments. The Chair has warned the gallery three or four times during the day that they must not show symptoms of applause or dissent. Now, if there is any more disturbance in the galleries, they will be cleared. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWDLE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the old man in America is going to have an inning. [Laughter and applause.] This is the last effort of that forgotten institution to save his pants. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, a great many men do not comprehend the significance of the antisuffrage movement among women. They can not understand why women who do not want to vote should impede women who do want to vote. Just a word or two of explanation:

Giving the franchise involves a change of status on all who receive it, whether they exercise it or not. The women who do not vote will infallibly experience a change of status. Let us see:

To be an elector implies certain things. Electorship, which is simply the power to determine the nature of the civil state, carries with it, or must sooner or later carry with it, the power of administering all affairs of state, including the administering of justice. It must be clear to the Members of this House that the power to determine the legal nature of the state must imply the power to assume and administer any office in the gift of the State. It would be a disturbing thing to have electors with power to erect institutions which they could not administer.

Necessarily, therefore, this proposed extension of the franchise involves finally a movement which will subject all human rights to feminine decision; and the women of America who are opposing this movement are opposed to this change of their status. Those women have a vested interest in this question. They ask the men of this Nation not to foreclose that interest without a vote from them. The antisuffragists are the Jeffersonian Democrats on this question. And this is precisely what those women will not get if the suffragists have their way.

With banners unfurled bearing the proud device "The emancipation of women," they decline to allow those to vote on the question who, they say, are to be the beneficiaries of the movement. [Applause.]

The fact is the movement is the most undemocratic movement ever commenced in the history of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to hear the opening address in what turned out to be Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for a third term. As a member of the constitutional convention of Ohio, sitting at Columbus, I heard it. It was very interesting to hear him take precisely this ground on the suffrage question—that is, he wanted it submitted to women democratically.

But later in Chicago he met Miss Addams—just before the convention—and he saw a great light.

Who knows, maybe we shall live to see a "Mrs." at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue as President of the United States. Who knows, a "Mr." may hook up and unhook the gowns of the Nation's Chief. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Speaker, one thing I do know: There will be no change while the world lasts to the little phrase "The man behind the gun." [Applause.] Should the Prince of Peace defer His glorious promised advent for a thousand years the intelligence behind the gun will be masculine and the ragged corpse in the ditches of this world's wars will be a masculine corpse. There he is, Mr. Speaker, the masculine man who has carried the ensign of liberty from Thermopylæ to Yorktown, staggering slowly on toward a rational ideal which would lend some meaning to human life and history. [Applause.]

Oh, yes; I know women have played a great and noble part in this world's history; but it is a notable fact that this noble part was played without the ballot and some time before the movement came which last year destroyed $5,000,000 of London property created by men. The women who played that noble part did not have to be watched by the Scotland Yard detective force; they did not leave bombs in St. Pauls; they did not burn the Edinburgh collection of scientific marine instruments, working an irreparable loss to science created by men only, and which marks streets and lanes in the high seas. No, Mr. Speaker, the women whose names grace the page of history admired men and bowed to the scientific and political genius which he has slowly evolved and ever used to make of this planet a place of residence for wholesome life. [Applause.]

I was saying a moment ago that the women who are opposed to suffrage oppose it because of the necessary change of status that will ensue to them. It ought to be apparent to any man that the power to create institutions implies the power to manage them. Now, women do not wish their rights to be passed upon by women. Women uniformly prefer men judges and men jurors. What woman in a criminal case would take a woman jury? They know the leniency of men. What leading suffragette in a breach-of-promise case would ask for a woman jury? Why, men are almost silly in their kindness to women who come before them for justice.

Why, such is that kindness that the records of this country for the past two years will show that women charged with murder in the first degree have gone scot-free in numerous cases in which men have been hanged. So general is this spirit of consideration that the criminal laws are almost suspended in our large cities in cases involving women when any sort of a defense is made.

If there is anything on the bargain counter of justice which women are denied, I should like to have the article pointed out. Speaking from an experience of 22 years at the bar, I would not undertake a civil case against a woman for a man unless the case rested on documentary evidence. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the functions of women are of a character that disqualifies them from acting as jurors or judges. If I were to defend a man on a capital charge and a woman were to offer herself as a juror, there are some very intimate questions that I should insist on putting to her. And that man or woman does not live who would submit his or her personal or property rights to a judge or juror who was with child. Her condition at such a time rendered her peculiarly sacred under Roman law and under our law.

It is this great distinctive function which is at the basis of that consideration which men instinctively show to women in so many ways, even to the point of suspending the criminal laws in their favor.

There are a thousand duties to which you can not summon women who are rearing children. And every vigorous woman, even though unmarried, may be invited into that legal relation which brings those powers into play.

Man's powers in this particular do not summon him from those external duties on which the State is founded. Is he a young man serving the State, his marriage will simply strengthen his relations with his job, for he will need his salary twice as much as formerly, for he must needs support two, and presently three, and shortly four.

If he is a young man, unmarried, serving his employer, his marriage will stimulate his loyalty to that employer, for he needs him twice as much as formerly. The young woman at marriage leaves her employer, and rightly. She has other duties. This fact, by the way, is one of the chief causes of lower wages to women than to men for like work. The man's service is regarded as the more permanent. It is less subject to termination by natural events or the illness that attends women's functions. While I have no sort of sympathy with low wages for anybody, yet this difference in wage is based upon a natural instinct which must be reckoned with. The man starts the family. He brings that together which gives the family its start—the food, the clothing, the shelter—and he represents the necessary sex initiative which sustains the life of the family. He is the positive agent. He must deliberately do. He must desire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWDLE. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has promised to yield me some time.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BOWDLE. I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield the gentleman seven minutes. [Cries of "Give it to him!"]

The SPEAKER. The Chair was mistaken. The timekeeper says the gentleman is still entitled to 5 minutes more under the grant. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOWDLE. Women have a great function. Her functions are not man's functions. Men and women are different. They are different in every atom. Right here is where women set up a grouch. Many women resent the limitations of sex. But why quarrel with God, when he has the final word? I might as well weep because I can not gestate a child.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we instinctively give more to a young man than to a young woman because we recognize him as the prime mover in the creation of life and the family. Some men object to that word "instinct" as unworthily applied to the human, but no student of the operations of the human mind on this floor will object to it. Falstaff had it right:

Instinct is a great matter.

I observed a suffragette a few evenings ago tipping a waitress, who had served her and a friend a meal, and I saw that she gave her less than half what she had given a waiter the evening before. I quickly—and she thought rudely—called her attention to this fact as an exemplification of instinct working out unconsciously in human conduct. The instinct and its meaning proved quite shocking to her. [Laughter.]

This family idea, this life idea, is far more ruling in matters of conduct than we suppose. Mankind, like all created things, instinctively looks toward life and toward its preservation. We bravely deny any identity with lower animals. We proudly deny this identity though the form of every cell and muscle and nerve and organ identify us with all life. I admit this identity, though I devoutly believe in man's divine mission and destiny. The heroism of the men in sacrificing themselves on the decks of the *Titanic* by placing all the suffragettes in the boats was, indeed, heroism. It was the instinct heroic. But how few will see the same instinct heroically working in a disturbed ant colony, when, getting down on our knees, we see powerful ants, utterly careless of self, straining every nerve and muscle to rescue the eggs and carry them away from some titanic disaster, yet Lubbock and Farel and McCook point this out to us. It is the office of true science to humble us. [Applause.]

This world is not just what each of us would have it. But, Mr. Speaker, blessed is that man who recognizes facts cheerfully. Were I given the remaking of this world, I do not know just what I should do. Ingersoll said he would make it not rain so hard in the sea; but, coming from Ohio, where we have had terrible floods, I should make it not rain so hard on the land. Of course, the suffragists would recommend some changes. One said to me that she would make papa bear the children. And this, Mr. Speaker, only bears out the claim that this movement, like the whole modern feminine movement, is a simple expression of sex resentment. Only the other day some sociological person examined the roster of a certain women's club in a western city, and out of 72 women members, all married and able, not a child had been born within the year.

I would respectfully suggest to the patriotic ladies that when next they meet, instead of denouncing the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. LEVY] because of the condition of the back gate of Monticello, they resolve on an investigation of this race-suicide question; that they give some attention to the feminine clothing question and the millinery question.

These ladies should also examine into the menace to our Nation found in the fact that within 10 years a multitude of American women, with great fortunes gathered by American men, have laid them, to the extent of hundreds of millions, at the feet of foreign lords and dukes, while American workmen stand by and see their strength and genius go abroad to add to the ease of foreign parasites. American men have not done so. American men of wealth have married American women. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, our civilization in form favors the family more than is generally supposed. The vote is really by families. Unmarried men vote, of course, but each is the potential creator of a family; each is the potential creator of life. Marriage is the institution out of which we have all come. The State grew out of it. We must sustain it or perish. The most somber sign of modern times—the sign which gives the most concern—is the assault upon the family by increasing divorce. It is proposed that a further assault shall be made upon it by introducing two political heads, by subjecting its purse to the drain of supporting two antagonistic parties. Will the family survive the attacks being made upon it? Well, I think so. Hegelian philosophy, which I accept, makes me think so, but the present strain upon it is immense.

To the State man is primarily responsible. He must serve it, protect it, and die for it. The State holds him primarily responsible for these duties and a thousand others. He pays the rent when he lives with her and the alimony when he does not. He goes to jail when he fails. Is it allowing him any peculiar privilege to manage the institution wherein that responsibility is to be discharged? The dollar is earned in the State, not in the home. Shall he who is charged with the duty of bringing it home have the State managed by the one who receives it? [Applause.]

Mr. Spencer states the case admirably:

Are the political rights of women the same as those of men? The assumption that they are the same is widely made. Along with that identity of rights above set forth as arising from the human nature common to the two sexes there is supposed to go an identity of rights in respect to the direction of public affairs. At first sight it seems that the two properly go together, but consideration shows that this is not so. Citizenship does not include only the giving of votes, joined now and again with the fulfillment of representative functions. It includes also certain serious responsibilities. But if so, there can not be equality of citizenship unless along with the share of good there goes the share of evil. To call that equality of citizenship under which some have their powers gratis while others pay for their powers by undertaking risks is absurd. Now men, whatever political powers they may in any case possess, are at the same time severally liable to the loss of liberty, to the privation, and occasionally to the death consequent on having to defend the country; and if women, along with the same political powers, have not the same liabilities, their position is not one of equality but one of supremacy. Unless, therefore, women furnish contingents to the Army and Navy such as men furnish, it is manifest that, ethically considered, the question of the equal political rights, so-called, of women can not be entertained until there is reached a condition of permanent peace. Then only will it be possible (whether desirable or not) to make the political positions of men and women the same.

Edmund Burke used to say that every law of the British Empire had for its ultimate object the getting of twelve honest men in the jury box. I think he overstated it; for there is something that precedes even the administration of justice—it is marriage. The ultimate object of every law of every civilized country is to get one man in love with one woman. Unless that is the object the Nation must come to an end. Mr. Speaker, a civilization can not be erected that favors celibacy. If it could, the arrangement would be quite temporary. There might be some justice in giving unmarried women the ballot; but every unmarried woman is ready to marry, and she should sacrifice something—if it be a sacrifice—to that institution which all the world hopes she will finally enter. It is best for the unmarried that our laws should favor the married. The unmarried need no special laws. And the unmarried know this, and hence unmarried suffragettes claim that their special value at the polls and in legislative halls will be to reduce infant mortality. They need not concern themselves. The married will care for the children of this world. Should suffrage become a fact, the old man will parade the floor as usual in his nightshirt. [Applause.]

All history, Mr. Speaker, is nothing but the record of an affair with a woman. Happy is that man whose affair is honorable.

I saw smoke curling up from a cottage chimney in a mountain glen. I followed it and entered the house; it was an affair with a woman. I looked into the dimpled face of a babe; it told of an affair with a woman. I saw a myriad of black-grimed men emerge from the mine's mouth with lamps and dinner pails, and they smiled and went each his way, and I wondered why they worked amid such dangers; but I followed and found it was an affair with a woman. I was in the cab of an express locomotive hurling us through darkness toward the city. I wondered at his willingness to endure the dangers, as block signals and switches and cars shot by, but I saw his face for a moment by the steam-gauge light, and he smiled as we approached the division end; and I knew it was simply an affair with a woman. I was with the inventor in an upper room at night, where he had slaved for years on the turbine principle, and I marveled at his constancy; but he showed me her picture, and, Mr. Speaker, it was an affair with a woman. And the words of Swedenborg came to me, "Though men know it not, love is the life of this world." [Great applause.]

Women; have they a mission? Yes; it is to rule in the world of love and affection—in the home. It is not to rule in the State. They have a function to perform which precludes the latter sort of rule. Man is king of this universe; woman is queen. The queen rules when the king is dead, or becomes a mollycoddle, and the American man is not that yet. [Applause.]

The great need of America to-day is more marriage; but many men are afraid to attempt to support the modern woman; and this suffrage question is making women less attractive to men.

Yes; the need is more marriage. America needs a new baptism of the old-time masculinity, and the baptism should be by immersion. We need the old type of feminine woman.

I know that marriage is by the economic condition unduly postponed or prevented altogether, and I deplore this; but I have never yet heard that the way to treat a disease was to make it worse.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of our Government are immense. Yes, they are immense and at times seem baffling. I would solve them as far as they can be solved by statute. I would not add to them. We have among us as an immense problem, staring at us at every corner, a vast mass of undigested foreign citizens, who, by loose immigration laws, have come here and, by looser naturalization laws, soon become voters. I do not for one moment begrudge them residence here—those who have come—but I do ask the patriotic American men of this Nation whether they desire to increase our national problems by inviting the wives and sisters of these men to the ballot box—and these persons are plentifully supplied in this particular. In

the proper immigrant I believe, but in limited and digestible quantities.

Mr. Speaker, many things are to be changed by feminine suffrage. One of them is the "double standard," so called. Mrs. Pankhurst, lately in this city, assured us that this change is the first thing upon the suffrage program. I should like to have her exhibit to me the statute she would pass on this subject. Its wording would be interesting. But pray—and let us be frank—who is it that treats fallen women most harshly? Is it not woman herself? Her bill would have to be entitled "An act to reform women's views of women." And who is it that treats a delinquent man with the most consideration? Is it not women?

What would Mrs. Pankhurst do with him? Let this famous lady try to put some legislative stigma upon him (say on his forehead), and the first persons to protest would be the young man's mother and sisters.

I deplore the immoralities of this age. I know how the energies of thousands of young men are dissipated. I would to God that every young man knew the true dignity of pure manhood. I would that every young man had written over the lintels of his heart the seventh chapter of Proverbs as my mother bade me write it. But this thing is unreachable by law. Self-restraint is not begotten by statute.

And we all weep too much over prostitutes. Reform for them is easy. Any one of them in any American city, desiring to reform, can wash the paint off, clean up, go to the next town, and get honest housework. Laziness and vanity are largely responsibile for their chosen vocation. We are too lugubrious anyhow over evil people, lazy people, and criminals generally. Our stamina seems to be breaking down in this matter. It would be better were we sadder over the plight of some honest people. My sympathies are with the hard working and honest.

Word has gone forth that nothing unflattering shall be said of women. But if women want to jump into politics they must not be astonished to have their pedestals jarred by an occasional truth. "Hold onto your halo, when you enter politics," is a good motto. Women surely can not burn property and assault and insult State ministers without hearing something about themselves.

Having declared man to be a tyrant, they must not get embarrassed when sternly asked to name the day and date when he became so, for our mothers did not regard him so.

Of course women can no more guarantee the millennium than can men. Every woman in Colorado has had the ballot for 18 years, yet prostitution is as common in Denver as in any other American city. Wonderful things are to occur under suffrage, yet only the other night I read again Judge Lindsey's book, the Beast in the Jungle, and to my surprise the beast was the same old beast of special privilege in Denver, and the jungle was in Denver.

No; we can not have the millennium by law, and women will learn this, as men have been compelled to learn it. If we could, this Nation would long since have been the scene of millennial glory surpassing anything dreamed of by the prophets of Israel, for we certainly have the laws.

We are so far from the millennium that some of our sects look for the second advent as our only hope. The fact is, with all the light we have had, especially in this Nation, we should have developed a multitude of Christs in these centuries. We should not have to be asking the badly treated one to come back. One thing is certain, our civilization is so complex that it is going to take vastly more fidelity to ideals, vastly more virtue and honor, to manage it in the future than in the past. A multitude of Christly characters must be produced to guide this Nation.

I personally have no fear of what suffrage will do if it comes. But I deny its claims. My wife will vote with me or she will not. If she votes with me, her vote is unnecessary. If she intends voting against me, then it is not necessary for either of us to vote. We can hang out a sign "Occupants of this house are paired."

I know quite well that wives will quite uniformly vote with their husbands. Even those receiving alimony will vote with the recreant husband and rally around the pay check.

They say that "man-made" laws are not just to them. When did woman acquire a well-being separate from man's well-being? When did this race become divided? When the well-being of man is cared for the well-being of woman is assured. Give a young man money and his first expenditure is often in the interests of some woman. The first evidence that dad is getting on is usually seen on mamma's back. Help a man and you have helped a woman. As for man-made laws, I will compare Ohio's laws with the laws of any suffrage State on earth and prove their equality in point of progressive justice.

They say that in some States a man is still able to will away even his children and may confiscate his wife's wages. Mr. Speaker, I have had a long experience at the bar, and I have patiently read the legal journals, but I have never heard of an American man asserting such rights, if he ever had them. I know that in all probate and orphans' courts where I have ever practiced the tenderest consideration has ever been shown for the rights of wives, mothers, and widows. And as for wages, the vast mass of American workingmen turn over their pay envelopes to their wives, keeping only enough for a little chewing or smoking tobacco. The nations of the world agree that the finest and most generous man on earth in his treatment of women is the American man, the suffrage leaders to the contrary notwithstanding. They say that the present situation is taxation without representation. The fact is that 99 per cent of the women of wealth received the same either by gift or inheritance from some "tyrannical" dead man, who labored hard to make it. Men create the property wealth of this world, and it is proper that they should.

Mr. Speaker, there is in America to-day a forgotten institution known as the "old man." I know him, you know him. Our mothers knew him and honored him, and he honored them. But he is now forgotten and often derided. Suffragists insult him. I looked upon his frozen features as he conquered the Antarctic Zone, while women burned up five millions of his property at home, made by him with back-breaking labor. I have seen his face in the deadly saffron flames of molten metal, where a mismovement meant death. I have been with him in the bowels of steamers and have seen him wipe the scalding sweat from his face as he fed hellish furnaces. I have been with him working on great engines, in work taxing nerves and strength, where a mistake of a thousandth of an inch meant ruin. I have been with him in the grease and slime of repairs to great engineering apparatus. I have gotten up with him in the frosty darkness of the morning to go to the great shops of the cities, while leisure America slept. I have eaten with him his spare breakfasts. I have been with multitudes of him around the forges of the world at noon dining from buckets, yet always cheerful. I have seen him pinned beneath locomotives, with his flesh frying on his bones and his hand still gripping the throttle, when his last question was as to the passengers and his last message was to a woman. I have gone in imagination 5,000 feet into the sea and visited the *Titanic* wreck and have seen 500 of him, cold in death, still in the shaft alleys, engine and boiler rooms, and each dead at his post; and a thousand more I saw, all men, who had nobly offered their lives that women might live. I have seen multitudes of him in the lagoons and morasses of virgin countries, shaking with malaria, yet pushing forward the frontiers of life that more life might safely live upon this planet.

I have visited the trenches of battle fields populous with his ragged corps, unmurmuringly dying for his country. I have seen him strapped upon the plank of the guillotine and stand upon the scaffold "with head bloody but unbowed" offering his life as a witness to his principles. I have seen him upon the calvaries of this world drinking the vinegar of temporary defeat. I have seen him labor with his philosophies, without hope of gain, that men might be happier here and—

better know their end, and the number of their days, and be led to incline their hearts unto wisdom—

And I have seen him work in music, and laboriously chisel in all arts that he might better teach his fellows the divine destiny of the race. Yes; I have seen all this, and you have seen it, Mr. Speaker, and it has convinced me long since of man's divine origin and destiny. Despite the buffetings of sin, the angel in him has overcome the Jacob in him at Jabbok, and I this day believe the inspired account of his creation, when Jehovah, speaking with an unnumbered multitude of the heavenly host, said, "Let us make man in our own image and likeness."

This, Mr. Speaker, is man "the tyrant." This is the being of whom Miss Shaw said the other day, "All we ask of man is that he stand out of our sunshine." This is the being who is no longer able to represent women, who indeed misrepresents them, though he furnishes the world its meal ticket.

Mr. Speaker, the women of this land who do not want the suffrage are entitled to be heard on this floor and at the ballot box. Their case has seldom been adequately stated. Fear among men, I regret to say, has usually prevented its statement—fear of alienating votes. I have stated their case without fear. My personal regret is that a statement of the case wears the aspect of hostility to women and the suffrage. But

no thoughtful person will say that this is so, for I have taken the position occupied by Mr. Roosevelt, which is that those whose status is to be changed shall themselves vote upon the question democratically. In taking this position I am aware that many antisuffragists do not concur, believing that men alone should settle this question; but in a democracy it should be evident to any man that society could not long withstand even a 25 per cent demand for the ballot. A 10 per cent to-day is quite sufficient to embarrass legislators and arouse their fears.

As to hostility to women, allow me to say that never for a moment have I done other than honor them, and on that great day when "God shall judge the secrets of men" whatever other sins may rise to shame me, and they are many, no wretched Magdalen will rise in the judgment to say that I helped her down; and I can say to my sainted mother, who always honored men, that those principles in this regard which she bound upon my fingers and wrote upon the tables of my heart have been kept. Mr. Speaker, I love masculine men and feminine women—not women of the rostrum, not senatorial ladies who cross their limbs in political wigwams. I love those women whose functions are so beautifully described in Byron's tragedy of Sardanapalus:

> The first of human life is drawn from woman's breast;
> Our first small words are taught us at her knee;
> And our last sighs are too often breathed out in
> A woman's hearing, when others have fled the ignoble
> Task of watching beside him who led them.

Mr. Speaker, I have come in late years to see who is the real statesman in America. He is not always, or even usually, the honorable or right honorable personage in the noisy halls of legislation. He is rather the quiet man, the silent man in the community, whose life, lived agreeably with the ideals of patriotism and religion, serves to create those conditions on which the State and all laws must finally rest. And in this statesmanship true women share and have ever shared. Such women are stateswomen, indeed, far more potent than any ballot box or rostrum lady will ever be. It is this profound stateswomanship that makes certain the claim that—

> The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is representative government. I am happy that it is so. May it ever remain so. I am a United States Congressman, representing the first district of Ohio. That district and that State recently voted down any extension of the suffrage by an immense majority. To represent my district and my State I have taken the only stand that I could take, for I am not wiser than my State or my party. Moreover, I am opposed to any further centralization of power in our Government which would allow Oklahoma and Colorado to overturn the deliberate judgment of Ohio in matters which may well be left to each State and which have heretofore been left, under the Constitution, to each State.

I am a Democrat and I stand for the Democratic settlement of all questions. If the women of this country want the ballot, I want to know it. I stand ready to vote for any law which will allow them to express their will. Until that vote is taken I shall deny that a handful of vocally gifted women represent the women of America.

Show me a law which will exempt women from the disqualifications due to sex, and I will vote for it.

Show me a law which will unfetter men or women in the economic struggle, and I will vote for it.

Show me a law which will hasten self-restraint among men in sex matters, and I will vote for it.

Show me a law which will expedite the millennium, and I will vote for it.

Show me a law which will ease the burdens on the backs of men—burdens which give them hard hands and shiny clothes and stooped shoulders—and I will vote for it.

Show me a law which will ease us of our vanities, our restlessness, our riotous desires, which to-day are taxing our purses and health and causing despairing men to cry out—

> The wine of life is drawn, and naught remains but the lees this vault to boast of—

And I will vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong in all this. If so, I am not obdurate. But I think that I am right. I have spoken frankly and without fear, qualities not wholly undesirable in our political life. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker: The question before this body is: Shall Congress submit to the States the proposed amendment which contemplates giving the right of suffrage to women?

Each State of the Union is represented in Congress by two Senators, who are elected by the State to represent the State in national affairs.

Each State is subdivided into congressional districts, from each of which there is a Member upon this floor, whose first practical duty is to look to the welfare of his own constituents as national legislation may affect them.

There are times when both legislators and the people themselves fall into error as to what is best for the people. Those errors of judgment usually are the result of a lack of mature consideration and serious thought. In these days of wide reading and range of opportunity for information the people are wide-awake as to what they want and when they want it. When they have laid aside all heat and passion and have taken a public question under calm and serious consideration, their solution of it is usually accepted as the correct solution. If it should not be, more deliberate consideration, coupled with the light of further observation in the school of experience, settles the question right; and no question is ever settled until it is settled right.

When the people have taken a proposition under advisement and have reached a conclusion, they are no longer slow to express their views and to make known that conclusion to their Representatives whom they have selected to speak for them.

A Representative in Congress is the servant of those whose commission he bears. Before they have spoken he may advise with them and take counsel of them. When this has been done and they have spoken, he must voice their judgment; or, as Kentucky's illustrious son, "Bill" Thorne, has said, "they will get some one who will."

It is quite clear to me that my constituents are either against the proposition to give the ballot to women or that they have not yet reached a conclusion upon the question.

Recently I spent nearly forty days in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and while there only one person asked me to vote for this resolution while a number asked me to vote against it.

Nearly everybody now has postal facilities at the door. Nearly everybody is freely using these facilities in conveying their views upon public questions to those whom they have selected to voice their views.

There are thirteen counties in the district which I represent. I have not received a request from anyone, either man or woman, in Green County asking me to vote for this resolution. Neither have I received any such request from Taylor County, nor from Marion County, nor from Washington County, nor from Nelson County, nor from Bullitt County, nor from Larue County, nor from Hart County, nor from Grayson County, nor from Ohio County. I have received such requests from Hardin, Breckinridge and Meade Counties; but these requests came only from West Point and Stithton, in Hardin County, and only from Muldraugh and Brandenburg, in Meade County, and only from Irvington, in Breckinridge County. There are two hundred and fourteen precincts in the fourth congressional district. The above communications came from only five of these precincts. Only one came from Brandenburg, only one from Irvington, and only one from Stithton.

Twelve of these communications came from West Point, and four of them were written by the same hand, upon the same kind of paper, and were mailed in the same kind of envelope; twenty came from Meade County, nineteen of them from Muldraugh; of the nineteen which came from Muldraugh, seventeen of them were written by the same hand, with the same ink, upon the same kind of paper, and were mailed in exactly the same kind of envelope. Thus, it seems, that these communications were the result of suggestion rather than of individual initiative. In this connection it may not be out of place to say that West Point and Muldraugh are both upon the Illinois Central Railroad, but a few miles apart, and are adjoining precincts, although one is in Hardin County and the other is in Meade County.

From two hundred and nine precincts in the district I have not had a single request to vote for the resolution. All told, I have but thirty-three of these requests; thirty of them came from two adjoining precincts, and twenty-one of them are written by the same hand.

If I have received any such requests other than those just recited, I have misplaced the letters containing them and do not now recall them.

The expense of submitting this question would be enormous. The Legislature in Kentucky sits only sixty days in every two years. It is possible that an extra session of the legislature would have to be called.

When those for whom I am here to speak have indicated to me in significant numbers that they are willing to incur the trouble and expense incident to the submission of this question, then I shall cheerfully respond to that expression and vote for submission. But it seems to me that such expense should not be incurred upon the petition of only thirty-three out of a total population of 225,000.

Here and there throughout the country are those, greater or less in number, who are asking that more than a hundred different propositions to amend the Constitution be submitted to the States. None of these can be granted until the petition comes from at least a significant number of the people.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that a significant number does not exist in many portions of our Northern and Western States for this particular one, but it is patent upon the showing just stated by me that there is not yet sufficient sentiment among my constituents to warrant my imposing this great expense upon them.

As I before said, should that sentiment continue to develop until it has become the will of the people of the fourth congressional district, I shall acquiesce in that will to the extent of casting my vote in Congress for the submission.

In so doing I would be but performing a duty to the people, whose servant I am.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, the woman-suffrage amendment in Nebraska has not been considered as a partisan question. In our constitutional convention it was debated at length, but was rejected, and the constitution from which it was excluded was, in 1875, adopted by the people of the State. In 1882 it was submitted to the people and defeated by a decisive vote, as follows: For suffrage, 25,756; against, 50,693.

Recently Nebraska adopted the initiative and referendum system of submitting questions directly to the people. The friends of woman suffrage appealed to the referendum system during the last year and had the question submitted to the Nebraska electorate. The vote cast on November 3, 1914, was—for, 90,738; against, 100,842; majority against, 10,104. In the fourth congressional district, which I represent, 10 counties out of 11 cast majorities against the proposition. The vote by counties was as follows:

	For.	Against.
Butler	1,085	1,675
Fillmore	1,382	1,609
Gage	2,401	2,519
Hamilton	1,097	1,237
Jefferson	1,250	1,607
Polk	1,025	906
Saline	1,163	1,830
Saunders	1,430	1,985
Seward	1,067	2,129
Thayer	926	1,694
York	1,652	1,859
Total	14,478	19,050

Majority against, 4,572.

While unwarranted obstacles should not be placed in the way of amending our National Constitution, we must recall the fact that the unit for amending the Constitution is the State itself, and where the State itself, through its recognized system of expression, has recently published at the polls its sentiment upon that subject, that should be controlling upon the Representatives of the State. Especially is this true where a Member of Congress representing a district of the State finds the people whom he is elected to represent so emphatically speaking upon the question involved.

If no recent deliverance had been made by the people of the State or my district on the subject, my course would be largely governed by whether or not, in my judgment, a very large percentage of the people of the district and State desired a right to express themselves on the subject; but in this their expression is not a matter of estimate but one of established fact. I feel it would not be my duty to vote to submit the question to the 48 States, which would give 36 States an opportunity to force upon my own State a measure which it has so recently rejected.

Controlled by these considerations, I shall vote against the pending resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the inspiring sight of the galleries to-day might operate as an eternal bar to any man raising his voice against anything the ladies might demand. We should all be grateful for the presence of the ladies here to-day, whether they be for suffrage or against suffrage. Individually I am always glad to see the ladies take part in public meetings. I am always glad to see them participate in public affairs. I believe that public meetings are made better by their presence and public affairs are made better by such participation as they indulge in at present. Especially is this true in America, for the American woman is the greatest woman that ever graced the face of the earth. She has not an equal, she has not a peer, in either ancient, medieval, or modern history. Other times and other climes have furnished great women, but they were always of the individual, of the personality, rather than of the class. But we men believe that the American women are all so great, are all so grand, that no particular star is able to stand out and shine to the exclusion of a great many others. They are angels, they are jewels, they are the queens and princesses of our hearts, and we poor benedicts sometimes find them to be the autocrats of our households. I am really such a believer in woman as a class that sometimes I am almost convinced against my better judgment that she should indulge in the pastime of voting. Were it not for shattering an ideal, were it not for dethroning her from that high pedestal upon which we are accustomed to place her, and dragging her down to the level of us beastly men, I believe I might even to-day be willing to vote for universal woman suffrage.

But I am going to leave that to the ladies, and I am going to be perfectly fair about it. If they will take a vote on woman suffrage and they will say by their ballots that they think they ought to have the right to vote, and say it unanimously, then we might consider favorably such resolution as is presented here for nation-wide woman suffrage, but there should be no dissenting voice. [Applause.]

Suppose the citizens of some particular Commonwealth—both men and women—should be overwhelmingly opposed to the extension of suffrage to women? Are we to force an unwilling condition upon them? That is certainly what this resolution means if it is passed and adopted by a sufficient number of the States.

Certainly, I will go a great deal further with relation to the States themselves and say that a majority vote of the good ladies of any State should determine their right to vote in that particular State. The State of Oklahoma has gone on record against woman suffrage by a State-wide vote of nearly two to one, and until the ladies of my home State give some adverse expression I shall certainly consider this action as binding instructions on me.

But aside from the question of woman's rights and desires I can not bring myself to look with favor upon these efforts to have the Federal Government prescribe qualifications for the rights of suffrage in any of the separate States, but had rather leave their settlement to the States themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MULKEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MULKEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman is not in the Chamber, I will withdraw the grant of time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is now pending before this House involves a question of absolute natural right, for such is the right of woman to vote, just as is the right of the man to vote. This is no time nor place for hairsplitting technicalities. There is in this debate much to indicate too many are disposed—like the administration—to permit molehills of technicality to obscure great mountains of principle.

The right to vote is simply the right to share in the directing of the affairs of the Government, which has been formed to promote the general welfare. The right is inherent in every individual, and to withhold the exercise of that right from any individual, except from those unfit to exercise it, as the minor, the insane, the criminal, or the idiot, is an infringement on the natural God-given rights of liberty.

The Declaration of Independence is revered to-day by all Americans and by lovers of liberty everywhere, not because of its recital of the wrongs suffered by the Colonies, nor yet because of the momentous event which it heralded to the world, but because of the principles it enunciates—the basic and fundamental principles of human rights and liberty:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: 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;

that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Following that Declaration came 11 years later the forming of the Constitution for the new Government of the United States, in the preamble of which the purpose of that Government is stated to be "to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The world's experience has shown in every page of history that, whatever may be the form of government, the affairs of government are conducted primarily in the interests of those who have control of the Government, and that each Government will be aimed to secure the general welfare just about in proportion as it may be under the general control of its people.

Under individual despotisms the welfare of the despot was his first concern and that of his Government. Herod had the power and he exercised it in his own interest, causing to be put to death thousands of little children in his dominion in order that his own throne might be secure. Under the aristocratic rule of feudalism the many existed but to serve and promote the welfare of the few. Under our own Government, the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, it has constantly served the general welfare more and more as the individual citizen has more and more come to have a direct and *positive* share in the direction of its affairs.

It is for this reason that the very foundation of the great progressive movement of which we hear so constantly rests upon the right of each individual to participate in his own government. Legislation which will secure to each individual more firmly the exercise of that right or make this exercise more easy and effective is progressive and is paving the way for all legislation for the general welfare.

The new constitution of Michigan, adopted in 1909, declares in section 1 of the declaration of rights:

All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for their equal benefit, security, and protection.

That Declaration was approved by the overwhelming majority given that instrument by the voters of Michigan. No one, either in Michigan or elsewhere in this country, would question the correctness of the principles it enunciates. Had the opponents of this resolution, however, drawn that declaration of rights they must logically have stated, "All political power is inherent in the people who are males." No one would seriously propose or defend a declaration in that form. Those who oppose this resolution must admit that all political power is by nature inherent in the people without regard to sex, but defend their opposition to the exercise of such power by those who may be females on the ground that the general welfare of all would better be served by the exercise of political power by a part of the people and exclusive from such exercise of another part. Such exclusion of a part being the denial of a natural right of the individual ought not to be contemplated or permitted to continue unless it is clearly and positively established that the general welfare is thereby promoted. It has been so established that the general welfare is best promoted by excluding from the exercise of this natural right the minor, the insane, the criminal, and the idiot. These are not permitted to vote because of the immaturity of the mind of the minor, the lack of mind in the idiot, and the perverted mind of the criminal or the insane. Farther than this it has not been deemed for the general welfare to go so far as the male population is concerned. How conservative we have been in restricting this natural right as to men is evident when we think of the men who vote and have their say as to the decision of questions affecting the general welfare, the conditions under which women as well as men shall work and live, the environment which shall surround the children which women bring into the world and rear, the prosperity and happiness of the home which is the peculiar province of the woman, as well as the prosperity and success of the business which is the peculiar province of the man.

When we think of some of the men who have their say as to all of these things which go to make up the general welfare, men who have not enough capacity to provide for themselves, to say nothing of providing for and protecting the interests of a family, men so dominated by habit and appetite that they have lost all power to govern self, and men so ignorant or so shiftless that instead of being able to labor for the general welfare they are, in effect, a burden upon it, we realize how jealously we have been disposed to guard the simple and natural right of the individual man to vote. It is only in the most extreme, well-determined cases that we have dared to deny this right to any male citizen. It is just as clearly a natural right of the woman as of the man, and unless the incapacity of womankind as a class to exercise that natural right appears as clearly as does the incapacity of the idiot, the criminal, or the insane, and more clearly than does the incapacity of the confirmed drunkard, the vagabond, or the half-witted ignoramus, then, in all logic, womankind as a class should not be deprived of the opportunity to exercise this natural right.

And if their incapacity as a class does not so clearly appear as to justify their exclusion as a class, then the individuals of that class, whether they be few or many, who desire to exercise that natural right, and whose individual incapacity has not been demonstrated, should be permitted to exercise it. The burden of proof rests absolutely upon those who would continue to deny to woman the right to vote. It is a burden of proof which can be satisfied not merely by a preponderance of evidence, but by evidence which will satisfy beyond any reasonable doubt, just as has been the case in connection with the voting power of the men. The right of one person to take part in the affairs of government should not and does not depend in any case upon the desire of any other person to exercise that right. The right is not the right of a class, but the right of an individual. Not only our individual acquaintance, but the rapid spread of woman suffrage in this country tells each of us that there is a widespread desire among women to vote.

Does anyone believe that California or Washington would have granted the suffrage to women in the face of united protest against it from the women; and does anyone know of any united demand from the women of Wyoming for the repeal of this proposition in that State? The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] who has introduced the pending resolution has, since he introduced that resolution, gone again before the electorate of that State as a candidate for reelection to Congress, and that electorate, including the women of his State, has again given to him its indorsement, and thereby has given the most positive approval that the women are not against woman suffrage. But whether the per cent of women desiring the right to vote be 20 per cent or 50 per cent or 90 per cent is quite immaterial. When the exercise of the right is permitted each individual woman must decide for herself whether and how she shall exercise that right, just as each individual man to-day must decide for himself. But the 80 per cent or 50 per cent or 10 per cent of women who do not think that they need or care to vote should not be permitted to deprive of the exercise of their natural right those women who do care to exercise it. And such is the intelligence, moral quality, and patriotism of womankind that the larger the part that woman consents to take in affairs affecting the general welfare the better will be the results secured.

In so far as their interests are identical with men the right of women to participate in the affairs of their Government is identical with that of men. In so far as matters are concerned where their interests differ the right of the woman to be admitted to participate in the decisions of such matters is intensified.

It is the policy of this administration and of many Members on this floor to parade their solicitude for State rights. They show a greater concern for debatable State rights than they do for acknowledged individual rights.

The various States of the Union, the Federal Government itself, and the individual citizens who maintain governments, both of State and Nation, all have their obligations and their rights defined in our Federal Constitution. The same Constitution provides how it may be amended. This provision was agreed to by the States, and the amendment under consideration is exactly in accordance with the agreed method of amendment. It does not propose to interfere in any way with any matters of purely local or State concern. It is the theory of our Government that those matters which involve alike the welfare of the whole country shall be passed upon by the Federal Government, but local matters which may require different treatment in different sections of the country shall be governed locally. The women in one section of this country I do not believe are materially different from their sisters elsewhere, and especially their natural right to share in their government exists in one State as much as in another. It is simply proposed to guarantee to them everywhere the exercise of that natural right, leaving to the individual States the same control over the exercise of the right of franchise by women as they now have as to men.

These gentlemen who are so exercised about State rights in connection with this proposition should read again the first 10 amendments of the Federal Constitution. These were among the 12 proposed by the Congress of 1789, the other 2 proposed by that Congress not being adopted. In the main, those 10 amendments aim to protect and secure individual rights against any possible infringement on the part of the Federal Government.

The right to bear arms; to security against unreasonable searches or seizures; to trial by jury; to security against being placed twice in jeopardy, deprived of life, liberty, or property, except by due process of law, or the taking of private property for public use without just compensation; to have speedy and public trial by an impartial jury; the right of the defendant to confront witnesses against him and to compel the attendance of witnesses in his favor and have counsel, and the right of trial by jury in civil cases, protection against excessive bail, excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishments—these all invade possible subjects of State legislation and of State concern, but they were placed in the Federal Constitution as amendments as a bulwark for the protection of individual right as against possible tyranny of State or Nation. Not one of these amendments, which came into the Constitution by amendment, treats of any right of the individual more positive, fundamental, or important than is treated by the amendment proposed to-day—that no individual shall be barred from voting by reason merely of sex. Many here will vote against submitting this new bulwark of individual liberty, this new mark of progress, to the States for consideration. They should note that three States—Georgia, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—voted against every one of the amendments I have above referred to, those guaranties of individual right. In much less than another hundred years votes cast to-day in this House against this resolution will appear as reactionary and as lacking in the true principles of individual liberty as now does the negative vote of those three States.

The resolution before us is a simple guaranty of an inalienable individual right and should become a part of the supreme law of this land. There is an undeniable and widespread demand for the submission of this resolution to the several States for ratification or rejection, and even if I did not myself personally approve of woman suffrage I should not feel, as a believer in popular government, that I had any right to vote to prevent a decision of this question by means of the referendum provided in the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MULKEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MULKEY] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MULKEY. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment is far-reaching. Its adoption would require the States to admit woman on an equality with men in the exercise of suffrage. The exercise of the franchise is not a right, but only a privilege granted by law.

There is nothing, so far as I am advised, in our Federal Constitution which prohibits the several States from conferring this privilege upon women. In fact, several of them have already done so.

I am not now going to argue against the wisdom of such provisions in our State laws. I have the profoundest respect for those who are insisting upon this right. I know many women who could vote as intelligently, and probably more so, than some men; they are patriotic, and the end they have in view is their country's good.

Many of them know and understand better than I the principles of good government. I believe that on all great moral issues their votes would be in the right direction; and though many of them might be influenced by sentiment, superficial in its nature, yet in the end they would settle down and act with deliberation.

No man goes before me in his regard for woman, her intellect and her patriotism. She is the salt of the earth. I am not among those who believe her extraordinary powers and talents should be limited or circumscribed. I believe in her expansion. I know her influence is for good. If her precepts and examples were followed, we all agree that the world would be better.

All men, almost, entertain this view. But men, at the ballot box and in the halls of legislation, look after her interest.

At one time in the history of our laws she was civily dead. She could not contract or acquire property without certain kinds of consents of her husband. Many kinds of restrictions were thrown around and about her. They have been removed.

In Alabama, and I believe in most of the States, the only limitation placed upon her power now to contract is that she can not become the surety of her husband. This is for her protection. In most of the States he can not convey an absolute title to his property without her voluntary signature to the deed. She can veto a sale. Usually insurance carried by the husband is exempt from the payment of debts and goes to his wife.

Laws are made for her benefit and protection. If she separates from her husband and undertakes to get a divorce, he is required to pay her lawyer's fee and alimony pending a hearing, though the charges may be wholly groundless.

Man has always been considerate of her welfare, at least in legislative matters. If in court the jury are her sympathizers, and often she wins against evidence and justice. In other words, socially, in legislation, and in the courts she is the ward of the manhood of the country. Why then does she want to exercise the right of suffrage? Could she do any better for herself than man does for her?

If she were here daily contending with us, how much more could she expect to accomplish than is already hers? Nothing but a taste of power. The great cry is that woman should be allowed to vote in order to protect themselves. Against what? Do men oppress them? Do we act toward them as though they were not American citizens or entitled to the protection of our laws? On the contrary we show them every consideration, provide for their safety, and protect their interest always and everywhere. If, therefore, they could vote, they could not improve their condition, but might place themselves in a position that men would not be as tolerant and patient and chivalrous toward them as they now are.

But whether they should or should not vote is not a question proper for national constitutional regulation. The States should regulate it. Different conditions may exist in different States, and hence woman suffrage might be acceptable or desirable in one State and not in another. There seems to be a disposition on the part of some to regard the Federal Constitution as a wholly imperfect document and needing amendment every year. Sir, I do not so regard it. We have lived under it for more than a century. It has stood the storms and tempests. Under its wise and beneficent provisions we have grown to be the greatest Nation in the world, and for one I shall be slow to take any chances on radical changes in our organic law. I shall therefore oppose the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield another minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker this Hall has resounded to-day with praise of woman—her great virtue, her great intelligence, her great morality, her great patriotism—but she is not good enough and intelligent enough to vote.

A few women, like a few men, may be influenced by this fulsome praise, but the vast body of womankind in this country are not phazed with that. They ask for simple justice—the right to participate in this Government, their Government, to be real citizens; and well may we concede that privilege, because it will be for our good, for the good of our Government, and for their good.

Some gentlemen are afraid that the women in the congested districts may not have the necessary intelligence and the morality to vote properly there. I want to tell you, my friends, that women in the congested districts are thinking women. They are surrounded by adversity. They know what are the great problems, and they will know how to help in their solution when they get the opportunity to vote.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWDLE] presented interesting figures as to the nonnewspaper readers among the women. The women do not have to read in order to know. They do not have to look in order to see. That great intuitive power of theirs is a source of knowledge and wisdom which, embodied in the practical citizenship of the day, will mean great and useful development. Let me contrast with those figures this statement, that in one penitentiary in this country there are 300 inmates, of whom 275 are men and 25 are women. This is true throughout our country.

We say that good citizenship is based on intelligence and morality. The women have both those qualities, and we need to give them the opportunity to use them in the affairs of government. We may rest assured that they will not vote against their home or their children, and, as a rule, for right and justice, to make conditions better and to help those who need help. As for the sturdy oak and clinging vine theory voiced to-day by those opposed to women voting, we know that in times of trouble, adversity, and distress, when real courage and faith and wisdom are necessary, very frequently the sturdy oak is the woman and the clinging vine the man.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, I am for woman suffrage because our country needs the great civic service which the women can render, and because that privilege accorded to the women will result in a practical development which, joined with their blessed intuitive mentality, keen insight into human nature, high morality, and splendid powers of vision, will be of incalculable benefit to them and to civilization. Already we feel the impulses of

woman's greater activities and thought in the practical consideration of great sociological and moral questions, and we are only at the threshold of the tremendous problems that our rapid increase in population, congested communities, and the struggle for survival will evolve. A woman's power for good in her home, her usefulness there, will be greater. Suffrage will be an incentive to greater information as to politics and government, which, after all, are synonymous terms. This increased knowledge will be reflected in her children, and will be an additional stimulus to her husband to do his full duty as an American citizen.

I want a school of politics established in every home, so that the little ones as they grow up will imbibe from their mothers not only patriotism, but intelligence and information as to the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

I shall vote, Mr. Speaker, to submit this question to the people of the various States for their consideration. It is a duty we owe them. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, in the small time allotted to me it will be impossible for me to discuss this subject in any exhaustive or fundamental way, and I shall not undertake to do so. I shall confine myself largely to a few little facts of personal experience.

I come from a State where the women not only are entitled to the elective franchise, but where they qualify and participate in all elections in almost equal numbers as the men. It is often claimed by the opponents of woman suffrage that the women do not want the ballot and would not avail themselves generally of the right to vote if given it. Of the women of California this is absolutely not true. As large a percentage of the eligible women of California are on the great register as of the men, and of the women who are registered a little higher percentage vote than of the men. It is true that many women who opposed the extension of the franchise to their sex announced in the campaign that resulted in giving it to them in California that they did not want it and would not vote if given the opportunity; but so far as my personal observation goes, all these women have registered and voted, and most, if not all of them, would probably vigorously resist any effort to take the franchise from them.

I have heard ever since I was a youth every argument I have heard advanced on this floor to-day against granting the franchise to women; the same old slush about the home being the kingdom of woman and about her being out of place in politics.

Now, nobody denies that the home is the particular kingdom of woman; nobody denies that there is the place where she most shines; but, Mr. Speaker, all these various alleged arguments, based on assumed facts, must fall before the actual demonstrations of experience. The experience of the people of California has demonstrated, as I have had an opportunity to observe, that the possession of the franchise does not change the position of woman with reference to the home in any particular.

Last November we elected in California a full complement of State and county officers. There were also on the official ballot 48 propositions embracing constitutional amendments and initiative and referendum legislation provisions. All the candidates and the various provisions submitted were fully and freely discussed by myself and wife, my sons and daughter and daughter-in-law at several family conclaves before the election with a view to arriving at wise conclusions upon the various candidates and the legislative and constitutional questions at issue. We did not all agree, but no inharmony or quarrel resulted. On election day I took my wife, daughter, and daughter-in-law with me to the polls, where we all voted. We were gone from the house probably 30 minutes. In most families in California the same general program as outlined above was doubtless carried out.

To assert that my wife and daughters by the experience to which I have briefly alluded were in any way contaminated, injured, polluted, or rendered less womanly strikes me as ridiculous and as wholly lacking in any foundation of fact. To say that this experience, or any number of similar ones, tends to divorce a woman from her home or home duties is entirely contrary to the fact. To participate in a campaign and election as carried on in California is no more contaminating to a woman than going to church, or shopping, or participating in club meetings, or calling, or engaging in any of the other activities universally conceded to be proper for women to engage in. So far from making our women less womanly, this activity increases their intelligence, broadens their minds, and renders them more charming as women, while at the same time making them more capable as wives and mothers and home makers and more truly companions and helpmeets to their husbands.

In nearly every community in California before the last election there were associations of women who met once a week to become informed upon the various political issues before the voters. Not only were the various candidates invited to appear before these associations and present their claims, but each one of the constitutional amendments and initiative and referendum propositions to be voted on was discussed, for and against, by members of the legislature and others who had made a special study of each particular question; so that I feel safe in saying that the vote of the women of California last November was certainly as intelligent—and I believe often more intelligent—than the vote of the men.

But the principal reason why I am in favor of extending the franchise to women generally in the United States is that we need their help in arriving at a correct solution of our various political, social, and economical problems. Their viewpoint is somewhat different from ours and things appeal to them in some respects in a different way. We need their efforts to supplement ours. I think I can truly say that their influence upon the politics of California and upon all our social problems there has been elevating, without a single exception. I do not expect the millenium as a result of extending the franchise to women, but that the result will be in any respect evil I do not believe. Therefore I shall cast my vote in favor of the pending resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from a State where we have woman suffrage, I am glad to have even the short period of two minutes to testify to the salutary and wholesome effect of woman suffrage in the State of Oregon. Instead of degrading woman, the ballot for woman in Oregon has resulted in purifying the ballot, has resulted in giving us better political and social conditions in that State. The influence of woman in the State of Oregon on the last legislature has given us a widow's pension, so that women with dependent children are protected from poverty and want. It has also given us a minimum wage law for women and for minor children, so that the sweatshop is unknown in the State of Oregon, and will always be unknown, due to the influence of women on our political and social conditions. [Applause.] It has been stated on the floor to-day that the proper criterion for us to judge whether or not we shall submit a constitutional amendment is, Will it be adopted by the people?

The Constitution furnishes no such criterion for our guidance. Article V contemplates the proposal of amendments "whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary." Story, in his great work on the Constitution, interprets this to mean that whenever two-thirds of both Houses think it expedient amendments shall be proposed.

There is found in section 3, Article II, of the Constitution, language analogous to that found in Article V, to the effect that the President shall recommend to Congress "such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." Can it be successfully argued that the President should propose to Congress no measure unless confident of its passage. If so, then the President has either grossly misinterpreted the Constitution or has been greatly deceived or disappointed in his expectation of what he terms "teamwork" on the part of his congressional team mates, for they have wholly ignored his recommendations on great measures, for instance, the rural credit bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill brings before the House for consideration the political rights of approximately one-half the population of the United States of the age of 21 years and upward.

I know the bill is going to be beaten. It will be beaten by selfishness, greed, and fear, masked behind the doctrine of State rights.

I have as much respect for the rights of the States as any man here can have, but when that doctrine obtrudes itself across the pathway of human progress it must, like every other obstacle to progress, be brushed aside.

The demand for woman suffrage denotes a healthy and steady growth of the principle of popular government. "Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," said Jefferson, and yet for a hundred years after he said it the Government which he helped to found and whose Constitution he helped to draft has denied to one-half its population any voice in the affairs of their Government.

Jefferson also said "All men are created free and equal," but if he took occasion to glance out of the window of his Monti-

cello home after he had penned the famous lines he would in all probability have caught sight of many black men who were his chattels, just as his horses and cattle were his property, and while he preached the doctrine of equality of men he did not practice it with his black slaves.

Jefferson preached a doctrine which was far in advance of his time, but his practices were in line with the spirit of his own day. I yield to no man in admiration for the doctrines proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson. As a scholar, an author, and a statesman I admire him much, but as a prophet I admire him more.

When he said "All men are created free and equal" he was prophesying. He was not stating the fact, because the fact did not then exist and it does not exist to-day.

When he said "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" he was prophesying. He was not stating the fact, because the fact did not then exist and it does not exist to-day.

Jefferson is frequently appealed to and quoted from in support of the doctrine of State rights. He was a devoted advocate of that doctrine wherever and whenever it was a vehicle of progress; but when it obstructed progress he did not hesitate to brush it aside. He did not hesitate to acquire Louisiana Territory by means which he regarded as in violation of the Constitution, but its acquisition was in line with progress and a forward step in humanity's upward and onward march.

I am not familiar with any expression by Jefferson on the subject of female suffrage, but the fact that he was a warm advocate of unrestricted manhood suffrage at a time when men were struggling to maintain the principle of manhood suffrage against the "divine rights of kings" leads me to believe that he would not be in favor of one-half of his country's population having the special privilege of voting to the exclusion of the other half, if all were equally qualified. But the question before us is not what Jefferson would do if he were here, nor what Jefferson said or thought. We may look to Jefferson for guidance and consult the authors of the Constitution for inspiration, but the duty to act and the responsibility for the action is ours. One-half of our population is asking for the right to participate in the conduct and management of our Government. The question for us to decide is, Will we vote to let them have a voice in the management of their own Government or will we continue to deny them that right? For my part, and as I view the question, there is but one answer. We can not, in justice to ourselves or the women of the United States, deny them the right to vote.

I shall not attempt to answer any of the alleged arguments against woman suffrage, but I will take the liberty to state here some of the reasons which have prompted me to my conclusion.

It is my conviction that all Governments should derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is Democratic doctrine. But such a Government will never be a reality here while one half of our population is deprived by the other half from participating in governmental affairs. All admirers of Jefferson should help to bring about the fulfillment of one of his prophecies, by supporting the bill which gives women the right to vote.

The discrimination which we have so long indulged against women in the matter of voting is unfair, undemocratic, un-American, and unnatural. It harks back to that ancient day when the only government was the tribal government, and the leader of the tribe ruled by virtue of his brute strength.

We have advanced from a government by brute force to a government of men, for men, and by men, but when women have the right to vote, Lincoln's dream of a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," which means the abolition of sex discrimination, will have been realized.

There may be some force to the claim frequently made that the right of suffrage should be restricted by certain educational tests or, in some instances, by property qualifications, but never on the ground of sex.

The latest census reports show that in 1912 there were 24,555,754 women 21 years of age and upward in the United States. The same report gives the male population 21 years old and upward as 26,999,151. Of the female population there are 5,591,086 engaged in gainful occupations. Among the occupations in which women are engaged, the following may be mentioned: Lawyers, judges, doctors, ministers of the Gospel, authors, inventors, and teachers in schools and colleges.

There are millions of women in the United States who own property and pay taxes. They are all subject to the laws and must pay their proportionate share for the maintenance of the Government; their property is subject to levy and execution; their children may be taken from them by man-made laws and placed in public institutions. When a woman wants to employ help in her home, in her office, in her factory, workshop, or place of business, she may do so just as men may, but when it comes to hiring a public servant, such as a Member of Congress, or Senator, or President of the United States, she is not permitted to have a voice in the selection, but her property is subject to taxation to help maintain the Government and pay the salaries of servants she is not permitted to have a share in hiring.

There are men in this House who are going to vote against this bill who believe, and are sincere in their belief, that women are not capable of intelligent participation in governmental affairs; that to permit her to do so would be degrading and demoralizing to the women of America. And yet there is not one of us who will not admit that he acquired those fundamental precepts which are always the foundation of good citizenship and honorable manhood at his mother's knee.

We can not here and now give the women of the United States the right to vote, but we can express our judgment that she ought to be permitted to do so, and then leave to the States, through their legally elected legislatures, to say whether they approve our act. We ought, in my judgment, so amend our fundamental law as to permit the women of the United States to share with us in the management of the Government of our country. It is their country as well as ours. Her right to vote should come from the highest source from which we are capable of giving it to her. Her right to vote should rest upon a foundation so secure and be so firmly rooted in the fabric of our Government that no State now existing or hereafter to be created can deny her the right to share in the responsibilities as well as the burdens of government.

Her right to vote should be founded upon the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the nine minutes I also yield him four minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, when I have spoken nine minutes I will ask to be notified, as I desire to reserve the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UNDERWOOD). Very well.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the man who is indifferent as to whether woman votes or not may be lacking in appreciation of woman; he may be lacking in a proper regard for her highest and best interest. And the man who opposes the movement to bring women into active participation in politics may be prompted by his keen appreciation and great love for womankind. Those who care about what we do and feel interest enough in us to tell us what they think is best for us, whether it pleases us or not, are the ones who appreciate us most and love us best.

So, Mr. Speaker, those representatives of the American people who oppose woman suffrage here to-day are doing what they believe is best for the women of the country. This dragging of our women into politics is a radical change in the status of woman as we have known and loved her all these years, and we do not want anything to happen to her that will rob her of a single charm or impose upon her duties and responsibilities that she should never bear. We are told by good women here to-day that three-fourths of the women of America are opposed to woman suffrage; that they do not want the ballot. They do not stop there. They say that voting and looking after governmental affairs is the duty of the man and that woman has her hands full now with the duties and responsibilities that are hers in the sphere where God in his wisdom has placed her. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss here at length the merits of the proposition to confer upon women the privilege of voting, but I do resent the insinuation and suggestion that woman without the ballot is of no force in society, that she can be of no value to her day and generation unless she becomes a voter. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, she has been the greatest factor in the progress of our country and the betterment of our race. Our country has prospered wonderfully, and through all its marvelous growth and development woman has spoken—not from the hustings with a ballot in her hand, but as a womanly woman, through the social side of her gentle nature, from the fireside with her children gathered around her. [Applause.]

The greatest battle that ever was fought—
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the map of the world you will find it not—
It was fought by the mothers of men.

The good wives and mothers of our country have bestowed upon their husbands and children the blessings and benedictions of a woman's love. A moment ago a gentleman said that "Love should be above lust," and I agree with him. Mr. Speaker, when a man wins the love of a good woman he has

something worth more than gold, and she is love's queen at the fireside, and love is the fulfilling of the law.

Let me read here a toast proposed to Mayor Mitchel, of New York:

Here's to the woman of days gone by,
May we meet her kind above,
The woman for whom a man would die,
The woman who ruled by love—

[Applause.]

Who didn't harangue and who didn't parade,
In whose home it was sweet to dwell;
Who believed in raising children,
And not in raising ———!

[Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, in the sphere where God in his wisdom has placed her, woman is as necessary to the welfare and vital life of our country as the sun is necessary to the welfare and vital life of the universe. Woman is now the soul and center of every movement looking to our temporal comfort, our moral welfare, and spiritual uplift, and she is the guardian of the dearest heritage of the human race. [Applause.]

If the political arena becomes more attractive to the average woman than the important duties of the home, who will perform those duties? Man can not, and if woman neglects them the State is doomed and the Republic must perish.

Church government and State government derive their strength and glory from family government, and when the wife and mother, sister, and daughter contribute of their goodness and true soul wealth to the male members of the family, bestowing upon them that which gives beauty, strength, and nobility of character, they are rendering the highest and best service that it is possible to render in this world. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I saw morning-glory vines climb over the doorway of a farmer's home in my district. The blossoms of red, white, and blue, representing the colors of Old Glory, were swinging censors of perfume on the morning air. In the doorway stood the good wife, with a baby in her arms, bidding the children good-by as they went away to school, and I said Henry Grady spoke truly when he said:

The strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people.

Here the mother contributes both sons and daughters to the Commonwealth and the country. Her sons support civil government in time of peace and fight for its preservation in time of war. Her daughters keep the fires of maternal love forever burning on the hearthstone. They are the golden links in the endless chain of the Almighty's plan to bless the earth with beings whom God has in His image made. [Applause.] Let me read here what another has said on this subject:

I have yet to see a maid in love, with any prospects of matrimonial success; I have yet to see a woman with a kindly, sympathetic face and low, sweet voice clamoring for female enfranchisement. The woman who can transform an humble cabin into a happy home, gilded with God's own glory, who can rule her husband in her own sweet way, and rear a crop of boy babies fit to wear the crown of American sovereignty, never imagines that the country is going to the bow wows if she does not get the ballot.

Why, Mr. Speaker, woman votes now in the most important election in all the world. When the candidate for matrimony is abroad in the land, she is the most cherished voter in the universe [applause], and how sweet is the running for office then. He is a candidate for the most important office in the world. Quite different then from canvassing amongst multitudes of men with banners and ballots. There the voting males decide his fate, but here the queen of hearts must shape his destiny. The vote is cast and he has been elected to the high and sacred office of husband and crowned with the benedictions of a woman's love. [Applause.] Now, what cares she for politics when she has the politician? What cares she for the direct vote when she is the power behind the ballot? She had rather have the voter than the vote and she had rather train the voter than to vote.

Far from the fret and the fever of politics, she is the queen of hearts in the American home, the idol of man's affection, and the dearest and sweetest personage in the world. She is the strength and inspiration of every good man in the world to-day. God bless the modest, gentle, home-loving women of our country. [Applause.]

THE HAND THAT ROCKS THE CRADLE RULES THE WORLD.

I believe it was Themistocles who said:

Greece rules the world, Athens rules Greece, I rule Athens, and my wife rules me.

[Laughter.]

Representing American homes, Mr. Speaker, women are here to-day from every section of the country begging Members of Congress not to thrust upon women the burdens and responsibilities of politics. Surely these home makers and preservers, these guardians of all that makes life worth living, are entitled to be heard upon a question that so vitally affects the status of woman and may be the future well-being of the American home. No one can deny that a vast majority of the women of the country are opposed to woman suffrage. Then I submit that it is unfair and unjust to the women to force them into the strife and turmoil of politics when they protest against it at every step of the way. [Applause.]

There is no excuse for this effort to violate every principle of State rights to force upon our women through the Federal Government something that they do not want.

This is a question purely and wholly for the State to determine for itself. If we should offer here an amendment saying that no State in the Union shall have woman suffrage, the very people who are here to-day advocating this Federal amendment would say the State of Colorado or the State of Kansas gave us the ballot and Congress has no right to try to take it away, and I would agree with them.

Mr. Speaker, some months ago this very question came up for consideration in the Democratic caucus of the House, and I took the position there that the people of the various States had the right to regulate the elective franchise, free from Federal interference. The caucus by a vote of more than 2 to 1 adopted my resolution, which read:

Resolved, That the question of suffrage is a State and not a Federal question.

The people of my State are capable in every way of taking care of this important question, and the Member from Alabama who votes to deprive our people of their rights to manage their own affairs in this regard, to prevent them from voting directly on the question in the State, is going contrary to the wishes of the people of Alabama, and he ignores the action taken by a two-thirds vote of his Democratic brethren in party caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the good women of Alabama control the men now in everything that is worth while, and if a majority of the white women of my State ever want the ballot they will get it. But these women do not ask and will not ask the Federal Governmen to take away from the dear old State that they love a right which is sacred to the women as well as to the men. There are not many women in Alabama who want to vote. There are some good women there, however, who do, and the ablest advocate of the cause in Alabama told me that she was opposed to the Federal amendment for woman suffrage; that she wanted the ballot, but wanted the men of Alabama to give it to her. I refer to Mrs. Oscar R. Hundley, of Birmingham.

There are 11 Southern States that have a large negro population, and these States have passed through the dark night of sore trial with vicious, ignorant negroes bartering the ballot and voting against the best interests of the white race. But, thank God, by the exercise of the sovereign power of the State we have purified the ballot and removed a danger that threatened our very civilization. Careless and thoughtless indeed is he who will vote now to put into the hands of three-fourths of the States the power to undo all that these Southern States have done in restricting the franchise and bettering their condition. And yet that is precisely what could happen by taking from the State the right to say who shall or shall not vote. Under this plan three-fourths of the States that have no negro problem could force the amendment into the Constitution against the will and over the protest of every Southern State that has a large negro population.

The preservation of our institutions and the perpetuity of the State in all its virile strength and glory depends upon the retention by the State of all its rights and powers. Mr. Speaker, in the Constitutional Convention of the United States the question arose as to the qualification of voters. It was advocated by some that there should be one general standard fixed by the Federal Government, but the wise men of that convention did not believe that the Federal Government ought to have that power. Benjamin Franklin led the opposition to the Federal idea, and he declared that the State, and the State alone, should say who shall or shall not have and exercise the ballot. That doctrine became the fixed policy of the Government, and has been handed down to us. The State, and the State alone, has the right to speak on this question. [Applause.] Let this House refuse to do anything that will cause conflict between the separate and distinct functions of State and Federal Government. Let this House go on record as standing firmly and strongly by the States in the full and free exercise of the sovereign power vouchsafed unto them by the framers of the Constitution and the founders of this Government. [Applause.] Let the State grow and develop within its prescribed constitutional powers and limitations until she reaches that high destiny fashioned for her by the fathers of the Republic. Unhampered and unhindered by perverted

Federal power, bid her Godspeed and onward as she performs her distinct high mission in the household of sovereign States. [Applause.] Some of the States have woman suffrage. Let those who believe in the cause go to the States and ask them to do as the States having it have done, but do not ask us of the South to vote for a Federal amendment on the suffrage question. Do not ask us to surrender to the Federal Government the only weapon that we had in reconstruction times to defend our homes and institutions from the evils of the vicious, ignorant negro vote.

Under this Federal amendment, Mr. Speaker, the States would be denied the right to vote directly on the question and the legislatures would act instead, whereas if the question comes up in the State, the people vote directly on the amendment to the State constitution, and their will in the matter is determined. In the last two years I have heard women here discussing votes for women, some in favor of and some against woman suffrage. I have seen women who work in industrial pursuits opposing woman suffrage, and I have seen others engaged in the same character of work pleading for the ballot. I have feared that drawing women into politics generally would interfere with their duties and desires in more important matters. I have feared that the path of woman suffrage would lead not beside the still waters of domestic tranquillity. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I heard a story the other day concerning one of the woman-suffrage States. A man and his wife were both summoned to serve on the jury. The man sat in the rear of the court room and seemed somewhat nervous and embarrassed when the clerk called his name. The judge said, "Mr. Jones, have you any reason to give why you should not serve on the jury this week?" He looked mournfully at the judge and said, "Judge, I see my old lady has been chosen to serve on the jury, and by golly I have jest naturally got to go home and look after the babies." [Applause and laughter.] But some tell us that the man's wife would vote with him. Well, if that is true, why should she be burdened with the ballot? If my wife votes with me and my neighbor's wife votes with him and the two houses vote against each other the result is 2 against 2. Now, suppose my wife does not vote and his wife does not vote, but he and I vote against each other, the result is the same. Then why put that burden on woman? But another says, the wife would not vote with her husband. Well, then, in that event, you have a divided house, and the Bible tells us that a house divided against itself can not stand. [Applause.] Let me read here what the women of Virginia who oppose woman suffrage have to say:

The vast majority of women of the State of Virginia do not desire the burden and responsibility of the franchise, believing in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that the franchise is a privilege and not a right. They do not wish the franchise, because facts show indisputably that suffrage has done nothing that its advocates claim for it in the States and countries where women have the ballot; because the best legislation affecting women and children is in the States where women do not have the ballot; because women can not have the franchise without going into politics, and the political woman will be a menace to society, to the home, and to the State; because equal franchise will only double existing conditions in the electorate if all women vote, and it will double election expenses; because more can be done for the advancement of the highest interest of the race by the influence of women free and unfettered by political ties and obligations; because it would be a calamity if woman suffrage were carried into law without the real consent and deliberate demand of the majority of the women of this State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read just here what a good woman in my State says about woman unburdened with the ballot:

The fundamental school of instruction is the home, for therein is the lever to uplift the world; its handle rests in woman's hands, or in her hands to drag it down into godless desolation. The great masterpieces of character which have ennobled the world have been chiseled by God's hand through His ordained medium—the "Mother."—Miss Lida B. Robertson, Mobile, Ala.

And here is a statement of a good woman in Texas:

The fact remains that she has ever been and ever will be the mother of the race. She is the maker, the reproducer in nature's workshop; around her centers the continuity of the race, the unity of the family, the possibility of society. The great fact of motherhood and home remain the most beautiful and wonderful facts of the universe. As the woman, so is the home; and out of the home are the issues of life and death both for nations and individuals.

Mrs. R. B. McSwain, in Texas Christian Advocate:

The family is the very source and fountain head of the State, and woman selects and elects the head of the family. Show me a nation where the love of home and family is the supreme and paramount thing among its women and I'll show you a nation of increasing worth, growing thought, and enlarging hope. A nation strong and mighty in the earth.

Let me read to you what a woman in Colorado says on the subject:

I can see nothing that it has accomplished in its 16 years here that has not been done equally in other States where they have no woman's suffrage. Our political "ring" remains as corrupt as ever, and the addition of women's votes in the down-town districts has been only to double its purchasable vote. I believe that there is a growing feeling that the whole thing has been a mistake, and that it would be a great relief to be relieved of the responsibility.

MRS. CHALONER E. SCHLEY.

COLORADO SPRINGS.

Listen to what another Colorado woman says:

I am sure that I voice the opinion of a large percentage of Colorado women when I make the statement that we should be glad to see the franchise withdrawn.—Mrs. E. B. Field, jr., Denver, Colo., in the Ladies' Home Journal, April, 1911.

Now, here is a statement from a California lady:

I feel I was in a measure instrumental in bringing suffrage in California, and I want to tell you that if I had it to do over again I would work twice as hard against it.

It is the constant agitation of the same few going about the country that keeps the question before the public and leads some to think the desire for it is general.

Suffrage robs women of all that is gentle, tender, and attractive.

On the good, intelligent woman in the home, rearing her children, with a sense of responsibility and duty, depends the welfare of the Nation. The struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart burnings, excitement, agitation, disappointment of politics are not for women. A child has a right to have one parent from whom to inherit the finer qualities of being.

MISS ANNIE BOCK.

LOS ANGELES, CAL.

LEXINGTON, MASS.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note in the Boston Globe of February 10 an account of your address at the Baptist Church, Falls Church, Va., and I wish to thank you, both for myself and the many women in and around Boston, for your words in behalf of us who are contented to remain in the sphere of life where God in His wisdom has placed us.

And we feel that we can safely leave the government of the country to the men of the home.

May there be found in the present Congress many like yourself who will vote and speak for the modest, refined, home-loving women who do not wish suffrage thrust upon them.

I hope to again see accounts of your words in our behalf.

Cordially,

Mr. Speaker, I have feared that woman would lose something of her modesty, gentleness, and charm by active participation in politics, and that man would lose something of his chivalric bearing and courteous treatment toward woman, and that the movement is contrary to divine teaching and violative of nature's plan—to create a condition in which woman, the weaker sex, is compelled to take an equal part with man on equal terms. Would it not relieve man of his proud office as woman's protector and throw him into the struggle of life with her as his rival, create sex antagonism, and destroy sex sentiment? If the movement should change woman from the status of womanly loveliness as we men know her and love her to-day, it would destroy the dearest and best thing in our lives and leave in our hearts an aching void that the world could never fill. [Applause.] It takes the bloom of her modesty, the grace of her gentleness, the touch of her sympathy, and the glory of her love to make man what he ought to be. [Applause.]

Man is the bold, aggressive governing power. Woman is the gentle, conservative, refining power. Man is the mouthpiece in the political world and woman is the mouthpiece in the social world.

The man and the woman, distinctly different and yet harmoniously cooperative, are fulfilling their mission as God ordained it in the eternal fitness of things. Man the housebuilder and woman the home maker and preserver. Man the protector and defender and woman his helpmeet and good angel in all the stress and strain of life. [Applause.]

This Government is carried on by the men of the homes of America. These men, who vote for the best interest of the home and the country, are the brothers, the sons, the husbands, and the fathers of the women of our land. There are wrongs to be righted, great problems to be solved, but the men born of American mothers can be relied upon to solve them.

Mr. Gladstone has said that the American Constitution is the greatest civic production that ever emanated from the brain of man. Faithful to the doctrine of the old Bible and true to the teachings of the new, our fathers founded this Government upon the family as the unit of political power, with the husband as the recognized and responsible head. Under this splendid system we have marvelously progressed, materially, socially, politically, and religiously. Born but a little more than a century ago into the family of nations, we are to-day the most enlightened and best ruled Government on the globe. Why, then, should we abandon this system of government that has brought us peace, prosperity, and happiness unparalleled among the nations of the earth? [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young man my father gave me a volume of orations by Wendell Phillips. He told me that he had heard Phillips speak more than once, and that he was a man whose heart was true, whose vision was

clear, and whose gifts were great. Among these orations was one delivered at a convention in Worcester, Mass., on October 15, 1851, entitled "Woman's Rights." Phillips described this convention as "the first organized protest against the injustice which has brooded over the character and destiny of one-half of the human race."

This speech was said by George William Curtis—

To have launched that question upon the sea of popular controversy, more than any other single impulse. In the general statement of principle nothing has been added to that discourse; in vivid and effective eloquence of advocacy it has never been surpassed. All the arguments for independence echoed John Adams in the Continental Congress. All the pleas for applying the American principle of representation to the wives and mothers of American citizens echo the eloquence of Wendell Phillips at Worcester.

A few days ago I sent to the Congressional Library for this oration, and was furnished with the small pamphlet which I hold in my hand. It was published by the National American Woman Suffrage Association and contains the famous Worcester address and two other speeches on the same subject delivered in New York City in 1861 and 1866.

On the title-page are these words, written in the eighty-third year of her age, by that great and good woman, the chief heroine of her generation, who has been described as being to the cause of woman's emancipation what Garrison was to that of the slave:

The beautiful face, the fine figure, the matchless orator, the true friend was the author of these—Wendell Phillips. The like of him we shall ne'er see again.

Dated January 1, 1903, and signed Susan B. Anthony. [Applause.]

Let me read from this plea, made over 60 years ago, but every word of which is applicable to-day and will continue so until every woman is given every right, every privilege, and every liberty that any man now enjoys:

"We rest our claim on the great, eternal principle that taxation and representation must be coextensive; that rights and burdens must correspond to each other; and he who undertakes to answer the argument of this convention must first answer the whole course of English and American history for the last hundred and fifty years. No single principle of liberty has been enunciated from the year 1688 until now that does not cover the claim of woman."

* * * * * * *

"It is, therefore, on the ground of natural justice and on the ground again of the highest expediency, and yet it is because woman, as an immortal and intellectual being, has a right to all the means of education. It is on these grounds that we claim for her the civil rights and privileges which man enjoys."

* * * * * * *

"In every great reform the majority have always said to the claimant, no matter what he claimed, 'You are not fit for such a privilege.' * * * The lower classes in France claimed their civil rights—the right to vote and to direct representation in the Government; but the rich and lettered classes, the men of cultivated intellects, cried out, 'You can not be made fit.' The answer was, 'Let us try.' That France is not, as Spain, utterly crushed beneath the weight of a thousand years of misgovernment is the answer to those who doubt the ultimate success of this experiment.

"Woman stands now at the same door. She says, 'You tell me I have no intellect; give me a chance. You tell me I shall only embarrass politics; let me try.' The only reply is the same stale argument that said to the Jews of Europe, 'You are fit only to make money; you are not fit for the ranks of the Army or the halls of Parliament.' How cogent the eloquent appeal of Macauley:

"What right have we to take this question for granted? Throw open the doors of this House of Commons, throw open the ranks of the imperial army, before you deny eloquence to the countrymen of Isaiah or valor to the descendants of the Maccabees."

"It is the same now with us. Throw open the doors of Congress, throw open those courthouses, throw wide open the doors of your colleges, and give to the sisters of the Motts and Somervilles the same opportunities for culture that men have, and let the result prove what their capacity and intellect really are."

* * * * * * *

"Oh, no! You can not read history unless you read it upside down without admitting that women, cramped, fettered, excluded, degraded as she has been, has yet sometimes, with one ray of her instinctive genius, done more to settle great questions than all the cumbrous intellect of the other sex has achieved."

"Responsibility is one instrument—a great instrument—of education, both moral and intellectual. It sharpens the faculties. It unfolds the moral nature. It makes the careless prudent and turns recklessness into sobriety. Look at the young wife suddenly left a widow, with the care of her children's education and entrance into life thrown upon her. How prudent and sagacious she becomes! How fruitful in resources and comprehensive in her views! How much intellect and character she surprises her old friends with! Look at the statesman, bold and reckless, in opposition; how prudent, how thoughtful, how timid he becomes the moment he is in office and feels that a nation's welfare hangs on his decisions. Women can never study those great questions that interest and stir most deeply the human mind until she studies them under the mingled stimulus and check of this responsibility."

* * * * * * *

"And this is the last great protest against the wrong of ages. It is no argument to my mind, therefore, that the old social fabric of the past is against us."

Most of the arguments that we have heard to-day in opposition to equal suffrage are hoary with antiquity. Old and decrepit as they are, these veterans of a losing cause have again been mustered and mobilized, like the last reserves near the close of a long war, to again do duty. They have been answered long ago, most of them by Wendell Phillips, and I shall use his language from these orations to again put them to rout.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWDLE] refers with approval to the words of Saint Paul. Let us see what Phillips has to say about this interpretation of the teachings of the great apostle:

"Now, I am orthodox; I believe in the Bible; I reverence Saint Paul; I believe his was the most masterly intellect that God ever gave to the race; I believe he was the connecting link, the bridge, by which the Asiatic and European mind were joined. I believe that Plato ministers at his feet—but after all he was a man, and not God. He was limited and liable to mistake. You can not anchor this western continent to the Jewish footstool of Saint Paul; and after all, that is the difficulty—religious prejudice. It is not the fashion, we shall beat it; it is not the fastidiousness of the exquisite, we shall smother it; it is the religious prejudice, borrowed from a mistaken interpretation of the New Testament. That is the real Gibraltar with which we are to grapple, and my argument with that is simply this, you left it when you founded a republic; you left it when you inaugurated western civilization; we must grow out of one root."

The gentleman from Ohio is also quite confident that when women vote political differences will cause discord in families. Those of us who reside in the equal-suffrage States know that there is no merit in this contention, but let Phillips answer him:

"'Let women vote!' cries one. 'Why, wives and daughters might be Democrats, while their fathers and husbands were Whigs. It would never do. It would produce endless quarrels.'"

And the self-satisfied objector thinks he has settled the question.

"But if the principle be a sound one, why not apply it in a still more important instance? Difference of religion breeds more quarrels than difference in politics. Yet we allow women to choose their own religious creeds, although we thereby run the risk of wives being Episcopalians while their husbands are Methodists, or daughters Catholics while their fathers are Calvinists. Yet who this side of Turkey dare claim that the law should compel women to have no religious creed or adopt that of their male relatives? Practically, this freedom in religion has made no difficulty; and probably equal freedom in politics would make as little."

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] told us that the man and woman mind are essentially different. Let me read the answer of Wendell Phillips to that argument:

"Suppose woman, though equal, to differ essentially in her intellect from man; is that any ground for disfranchising them? Shall the Fultons say to the Raphaels, 'Because you can not make steam engines, therefore you shall not vote'? Shall the Napoleons or the Washingtons say to the Wordsworths or the Herschels, 'Because you can not lead armies and govern States, therefore you shall have no civil rights'?"

In his address delivered at Cooper Institute, New York City, on May 10, 1861, Phillips discussed this phase of the question in more detail.

"Then, again, men say, 'She is so different from man that God did not mean she should vote.' Is she? Then I do not know how to vote for her. One of two things is true: She is either exactly like man—exactly like him, teetotally like him—and if she is, then a ballot box based upon brains belongs to her as well as to him; or she is different, and then I do not know how to vote for her. If she is like me—so much like me that I know just as well how to vote for her as she knows how

to vote for herself—then, the very basis of the ballot box being capacity, she being the same as I, has the same right to vote; and if she is so different that she has a different range of avocations and powers and capacities, then it is necessary she should go into the legislature and with her own voice say what she wants and write her wishes into statute books, because nobody is able to interpret her. Choose which horn of the dilemma you please, for on the one or the other the question of the right of woman to vote must hang."

The gentleman from Texas has said that God purposely made men and women different and for different lines of activity. Phillips is in entire agreement with him on this fundamental fact, but draws an entirely different conclusion from it:

"I do not think woman is identical with man. I think if she was, marriage would be a very stupid state. God made the races and the sexes the complement one of the other, and not the identical copy. I think the world, and literature itself, would be barren and insipid if it was not for this exquisite variety of capacities and endowments with which God has variegated the human race. I think woman is different from man, and by reason of that very difference she should be in legislative halls and everywhere else in order to protect herself."

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] insists that we are thrusting the ballot into the hands of women even though they do not ask it, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is entirely persuaded that a very large majority of American women are utterly opposed to equal suffrage. This is the answer of Wendell Phillips to that argument:

"The age of physical power is gone, and we want to put ballots into the hands of women. We do not wait for women to ask for them. When I argue the temperance question I do not go down to the drunkard and ask, 'Do you want a prohibitory law?' I know what is good for him a great deal better than he does. When I meet an ignorant set of boys in the street I don't say, 'My poor little ignoramuses, would you like to have a system of public schools?' I know a great deal better what is good for them than they do. Our fathers established public schools before dunces asked for them."

The gentleman from North Carolina is likewise firm in the faith that woman's sphere is the home. He would not distract her attention from the fireside shrine, where she presides as the reigning sovereign and the uncrowned queen, by forcing her into the vortex of politics. This is what Wendell Phillips has to say about woman's sphere:

"We do not attempt to settle what shall be the profession, education, or employment of woman. We have not that presumption. What we ask is simply this, what all other classes have asked before, leave it to woman to choose for herself her profession, her education, and her sphere. We deny to any portion of the species the right to prescribe to any other portion its sphere, its education, or its rights. We deny the right of any individual to prescribe to any other individual his amount of education or his rights. The sphere of each man, of each woman, of each individual, is that sphere which he can, with the highest exercise of his power, perfectly fill."

And again, Phillips says:

"Make the case our own. Is there any man here willing to resign his own right to vote and trust his welfare and his earnings entirely to the votes of others? Suppose any class of men should condescendingly offer to settle for us our capacity or our calling—to vote for us, to choose our sphere for us. How ridiculously impertinent we should consider it. Yet few have the good sense to laugh at the consummate impertinence with which every barroom brawler, every third-rate scribbler, undertakes to settle the sphere of the Martineaus and the De Staels. With what gracious condescension little men continue to lecture and preach on 'the female sphere' and 'female duties.'"

* * * * * * *

"But as for woman, her time must be all so entirely filled in taking care of her household, her cares must be so extensive that neither those of soldiers nor sailors nor merchants can be equal to them. She has not a moment to qualify her for politics. Woman can not be spared long enough from the kitchen to put in a vote, though Abbott Lawrence can be spared from the countinghouse, though Gen. Gaines or Scott can be spared from the camp, though the Lorings and the Choates can be spared from the courts. This is the argument: Stephen Girard can not go to Congress; he is too busy; therefore no man ever shall. Because Gen. Scott has gone to Mexico, and can not be President; therefore no man shall be. Because A. B. is a sailor, gone on a whaling voyage, to be absent for three years, and can not vote, therefore no male inhabitant ever shall. Logic—how profound, how conclusive. Yet this is the exact reasoning in the case of woman."

Almost every gentleman who has spoken to-day in opposition to this resolution began his remarks by an eloquent tribute to womankind, praising them as jewels and stars and angels and the queens and princesses of our hearts. They prize them so highly, however, that they can not bear to think of these delicate and charming creatures participating in politics. Wendell Phillips has completely demolished this argument with his unanswerable logic:

"Does our sense of natural justice dictate that the being who is to suffer under the laws shall first personally assent to them; that the being whose industry government is to burden should have a voice in fixing the character and amount of that burden? Then, while woman is admitted to the gallows, the jail, and the tax list, we have no right to debar her from the ballot box. 'But to go there will hurt that delicacy of character which we have always thought peculiarly her grace.' I can not help that. Let Him who created her capable of politics and made it just that she should have a share in them see to it that these rights which He has conferred do not injure the being He created. Is it for any human being to trample on the laws of justice and liberty from an alleged necessity of helping God govern what He has made? I can not help God govern His world by telling lies or doing what my conscience deems unjust. How absurd to deem it necessary that anyone should do so! When Infinite Wisdom established the rules of right and honesty He saw to it that justice should be always the highest expediency."

In closing let me submit to those who doubt the expediency of adopting equal suffrage at this time, who concede the principle but prefer to postpone the event for reasons of policy, these words from one whose courage for righteousness never faltered in a fight for a just cause:

"The broadest and most far-sighted intellect is utterly unable to foresee the ultimate consequence of any great social change. Ask yourself, on all such occasions, if there be any element of right or wrong in the question, any principle of clear natural justice that turns the scale. If so, take part with the perfect and abstract right and trust God to see that it shall prove the expedient." [Applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago the State of Colorado gave its women the ballot. For 21 years the women of Colorado have voted at every election, and in that time they have been called upon to make a choice between candidates for every office from President of the United States to the constable of a precinct.

When the question of giving the women the ballot was before us, all the arguments that have been submitted here to-day were thrashed out.

We were told that the women did not want the ballot; but after they received it, we found that they voted in the same proportion as the men.

We were told that there was something mysterious about politics, something mysterious about the art of government which made it impossible for a woman to understand its intricacies; but as soon as the amendment was placed upon the statute books the women organized study clubs all over the State. They took up the study of political problems, and when they went to the ballot box for the first time we found they were fully as well qualified to cast a ballot as were the men.

We were told that if we gave the women the ballot our homes would be destroyed. And yet, my friends, the homes of Colorado are intact to-day. Our women have not become truculent amazons; our churches are still maintained and are full of worshipers; our schools are in operation and are overflowing with rosy-cheeked youngsters. In fact, my friends, none of the dire predictions made by the opponents of woman suffrage has come to pass.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman comes from a State that has had woman suffrage for 21 years. Is there any advantage that will arise from the adoption of this amendment to the State of Colorado?

Mr. KEATING. The State of Colorado will benefit to the same extent as every other State of this Union. Every State will benefit by the enactment of a measure which grants substantial justice to one-half the adult population of the country. [Applause.]

Colorado is as much interested in this proposition as Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania is as much interested as Colorado.

Colorado insists that you shall not place one-half of the intellect of the country in a safety deposit box and refuse to permit it to operate on the problems of government. And Colorado insists that this change shall be carried out according to the terms of the Constitution. We hold that the States have entered into a voluntary agreement that the Constitution may be amended under certain conditions. We are not asking for revolution; we are asking for evolution. We are asking that the Constitution be amended as Pennsylvania agreed it should be amended, and as every other State agreed it should be amended and when it is so amended, whether Pennsylvania agrees to that amendment or not, she will have no right to object.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman vote to submit an amendment to the various States prohibiting the States from granting the right of franchise to women?

Mr. KEATING. I would not vote for what I believe would be considered by the people of this country as an absolute absurdity, and I would not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to do it.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. No. You concede to Pennsylvania her right to manage her own affairs.

Mr. KEATING. I concede to Pennsylvania her constitutional rights, and her constitutional rights are to determine who shall vote within her borders up to the time that the Constitution of the United States is changed, and not for one minute longer. [Applause.] When we change the Constitution, then Pennsylvania and South Carolina and all the other States will have to come in under the Constitution. [Applause.]

Many silly and some cruelly slanderous stories have been told concerning the operation of woman suffrage in Colorado. A few years ago the men of the State formed a society for the purpose of denying these falsehoods and refuting these slanders. In indicating his sympathy with the work Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS, now senior Senator from Colorado, said:

> The one offensive feature of equal suffrage has been the flood of blackguardly abuse heaped upon our women by foes of the movement. Scavengers, commissioned to attack and defame, have made pretense of studying our lives, thoughts, laws, and institutions between trains. The supposition that inclusion in the responsibilities of citizenship implies the instant degradation of our wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters can only proceed from mental perversion and degeneracy.

My mother accompanied me to one of my first party caucuses. My wife votes; my sisters vote. Mine is not an exceptional case. On election morning you can stand at any polling place in any precinct in Colorado and see scores of mothers, wives, and daughters accompanying their male relatives to the polling places.

For many years the polling place in my precinct was located in a church. The three election judges and the two clerks were women who lived in the neighborhood; some of them, undoubtedly, members of the church in which they performed their official duties. The voters who gathered there on election morning were friends and neighbors. The proceedings were as orderly as any ever held within that sacred edifice.

I have been told that in some of the Eastern and Southern States polling places are located in the rear rooms of saloons and in other questionable places which no respectable woman would want to enter. Of course we would not tolerate that sort of thing in Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is a natural right, an "unalienable right," in the sense in which that term is used in the Declaration of Independence.

> We hold that it is a self-evident truth that all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those are the words of the Declaration of Independence.

"Endowed with certain unalienable rights." Endowed by whom? Not by some prince or president or emperor, but by God himself.

Gentlemen argue that there is no such thing as an "unalienable right," and in a sense that is true, for society has the power, if it has the disposition, to deprive us of even those rights specifically mentioned in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet the fact that society has the power to deprive us of those rights does not prove that it is justified in doing so, and Democrats, particularly, should scrutinize with jealous care any proposal looking to the limitation of man's God-given privileges.

To my mind the right to vote is the most important of all man's natural rights, and without this right all other rights are insecure.

The freeman knows only two weapons with which he may defend his rights. One is the rifle; the other is the ballot. Deprive him of the latter and he will appeal to the former.

The fathers of the Republic had this thought in mind when they declared that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." How can the governed indicate their consent if they are deprived of the ballot?

And does anyone pretend that women are not among those governed?

But the opponents of woman suffrage say society has a right to limit suffrage in defense of the common good. We are willing to concede that the mentally and morally deficient may properly be excluded, and we are willing to concede that there are moral and mental defectives among the women of this country, but how about the great mass of women who are neither mentally nor morally defective? On what ground does society presume to say that these citizens of a Republic shall not have a voice in the government to which they are expected to yield obedience?

Is it because they are not the physical equals of man? Surely we have not reached that point in our national development where the human being with the biggest muscle is accounted the best citizen. Judged by that standard, Jack Johnson would be the first citizen of the Republic. Is it because women do not perform their share of the world's work? If so, turn to your census reports and learn that millions of women are to-day engaged in gainful occupations, working side by side with their fathers, husbands, and brothers.

Is it because women have not a "stake" in the Nation—because they do not own property and pay taxes? Why, some of our richest citizens are women, and four out of five of the men who own their own rooftrees will tell you that the nest egg which they have laid aside for a rainy day was accumulated through the tireless thrift and marvelous self-sacrifice of the women of the house.

Or is it because women are not men's intellectual equals? I can not believe that that is your excuse, for every schoolhouse, every college, and every university in the land gives the lie to the assertion.

If it is conceded that woman does her share of the world's work, contributes her proportion of the taxes with which the machinery of a government is operated, and is the mental equal of man, then in Heaven's name what excuse can be offered for depriving her of the most sacred right of a free citizen in a free country?

More than 60 years ago a great Jewess, who had fled from her native land to escape religious persecution, stated the case much more succinctly and eloquently than I could hope to present it:

> We ask for our rights not as a gift of charity but as an act of justice, for it is in accordance with the principles of republicanism that as woman has to pay taxes to maintain government she has a right to participate in the formation and administration of it; that as she is amenable to the laws of her country she is entitled to a voice in their enactment and to all the protective advantages they can bestow; that as she is as liable as man to all the vicissitudes of life she ought to enjoy the same social rights and privileges. Any difference, therefore, in political, civil, and social rights on account of sex is in direct violation of the principles of justice and humanity, and as such ought to be held up to the contempt and derision of every lover of human freedom.

I do not believe we will win this fight to-day. It is probable that the majority against the proposed amendment will be quite large, but I would remind our friends and our opponents that "to-morrow is also a day."

Equal suffrage is coming to the people of this country as surely as death and taxes. When you opened the door of the schoolhouse to the little girl you set her feet in the path which will lead her to the ballot box in the maturity of her womanhood. It is evolution, not revolution. The ballot needs woman and woman needs the ballot. Equal suffrage will not bring the millennium, but it will make this Government a little more representative of the people who live under it.

My distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] presents an interesting psychological study. He is what might be described as a "throw back"—a twentieth century man who thinks in the terms of the eighteenth century. The thought concerning woman's sphere which he sought to express here to-day is not new. A great Frenchman once expressed it in this fashion:

> To please, to be useful to us, to make us love and esteem them, to educate us when young, to take care of us when grown up, to advise, to console us, to render our lives easy and agreeable, these are the duties of women at all times and what they should be taught in their infancy.

That paragraph was written by Jean Jacques Rousseau about 150 years ago. That will serve to show the gentleman from Texas just how far he will have to travel in order to catch up with the procession. That sentiment was not taken very seriously even in Rousseau's time. It can only provoke a smile to-day.

The modern thought has been expressed by Max Eastman, and I take the liberty of quoting it:

> It is not expected by the best advocates of this change that women will reform politics or purge society of evil, but it is expected, with

reasoned and already proved certainty, that political knowledge and experience will develop women. Political responsibility, the character it demands and the recognition it receives, will alter the nature and function of women in society to the benefit of themselves and their husbands and their children and their homes. Upon that ground they declare that it is of vital importance to the advance of civilized life, not only to give the ballot to those women who want it but to rouse those women who do not yet know enough to want it to a better appreciation of the great age in which they live.

Mr. Speaker, a I entered the House to-day a most interesting document was placed in my hands. It was a copy of a resolution presented to the constitutional convention of Texas 40 years ago by Judge W. T. G. Weaver, a great orator and a learned jurist, and father of one of our well-loved colleagues. Coming from the pen of a man born and bred in the South, it constitutes an illuminating contribution to the discussion which is engaging our attention. I ask to make the resolution a part of my remarks, as follows:

From page 191, journal of the Texas constitutional convention of 1875. Proceedings of September 22, 1875. Resolution by Judge W. T. G. Weaver:

"*Resolved*, That woman, being by ordinances of nature the mother of all living human beings, that, if we accept Hebrew traditions, the word 'Eve' typically means the mother of all living, and that, as mother, wife, sister, and daughter, she has the first care of our lives, is our nurse in childhood, our mentor in youth, our companion, helper, and consoler in manhood; our comforting, ministering, and sustaining angel in death, even at the birth, trial, death, and resurrection of Jesus, in the beautiful faith of Christianity, constant to him in the midst of monocracy and despotism; and that in history, wherever she has had the power to speak and act for herself, in the great majority of cases she has risen above the masses, like the full moon out of night's bosom, to shine with the light of beauty, virtue, charity, and truth over the moral darkness around her; and that, in this land of republican faith and representative, democratic government, by every recognition of modern, enlightened Christian civilization, she is morally and mentally man's equal; that the same 'inalienable rights' that Jefferson has made household words in every land, where human liberty has found a home or an advocate, are as much woman's as man's; that she is a citizen as much of these United States, by the same natural rights of citizenship, as man; that the elective franchise, being founded on these natural rights of the people, and inasmuch as woman is of the people and must be governed by the laws made by the people and is often a taxpayer, there is no reason, political, human, or divine—Paul to the contrary notwithstanding—why she should not have the same rights at the ballot box that man has.

"*Resolved further*, That the writer hereof believes that the presence of woman at the ballot box, as an American sovereign, connected with the feminal influence of a virtuous woman, as a legal voter, would do more to protect that shrine of the people's rights than all the laws to guard the elective franchise that have heretofore been passed."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. DECKER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I come from a State that has not extended suffrage to woman, but I sincerely hope that a new enlightenment will soon place my State among the States that have. [Applause.] I also belong to a party whose platform in the last election in the State I partly represent pledged itself to equal suffrage. I listened to an argument made to-day to the effect that if you gave the suffrage to woman she would not vote. In the largest town in my district in the last election 6,007 votes were not polled. Would you disfranchise all of the men in that district because of those unpolled votes?

Can not woman, who is the superior of man because she is the mother of man, be trusted in the making of laws that govern man? Who knows better what is good for man than the mother who bore him?

Do you men who are opposed to suffrage for women consider your wife, your mother, your sister, or your daughter unfit to determine what is best to do for good of country, State, or city?

As a matter of fact do you not consult the judgment of one or all in matters most important?

Is not the woman whose hand, heart, and head are the directing forces in the family, able to take part in directing Government by her vote?

The priceless jewel of motherhood is her manly son. Can not you trust a mother to make laws to best govern that son?

In times of trial and tribulation the comfort and advice of woman is sought and given to man; as she helps and sustains him, so can she help and sustain the Government by her vote.

There would be no dirty politics were pure, clean women the politicians. The law-abiding, decent man engaged in any business has no need to fear the power of suffrage in the hand of woman.

The rights of the States will never suffer by reason of voting women, but the wrongs of many will be righted.

Good women, like good men, will never be lowered by politics, but politics will be put on a higher level by reason of woman's participation.

The trend of the times is toward equal suffrage. The man who does not realize it does not keep track of what is going on. His eyes or his head is bad.

The near future will see the realization of the effort of to-day.

Eventually equal suffrage; why not now? [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is probably true that few people who think do not believe that the greatest stiffener in self-respect and quickener in diligence for duty is the consciousness that one has the right to provide by law for personal security. It has been said here, or words to that effect, that if women are allowed to vote they will neglect their work. Is that so with men, since they can vote? It is said, further, that if women vote, they will become wrangling politicians and get themselves elected to Congress. [Laughter.] We all know that mere politicians are never elected to anything. There are no politicians here. These are statesmen, all. [Laughter.]

It has been further said that if women vote, chivalry will go out of flower and never bloom again. Put it down, that kind of chivalry is spurious. When women vote they will receive more chivalrous attention than ever, for they will have added to their amiability, beauty, and intelligence the charm of power. This day's work has shown the splendor of the advance of the cause of equal rights. Men differ as to the channel through which it shall come, but there have been few discordant notes to mar the high conceptions that move the membership of the House; indeed, only one exposed the dimensions of his prejudice through the indulgence of his descriptive genius.

The first real thing in constitutions went into effect on April 30, 1789, just 14 years and 11 days after its founders and makers began to cut down the timbers at Lexington, in Massachusetts, April 19, 1775.

It was and is the greatest of civic productions, for while its expression illustrates the primacy, dimensions, and power of its conceptions, its operation has shown its adaptability, utility, and efficiency in the just government of men.

The very word "constitution" was hateful to those who controlled affairs in that and preceding ages.

It meant too much of definiteness and clarity as to the rights and security of the people, and it infringed and exposed the vagaries of irresponsible power, which thrives best where ignorance is dense and general and morals are low.

Since then physical remoteness and slow communication have been overcome by discovery and invention, so that now every part of the Republic is nearer every other part than one part of a single county was to most parts of the same county a century and a quarter ago, although our territorial extent has multiplied many times; and we are homogeneous as well as numerical, regardless of intervening rivers, mountains, plains, and even oceans.

No questionable act of government can now be done that will not be known by everybody, everywhere, practically within the hour.

Publicity in civics is the guardian angel of free institutions.

Despotism can not bear the light, its littleness and meanness shrivel and wither under the gaze of modern intelligence and moral sensibility.

Local self-government is as useful and necessary as the succession of the seasons and the procession of the celestial planets, but

Centralization in the eighteenth century was a most different thing than centralization in the twentieth century; indeed, even austere and conservative men, as well as the mercurial opportunist, now speak with a complacency approaching enthusiasm of the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

The proposed amendment does not contemplate the repression or restriction of the rights and the power of the people; on the contrary it seeks to sensitize and extend them.

Men have been about the sole artificers in the construction and conduct of government, and there is now on exhibition, with Europe as the stage and a horrified world as the audience, the superlative illustration of the bleeding and burning handiwork of men.

Men are slow either to yield or to divide power, but then, in extenuation or mitigation, it must justly be said they are swift to add to that which they have. It has always been that way; the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

This has held up progress and has stood in the way of the prevalence of equal rights.

Some brave and true men started the evolution of our Government, and they pushed it along and forward and upward with the utmost pains, patience, faith, and courage.

They had no model, but they had clear minds, far sight, and high purpose. They laid it out on lines that would expand and respond to facts and ideas as they should become known. They did not set much store by the Medo-Persian law "that changeth not."

They knew that power must be kept near the hands of the people or it would be abused, and yet that it must be put beyond the reach of temporary popular frenzy.

That is why they said it would need two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate to formulate and set in motion any change in the Constitution for submission to the States.

They also had abiding confidence that intelligent, sensitive, and honorable men formulating an amendment, upon petition or otherwise, that would vitally affect the rights and the happiness of the people, would see to it that so great an issue should not be made the butt of arbitrary or vacillating official dictum.

They did not intend that the agent always and not the principal should pronounce the owner's ultimate will, for they knew the sacred story of "the hands of Esau, but the voice of Jacob."

A petition implies there is one who needs that which another can give.

Esther, the queen, knew Ahasuerus, the king, could give or take anything within his dominions of one hundred and seven and twenty provinces. She knew also that if her petition were not received with favor her life was forfeit, but she preferred her petition and saved her people.

Daniel was a mighty supplicator, who made his petition three times each day, and he had such wisdom bestowed upon him that he was the profoundest interpreter and wisest counselor of that or any age.

John of England had a poor ear for petitions. He could see no reason for them, nor could he comprehend their importance until the radiance of the daggers of his barons at Runnymede, 700 years ago, come June next, illuminated his sluggish intellect and taught him that there are human rights which even a king can neither dissipate nor deny.

The American colonists complained that the right of petition was denied them and their wrongs were ignored. They published their lamentations in the form of a declaration, denouncing the sovereign and the sovereignty that refused to hear them; then they flung the king and his scepter into the sea, and when they had assuaged their indignation they wrote and put into force a Constitution, in which they embalmed the sacred right of petition, and they made sure and ample provision for the amendment of the Constitution whenever the light of experience should reveal that it ought to be done.

More American citizens than all the people that lived in this land when that Constitution was proclaimed are now asking the Congress to set in motion the process provided in that great instrument to promote their welfare by broadening their constitutional guaranties, and to that end to enlarge the suffrage by amendment of the Federal Constitution.

Shall the Congress, like the king whom they therefore abolished, refuse to hear them?

There is no function in the all-pervading power of Congress that so vividly illustrates its dignity as its dominance of the form and substance of any and all amendments to the Constitution.

The fundamental law of the Republic can not be adjusted to the light of modern evolution if the Congress is not in step with the progress of the age.

The people may see visions and they may dream dreams, but these can not fructify if the Congress sees fit to interpose its interceptive dictum.

But with power goes responsibility, and the abuse of the one or the neglect of the other will invite swift retribution.

There is not one among us who does not know that the strength of the Republic is derived from the intelligence of the people, and that if our institutions are to endure that strength must be cultivated and utilized.

It follows logically that it is eminently due and pertinent that the Congress should inquire whether the average intelligence of our electoral expression would be lowered if women voted;

Whether the refinement of qualification to vote, as it now obtains, would be degraded if our wives and daughters were brought within its purview;

Whether because one person does not care to vote is a good reason why another person should not be allowed to vote;

Whether it raises an inscrutable question of mental atrophy for one to say he or she is indifferent to the right of franchise;

Whether there is a single instance of any in the quick and not of the dead who does not desire to control his or her own property and to have the right to provide by law for the security of life, liberty, and honor; and

Whether, if this is an age of counsel and progress, of facilitation and celerity, and of adjustment and sensitiveness to the rights of others, it is reasonable to express amazement, criticism, or resentment when constitutionally recognized citizens of the Republic ask to be admitted to the right of franchise.

Such a petition is permeated and attended with all the muniments of dignity.

It conveys the express will of the sovereign to those deputed to perform the functions of subordinate legislation, to formulate and facilitate the purpose to have submitted to the States and thereby their electors the question whether the right of franchise shall be enlarged.

The issue is by no means confined to whether the Members of Congress personally favor the extension of the franchise, but whether the States shall be denied or confirmed in their power to say what shall be the constitutional rights of American citizens.

The right of suffrage is as old as the human race. It is the bedrock upon which the sovereignty of the people rests; its denial is the act, the trick, the subterfuge of the usurper, and it is now wholly forbidden only within the pale of despotism.

It was the refusal of a voice in affairs that drove our ancestors into rebellion against the King and that justified them to themselves in the destruction of private property as their only means of audibly expressing their indignation against injustice; and it was that same wrong that thrust monarchy from the land of the setting sun.

What do the women of this country seek? Is it anything more than their fathers wrung from the crown by the bloody assize of war?

Do they ask for pensions, for preferences, for special privileges, or is it only for a fair field and no favor in the struggle for existence?

If it is true that half of the adult people of the United States have no voice in making the laws under which they live nor adjusting the revenues to which they must contribute, how do we account for our slogan of "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none"?

We have always declared in words that glitter and gleam, "Taxation without representation is usurpation," and yet we deny to women a single word in making the rates and levies through which we compel them to pay hundreds of millions in taxes annually.

Our duplicity outshines our consistency, overmasters our delicacy, and obliterates the last vestige of justice.

The smallest discernible object on earth is the man who boasts dominion over his wife's property.

At what jocund time, in what roseate place, and by what sinuous and sinister means did man acquire the right to violate every rubric of the square deal and to play the small despot?

We laud the Declaration of Independence and point with the scintillating glamor of pride to the fervid arraignment of the King "for imposing taxes on us without our consent," and then proceed to perpetrate the same tyranny on those most dear to us. We place a celestial halo upon the brow of the King by comparison.

Was not that world-convulsing document written by the hands and sanctified by the blood of our common forbears?

Where lies the keener intelligence and the major devotion of the human race?

Are these virtues luminously conspicuous and decorative only in the personality of those who now possess and parade the inestimable power of the franchise?

It is a matter of common knowledge, and no less of pride and satisfaction, that the minds and manners of the rising generation are largely formed and trained by women; and this is neither artificial nor abnormal, but on the contrary it is natural, spontaneous, and beneficial, for there is neither light nor the suggestion of betterment that women are not swift to discern, appreciate, and diffuse. And if this is true, why should we seek to deprive the Republic of the intuitive, subtle, intellectual strength of this boundless source of service?

Are the circumscriptions of the political influence of women to be the proof not only of the survival of prejudice but of its most obstructive culmination?

Is prejudice an illuminant; is it an embellishment?

Does custom sanctify imbecility?

Of whom here that has utility—real, fructifying mentality—has it not been asked, "Who is his mother?" not "Who is his father?"

For ages the firmament has been vocal with applause, the pages of history aflame with eulogy of her foresight, her judgment, and her triumphs.

Would we have exemplifications of her world work?

Who, then, had the prescience to consciously know and the courage of conviction to supply the means to lift the veil from this continent?

Was it Ferdinand of Aragon—the King, the man—or was it Isabella of Castile—the Queen, the woman?

Who drove the invader from France, restored her cities, and reestablished her sovereignty? Was it Charles VII—the King, the man—or was it Joan of Arc, the maid of Domremy?

Was it Francis of Lorraine, Emperor consort, her husband, or was it Maria Theresa herself who rescued Austria-Hungary from the clutches of her insatiable military neighbors and saved the realms of the House of Hapsburg?

The instances of the genius of women for affairs of government are numberless as the stars.

In the cabinet, in the field, in art, in science, in literature, in philosophy, who denies the transcendent intellectual power of women?

Aside from the equities, is it wise to debar this limitless influence, this matchless intelligence from participation in the elucidation of the problems of the Republic?

Like the surging roar of the sounding sea comes the ceaseless and swelling demand that we shall gravely consider the relation of this majestic potentiality to the future of our country.

Is the lurid exhibition of discourtesy and hoodlumism on Pennsylvania Avenue a year ago to be the gauge and guerdon of American civilization?

Has it come to such a pass that it is necessary not only that women should have the franchise, but that they should bear arms to protect themselves from those who are now clothed with the royal right to vote?

Election day is a sovereign day, and should be made a day of sacramental dignity and solemnity.

Shall not our own flesh and blood serve with us at this altar of honor and power?

Who ever increased his estate or enhanced his happiness by subjecting either to the animadversions of a courtier?

Who does not know that over-sweet words make bitter lives?

Paens of adulation, compliment, and admiration are delectable, but they are not dependable; they fade like the mists of the morning in times of stress.

Laws made by those who must live under them and sustain them are the only safe refuge in the mutations of human affairs.

We talk of the good red blood in our veins; is the proof of the color of our personal ichor established by our denial of equal rights to others?

Is it just, magnanimous, or honorable to refuse to others that which we demand for ourselves?

Only unreal men titter and sneer at those who have the splendid courage to try to dissipate prejudice, establish justice, and make an end of a hideous wrong.

Are we conscious of the throb of modernity in civilization?

Was the just, the wise, the martyr, Abraham Lincoln mad when he said: "I go for all who bear arms or who pay taxes, to be admitted to the franchise, by no means excluding females"?

The issue is fundamental. Shall it be postponed by the exertion of the procrastinating power of the House, or shall we rend this ragged remnant of the mantle of despotism from our unwilling shoulders?

Shall we, like the King, refuse to hear the petition?

A tumultuous call is clanging from the hills and sobbing from the valleys for equal rights to all.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. CLINE. Just time enough to say that I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the various arguments that have been advanced. I desire to touch upon one or two of these arguments. Those who are opposed to this proposition are especially insistent that this will deprive the State of one of its rights. I can not see how that argument has any pertinence. This is a proposition to submit to the States the question of whether they desire to change the fundamental law. The States, through their legislatures, elected for that purpose, are to determine whether they desire this change or not, and it seems to me that we need not concern ourselves on that point. Let the States settle that when this resolution finally comes before the various legislatures. This States rights argument like arguments against a measure upon the ground that it is unconstitutional is made so often against propositions that are not favored that it is somewhat discredited. It is often made for lack of a better argument.

In line with this doctrine of States rights it is claimed that the Constitution never would have been ratified had this proposition been a part of it and that this right of the States to deprive women of a right to vote is so sacred that it must not be departed from. True there was a time when it would have been idle to have submitted such a resolution as this with any hope of its passage. But during the years that have intervened since the formation of our Government many changes have occurred. Woman no longer occupies the same position in society. She is no longer the dependent, helpless, ignorant person of a century ago. She has risen to a position that gives her a right to ask for equal, fair, and just treatment.

It has been urged that woman is not qualified to vote, and a good many things that seem to me flippant have been said against her. I am not going to defend her. She needs no defense at my hands. It is too late to question her qualifications. She has long since demonstrated her qualifications in the States where for years she has voted. No one in this argument has challenged her course where she has exercised the right which she asks you to accord to her. See what is going on to-day in our public schools. It is the girl, and not the boy, that wins the honors. The graduates from our high schools are largely girls. She is everywhere the teacher of the boys who become our voters, and is now engaged in almost every occupation in life in successful competition with men. She has as good an opportunity to become acquainted with public affairs as men and may be relied upon to act as honestly and intelligently. The right to vote would give her a new and enlarged sphere of usefulness, which would help to develop her powers, just as it helps men.

One of the most amusing and to me ridiculous arguments is the contention that if women are given the right to vote they will be dragged into the mire of dirty politics and will neglect their homes and their children. Those who urge this objection appear to think that all women will immediately go on a strike if we pass this resolution; that from then on they will devote their entire time and attention to voting. Bless your soul, why does not the right to vote affect men in this same way? If the loss of a day or a few hours each year spent in voting is such a tremendous loss to society, why should not men forego the privilege of voting? The men who make this argument appear to assume that men as a class are engaged in dirty politics; that the exercise of the franchise has a debasing influence from which women should be shielded. They urge that the right to vote would corrupt, blunt, and destroy all her finer sensibilities. This argument is not new; it was made against admitting women to our colleges so they might be educated side by side with men. Grave and learned professors protested against that innovation. They protested on the same grounds as are now urged against suffrage for women. She would become debased, lose all her finer sensibilities, neglect her home, her children, and her husband. No doubt some of the men who made this argument still believe it to be true. They are standpatters of the old school and can see no good in anything that does not have the stamp of the fathers. But the world will move on, and the day will come when those who to-day sneer at the women who ask a right to vote will wish that some of their speeches might be forgotten. Why should not a woman have the same protection as a man? The ballot is his great weapon of defense. She has property upon which she is taxed; she has business interests as well as he; she has the home, with all its sacred interests to protect. The home and its interests are safer in her hands than in her husband's. Why should we not give her the power to protect it? You will refuse it to her to-day, you have the power, but if it is right that women should vote, as I firmly believe that it is, she will win some day, and when she does the men who have belittled and ridiculed her to-day will find but little satisfaction in the cheap applause which they have coveted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

The SPEAKER. For how long?

Mr. STAFFORD. Such time as the gentleman wishes to use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

[Mr. Bartholdt addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I should like to inquire how much time there is left.

The SPEAKER. Fifty-four minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. How is that time divided?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] has 2 minutes, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr.

TAYLOR] 17 minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 13 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] 17 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My understanding is that those who favor the resolution have the right to close, and I reserve that right if I have it.

The SPEAKER. The proponents of the measure have the right to close. That is the rule in every parliamentary body in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen favoring the proposition have more time than those in opposition. I suggest that gentlemen in favor of the proposition use some of their time. We shall have only two speeches in opposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall have only two speeches on this side.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, fundamental democracy is found in two great State papers and is expressed by a sentence of one great statesman. One of the State papers is the Declaration of Independence, and the reference I have in mind is the purpose of government as there expressed:

> All men are created equal, and governments are instituted among men to secure certain rights, among which are life, liberty, and happiness, and the right to govern must come from the consent of the governed.

That is fundamental, as expressed in our democracy by Thomas Jefferson. The other great State paper, which Mr. Gladstone said was the greatest single instrument ever stricken off by the brain or purpose of man, is the Constitution:

> The establishment of justice, the promotion of the general welfare, and the security of the blessings of liberty.

These are the best statements of fundamental democracy yet expressed in the history of government in the world. One great statesman couched it in a single sentence when he said:

> Government of the people, for the people, by the people.

Taking these fundamental statements, I ask this legislative body whether you believe that the term "people" and the term "men" exclude women in the conception of the writers of those principles. No one certainly would claim that the women have no interest in the establishment of justice and in the promotion of the general welfare or in the security of the blessings of liberty, and nobody certainly would state that a government of the people, for the people, by the people, is for men and not for women.

The question I ask of this body is, Will these principles be better subserved by a government made for the women than it will be by a government made by the women, or by the addition of the influences that they can give with that of men is the making of laws? Why do we admit women to the schools, admit them to the churches, admit them into industrial life, admit them in everything that makes for a better civilization save the law-making agency of the Government? Why is she excluded from this field of influence? She is not excluded from the church, she is in the church and by being in it she does not lessen her own influence, she does not become less womanly, but she does do the church good and the Nation at large. She is in the school and is the most telling instrument in the education of the Nation. She does not harm the school; she benefits the school, and in her work she does not make herself less womanly. We admit her in the industries. Eight millions of them are in the industries. Her influence in the industries has not made her a less useful agent in the betterment of the world, but she has in a sense helped the agency that should make the world better. The evils in the factory system as they exist will be lessened by her exercise of the ballot. She is admitted to the practice of law. She has not reduced the dignity of the profession and has maintained her own dignity. She is admitted into the ministry in certain churches. She has not in this field or in the home lessened her influence. She does not become less womanly and she does elevate the ministry and the particular religious sphere in which she operates. She is admitted in medicine. She has not lost her womanliness by going into medicine. In the art of healing she has not harmed the public that she serves. I ask again, Why shall women be admitted to every profession, to every avenue of achievement, in all of which she has not only maintained her womanliness but has exalted her profession, and be denied the privilege of using the ballot, the only agent she has to put into effective enforcement the principles that she tries to represent in these other various avenues into which she is admitted? The one weapon she needs must have to materialize in law what she stands for in daily life is the ballot. To me it is hard to understand how I can justify myself in demanding the ballot for myself, and at the same time deny it to my wife and declare that my sister must not have it. It is also difficult for me to understand why men will say, "We do not want to extend to her the ballot, because politics is a dirty pool."

If politics is a dirty pool, then for God's sake admit her in order to clean it up. Your statement argues that exclusive manhood suffrage is a failure. Woman's influence is demanded by your confession. That is the purpose for the urgency for her admission into this activity. Fellow Members, I have listened to almost all the speeches made upon this floor to-day. I respect the men who differ from me and give respect to their arguments. There is an argument offered against woman suffrage by way of constitutional amendment that has force, and that I respect, but it is not conclusive. I should have preferred to leave it to the States as a State question, but that is mere preference. With me it is a question—and a much larger question than State or Federal—Will woman as a lawmaker help us to solve the problems which we have not yet solved? Will she help solve the child-labor problem, the sweat-shop problem, the problem of the white-slave traffic? Will she help to better conditions in industry? Will she facilitate and put into effect measures against occupational diseases? Will she guard better the unfortunate of both sexes, calling loudly for her assistance? She to-day is left with the vacant, empty words of recommendation. Add to this the weapon of the ballot and note the effect.

Will woman, sensitive as she is, be an influence for the humanitarian movements that will make politics clean? The mission of woman in politics is to uplift and is holy.

As I said a moment ago, I would have preferred that this matter be left to the States. Suffrage is properly a State question I admit, but that is no reason why when it comes into this Chamber I should vote against this amendment which is to let the States pass upon this one subject. Shall you deny the right to vote to woman simply because she is a woman? The amendment does not confer the franchise on women. The denial must not be because of sex. She can be denied for other reasons. This is but a limitation and does not destroy the State's authority save in case of sex. Some one said to me, "Mr. Fess, your State voted against woman suffrage. How dare you vote for it?" That is true. I was a member of the Ohio constitutional convention in 1912. We submitted the question of equal suffrage to our State and it was voted down.

In November last the question was before our State again, and I am sorry that it lost by 180,000 majority. But hear me, men; that is no reason why I should surrender my judgment upon an issue that is fundamental in American democracy. I will vote for this measure, and when my people feel that I do not represent them, they have their remedy. I take it that I shall be respected if I cast my vote on this issue, as upon other issues, as my judgment dictates. I do not argue that the franchise is a natural right, neither do I urge it as a privilege, but rather as a duty. No woman risks anything when she performs her duty. She is not contaminated with her stronger sex in the church—in that field she is the more efficient of the two—neither is she in the home, where she is influencing the future citizens; nor in the school, where she is molding the thought and life of the future citizen, who is the coming voter. In all the service of the State, in the home, in the church, in the school, in the various professions, she is molding the future voter. But you declare, without giving good reasons, that she can not and must not be intrusted with the ballot, not because she has not brain power (she equals her brother in the field of research; consults the records of the college and university), not because she has not applied intelligence (see her work in all fields), not because she has not sympathy (consult her activities in social and industrial betterment movements), but simply and only because she is a woman, and the ballot will expose her to the loss of the chivalry of her brother. That is the reason given. Will she lose the chivalrous regard in which she is held by man? Not if the man is a gentleman. If he is not, it is too great a price the public pays for his chivalry.

Her participation will be an advantage to the public. The numerous questions with which we have battled unsuccessfully will appeal to womanhood in a deeper sense than to manhood. Were she a power in lawmaking and in enforcing the law there would be less irresponsible utterances about the futility of the Nation doing this or doing that. I need not enumerate. Men say the people do not want to extend the electorate. It is too much extended now. They cite the votes of several States against suffrage. I care not how many men have voted against extending this power to women. Why should I say that any woman should not have that power? The women have not been heard on it. If only one woman claims the right to vote, upon

what grounds do I justify myself standing up declaring she shall not have the right? Who gave it to me? Who denied it to her? Why to me? Why not to her?

I am told she will not use it, and Ohio, where she votes on school boards, is cited as proof. If I were permitted to vote for a constable and no one else my interest would not be great. If woman must be deprived of the ballot because she will not use it, why not the man for the same reason?

In this best example of a successful government where democracy has been an experiment and so many new governmental ideas and ideals have been worked out, we have clung to one undemocratic practice of admitting women to all avenues of influence and achievement save one, and that one is the sole instrument by which she can make effective the influences which she exerts in varied fields she has already entered.

Can she exercise intelligent judgment in the selection of officers? I say she can. In a great many ways women are superior to men in judgment. There are to-day over a million women devoted to study in the various social betterments associations in our land, becoming most effective in the charity work of the country. There are 1,142 women on charitable boards according to the census. There were, in 1910, 615 women on boards of education in England. I am speaking of a foreign country, but if you take the activities in a city like Chicago or New York or Philadelphia and analyze the activities that are making for social betterment in the cities you will find that women are taking a wonderful position.

The ballot is the one determining agency of action. Principles can be taught. Woman in the home, the church, and the school can pass the lessons of right conduct, of sound national character, of standards of citizenship, but is denied the one necessary element to make such teaching effective. I for one will not deny that right to her, and shall vote to forbid any State denying it simply because she is a woman.

You can not throw the charge into my face that I am voting simply because my State is for it or my State is against it. I vote for it because it is right, it is just, it is equity; and if you do not do it now, you but defer the time, for it will be done later on. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield a minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUTTLE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for one minute.

Mr. TUTTLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey will pass upon the question of equal suffrage at the election next fall. They are more interested in the result of that election than they are in this discussion of a constitutional amendment; but I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an argument, in connection with a letter, from Mrs. John R. Emery, wife of the vice chancellor of the State and president of the Morristown Branch of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. It is as follows:

MORRISTOWN, N. J., *January 11, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM E. TUTTLE, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My duty as president of the Morristown Branch of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage makes it necessary for me to call your attention to this body of women who in your constituency are strongly opposed to the passage of a Federal amendment in favor of equal suffrage.

To save you from unnecessary annoyance we have decided to write one letter—rather than many—as representing faithfully the expression of our views, and I have been deputed to present these views to you on behalf of our association, which now numbers over 700 women, all over 21 years of age.

I am therefore inclosing you a newspaper copy of my remarks before the New Jersey Legislature last January, which were fully indorsed by our association. It is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Morristown Branch of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was organized on July 3, and after a summer of study took up active work on October 9, and in eight weeks we had a membership of 600 women, all over 21 years of age.

"These women represent every type of American woman from the wage earner at $1.50 a day to the highly educated, college-bred woman of modern life and activities. Every class of social life is represented, and married or single we desire to protest as a body against equal suffrage.

"Our members include hundreds of names of so-called 'independent women' in every line of self-supporting occupation, many of them with families dependent upon their efforts and all with intelligent reasons for opposing equal suffrage.

"We are a home-making, home-loving, law-abiding body of women, and whatever our station in life, drawn together to oppose woman suffrage because we believe it threatens our best interests and the best interests of those dependent upon us.

"We know ourselves to be singularly well protected by the existing laws of our country and our State, and that these laws in regard to marriage and divorce, rights of property, personal freedom and personal privilege, child labor, with all educational and industrial laws, are in our own State just, well considered, and effective. Our recent employers' liability act gives the wage earner ample protection in case of accident, and new and protective legislation is under consideration at all times.

"For more than 100 years the American man has labored to give the American woman and child a status in the law and under our Government that has been the admiration of the world, and we wish to hold the honorable position so given us, and consider the constant criticism of the laws of our country and State both unjust and disloyal.

"We could urge upon you many just and real considerations of sentiment and feeling. Our faithful service to the State in the bearing and rearing of children; the care of the old; the intelligent and honest care of the poor, helpless, and unfortunate through church, charitable, and personal activities; and all the self-imposed duties and responsibilities of the home woman, and we do remind you that all this has been constantly done without the vote. But we do not wish to urge any such sentimental considerations upon you, but rather to beg you to consider this question in its practical bearing upon the American life of the future.

"We do not shrink from the responsibilities of political life just because they are responsibilities, for we have carried the responsibilities of life and death as plain home women for years, and are used to great burdens and have taken our full share of the outside duties of citizenship as well, but we do believe that such sustained political effort as equal suffrage should demand of us to be effective, would in time militate against our best service to the State in the direct and unalterable duties of womanhood.

"We antisuffrage women suffer just as much from 'modern unrest' as do the suffrage women. It is in the air and we too feel it, but we believe—and life has so taught us—that much as we may tire of 'the daily round, the common task' and long for larger fields to conquer, it is just this round of duties accepted and this unrest conquered and fused into serenity of spirit, that makes for the permanent quality and value of home and the race, and that such quality and value would both be seriously impaired by our entrance into political life."

I would further call your attention to some important indications of the effect of the woman-suffrage movement which have appeared during the past year.

We claim that the votes of women have not succeeded in bettering or controlling industrial conditions in Colorado nor have they succeeded in California in introducing valuable economic reforms, as the "high cost of living" there has been increased rather than diminished by a higher rate of taxes since the vote for women has existed there.

That also the proud claim that woman would "purify politics" can not be unquestioned as long as the leaders of the Women's Congressional Union continue to threaten the President and other Government officials with political destruction through their power at the next election unless they would pronounce themselves in favor of woman suffrage. Such a "black list" was indeed published during the current year and would seem to prove that politically there is not much difference between the man political boss and his feminine emulator.

In the Newark Sunday Call of this day I read the following sentence apropos of the approaching debate—referring to the activities of the Women's Congressional Union: "The committee this year is an active committee rather than in times past a semihonorary one. It is made up of women who are giving practically their entire time to the task," etc.

This is, indeed, true and would certainly fairly raise the question as to what becomes of any other than political duties under such stress. It must, indeed, be only the exceptional woman who can have the ability, strength, and energy for such duties and still retain her poise as home-maker and home-keeper.

For years our great neurologists have been telling us of the danger to our race through the nervousness of the American woman. Sanitariums and rest cures have been built and filled by hundreds of nervous cases, and yet the American women of to-day are urging upon their sisters the additional nerve burden of men's duties as well as women's.

We consider also that a great blot rests on the woman suffrage movement, in that they have not sufficiently repudiated the doctrines of the feminists who have allied themselves with them, especially in their teachings on marriage and divorce and their complete destruction of the idea of home centralization as a means of power and self-control.

That they have, in the same way, allowed themselves to be used by the Socialist Party for the advancement of their radical doctrines, having countenanced their organization by carrying their banners in their parades on more than one occasion.

We also deplore their reception and entertainment of such agitators as Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Christabel Pankhurst, and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, and we think this should certainly make the men and women of America stop to question the state of mind which makes this possible to women of honor and truth. If these are to be their political ideals, is it worth while to introduce them in America?

All these considerations lead us to believe that, politically as well as ethically, the equal suffrage will not benefit either our country, our women, or our race.

And, lastly, we contend that never in the history of politics has any party made such large and varied and overwhelming promises to gain votes as has the National Association for Equal Suffrage and the Woman's Congressional Union, and that it will take them until the millenium to make good their promises; and therefore their futility is apparent; and that until this association can control its own members on these and kindred points, it has not the vital force to entitle it to change our established Constitution by any such disturbing amendment as that proposed, especially at a time in the world's history when we need all the stability and responsibility of our form of government to meet and stay the upheaval of world powers now trembling in the balance.

If ever our country is to prove the superiority of her faith, her Government, and her ideals, now is the appointed time, and it is not for her women, the cradle of her race, to tear down her safeguards, but, rather, it is their duty to conserve and strengthen her in "quietness and confidence."

Very respectfully, yours,

MRS. JOHN R. EMERY,
President of the Morristown Branch of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

JANUARY 10, 1915.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Wisconsin want to speak?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may have only one speaker in closing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Are you going to give your 17 minutes to one speaker?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may. One of the speakers I had in mind just declined to use the time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Then you have only one speaker left?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may have two.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] is going to yield me five minutes at the conclusion of the eight?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the merit of the rule I ventured to refer to the rights of the States and point out what I wish now to review, that the proposed resolution does not interfere with those rights. It does not impose anything upon the States. It simply permits the sisterhood of States to put certain limitations both upon the Federal Government and upon themselves, and three-quarters of the sisterhood of States have an inherent fundamental right to that thing. To deny them this opportunity is to deny them the most vital of all their reserved rights.

Let me remind my colleagues, particularly those from the South, that this prescription of the qualifications of the franchise applies only to the question of sex. It does not inject any new problem into the franchise problems of the States; it does not complicate any existing problem in the franchise problems of the State. It is a complete fallacy to contend that the question of sex, the inhibition of discrimination on account of sex, would involve the race question in politics or any other complication. The sisterhood of States would leave individual States in full control of questions of the franchise, subject only to the provision that whatever the qualifications are that a State may prescribe citizens of the United States and citizens of that State shall not be discriminated against because of sex. I do not maintain that the franchise is itself an inherent right or a natural right, but I do maintain that unjustified discrimination is an inherent wrong.

If on any reasonable qualification requirement the vote were denied women simply as it is denied men I would have nothing to say. What are the legitimate qualifications for the exercise of this, the inherent right of free men? It is not might and brute force; it is not physical strength. Some have said, because women do not carry arms they should not be allowed to vote. I answer, neither do men bear children; why should they be allowed to vote? Is the carrying of arms more vital than the bearing of children?

Show me any function that man renders to society and to the State that is more fundamental than woman's function of bearing and rearing children and creating and maintaining the home. In the last analysis the true line of demarcation for determining the qualifications for the franchise is the character. If any gentleman here will demonstrate to me scientifically that woman has on the average a lower standard of character than man, I will not advocate the submission of this amendment. But there is no gentleman on this floor, however materialistic is his philosophy of life, who would dare to make such an assertion. On the contrary, it is known of all men, it is the uniform experience of criminal jurisprudence, it is on the records of our courts everywhere, that woman on the whole and on the average has a very much higher standard of character than man.

Therefore if either sex should be disqualified from the exercise of the franchise on account of sex it should be the male sex, and not the female. To discriminate against this citizen who has these highest qualifications is indefensible; it is fundamentally wrong.

Next after character comes the qualification of intelligence—educated intelligence. Proofs are overwhelming in the records of our schools—of the graduates from our high schools, of the teachers—showing that women are better educated than men. Women do not get their mental food daily from the headlines of newspapers on crowded cars, as the gentleman from Ohio seems to suspect; but those who sell standard books and edit standard magazines testify that woman is the reading sex of the race instead of man.

By the test of both intelligence—educated intelligence—and of character woman stands with higher qualifications than man. To deny her the right through the ballot to protect herself and her home and all that she holds dear because of her sex is absolutely indefensible. I understand why this has been so in the past. Governments have grown out of the military institutions of the past when making war was the chief function of the state. Naturally physical strength to bear arms—brute force—was usually the determining factor in government, as in war. It is natural, when the institution of suffrage was evolved, that it should have been confined to men. But what justification can be shown for continuing this relic of barbarism into the present and future ages where the destroying principle of war is giving way to the conserving, building principle of peace, where the test for fitness to survive in men and in nations is the capacity and the willingness to cooperate and to serve; when the greatest is to be the servant of all?

If we fail to vote for this resolution, we not only violate the inherent rights of the sisterhood of States, but we violate the inherent rights of man, dictated by the principle of immutable justice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used eight minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes remaining I wish to lay down a fundamental proposition from which there is no escape. The permanent success of free institutions rests, and can rest, on no other foundation than the average standard of character behind the vote. When that average gets low in the multiplication of degenerate votes the use of money—the danger of corruption—becomes increasingly menacing. By the use of money and corruption with degenerate votes tyrants have overthrown the liberties of Rome and of Greece, and unscrupulous monopolies are now menacing the liberties of America in cities, in States, and in this Nation. They help create the growing degenerate vote and then supply the corruption money with which to buy those votes and deliver them to politicians and political parties that will do their bidding and leave the people helpless in their hands. If we should give the vote to woman, we would of necessity raise the average standard of character and intelligence behind the vote and would put this Nation and its institutions upon a surer and more solid foundation. I do not overdraw this fundamental proposition when I say that in large measure the very perpetuity of our free institutions depends upon our taking some such measure as this to raise the average standard of character behind the vote.

Mr. Speaker, several times to-day I have been ashamed of my sex. Can anyone conceive of women saying such things as have been said here to-day apparently with gusto and self-congratulation, things that show an utter materialistic view of life, where the relation of the sexes was regarded as one of lust, not of the spiritual relationship, of true inspiring love. For myself and the majority of my colleagues I wish to repudiate this attitude. Man has an immortal soul. It is this spiritual part of man that gives dignity to human life above the life of the brute. In the differentiation of occupation the women in the homes, in the schools, in the churches, in the charities, and tender ministries of hospitals and philanthropy the women of the race have conserved and developed the spiritual nature of man. The great weakness of politics and government to-day is that they reflect largely, if not exclusively, the motive and activities of men who are engaged chiefly in business. I do not undervalue the importance of business and industry when I say this influence in government should be less exclusive. The great need of our day is to project woman's sphere, woman's activities, and woman's influence into government, so that questions affecting the home, the protection of the children, and the good morals of society would share with business the attention of public servants, the efforts and aims of public policy.

The only real effective way to accomplish this result is to give the ballot to woman. The effect on public servants is magical. Not two years ago, before equal suffrage was established in Illinois, Members of the Illinois delegation in this House were not inclined to give any consideration even to the elemental rights of women, their right to police protection when peaceably parading the streets of Washington being questioned on the floor of this House. To-day the Illinois delegation is so docile it eats salt out of woman's hand.

Mr. Speaker, all government exists to promote the evolution and uplift of the Nation and the race. If women had the ballot, it would broaden her views and activities and make her better equipped to be the companion of her husband. It would make her better equipped in heredity to be the mother of men. At the same time it would project woman's life more and more into the life of her husband, and not only make a better foundation for a true home but develop more the spiritual side of her husband. Our institutions need woman suffrage. The home needs woman suffrage. Woman needs woman suffrage. Man needs woman suffrage. Woman suffrage is now a crying need for the evolution of the race.

I am not a disciple of Swedenborg nor of Darwin, great scientist as he was. I certainly do not share the materialistic, atheistical philosophy of Robert Ingersoll. I know that nature

is not trying to develop a race of physical giants, but a race of noble men, rising higher and ever higher in spiritual attributes. I believe what the Bible says, to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life everlasting.

There is but one real question to ask: Would the giving of the ballot to woman tend to lower her average standard of character? Would it tend to take her from the home and have her no longer the differentiated repository of the spiritual life of the race. The testimony from all Members from suffrage States is directly to the contrary. I have not yet found anyone who has seen the franchise exercised in any equal-suffrage State—I have yet to find one man from a suffrage State, in politics or out, who said it tended to lower the character of woman to have her exercise the ballot.

Mr. Speaker, there are really no substantial objections to this question that are tenable. The passage of this resolution would accord to the sisterhood of States the opportunity to exercise their most fundamental right to change the organic law; it would comply with the Democratic principle of the referendum. Granting the ballot to women would render justice to half, and the weaker half, of our citizenship; it would strengthen the foundation of our free institutions; it would be in accord with and advance the political evolution of the age; it would help to solve the most difficult problems of the day and insure the great reforms now pending in the land; it would strengthen the home, aid in the development of both sexes on higher lines, and would advance the evolution of the race. I would that the friends of this great movement could get the necessary two-thirds majority here to-day. I fear they will not; but I say to these good women and the friends of equal suffrage everywhere, be of good cheer. The forces of nature and of nature's God are with you. Go forward, and in the end the victory will be yours. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. In announcing what time was left, a few minutes ago, the Chair accidentally left out five minutes belonging to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. The Chair wishes to make the announcement now, so that there will be no mistake about it; and he announces again that the proponents of this proposition have the right to close.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have the proponents the right to close in more than one speech?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself to a considerable extent in sympathy with the arguments which have been presented to-day advocating the right of woman to vote. But, Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible for myself to agree that this proposed change should be wrought in the Constitution of the United States. This Government of ours is a government of law. The majesty of the law is supreme in the Nation, in the State, in the town. It is the concrete result of 1,200 years of struggle for free institutions. It is the triumph of liberty, the supreme hour of conquest by man over the elements of tyranny and subjugation.

We have a most remarkable scheme of government. There are two sovereignties. There is the sovereignty of the United States and there is the sovereignty of each of the States. The structure of our Government and the spirit of our institutions require that these two sovereignties, each in its appropriate sphere, shall be supreme. The law under which our Nation is governed springs from the voting population. It is the effectuated will and desire, nationally speaking, of the people of our country. The law under which the States rule their own private and local affairs is the law that comes from the voters of the States. The structure, both Nation wide and State wide, rests upon the voting part of the population. Therefore the franchise is the fundamental fact in our institutional life. He who would place a disturbing hand upon the right to vote respecting those things that touch our national life touches the very heart and soul of the stability of our National Government and the perpetuity of our national free institutions. He who would lay a disturbing hand upon the franchise exercised in State and local matters affects directly the local welfare, the local autonomy, the very spirit of the local, free institutions of the States.

Mr. Speaker, I concede for the purpose of this argument that if it shall be proposed to amend the Constitution so that we shall prescribe who shall have the right to vote for Members of this House, the Members of the Senate, or the President of the United States, we very properly have the power so to act. Furthermore, we have the right so to act. It is a matter of national concern, this right to vote for national officers. One of the essential attributes of sovereignty is self-preservation. It is a right and a duty of sovereignty to perpetuate its existence. Our national sovereignty, our National Government, therefore, has a right to specify who shall vote upon national questions, and especially who shall vote for national officials.

But our control nationally should stop there. The lawmaking power of the Nation is vested in Congress, restricted in its exercise to certain specified classes of legislation. All other classes of legislation rest with the lawmaking power of the State. All State matters, all local municipal matters, including all property taxation, are outside the national power, and preserved completely to the States. The States, under our scheme of dual government, must have the right to determine who shall vote on all local matters. In no other way can the State exercise the duties placed upon it by the scheme of government under which we live. Local self-government is the foundation of free institutions. If you take from the State the power to determine who shall vote in local and State matters, you take from the State an essential element of her sovereignty, you lay a heavy hand upon the foundation of her free institutions, and you subvert the very scheme of government established by the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I say that when we attempt to specify by a Nation-wide law who shall have the right to vote in the States for State officers, in the municipalities for municipal officers, for the rates and kinds of taxation in local affairs, and for all purposes in the local subdivisions of the respective States, we are violating the spirit of free institutions and definitely disturbing the structure of our form of government.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MILLER. I can not yield, for I have not the time.

Mr. MONDELL. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he excepted the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. MILLER. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman declines to yield, and I think I have no right to force him to.

Mr. MILLER. I think I understood the gentleman to speak of the fifteenth amendment. If I have the time, I shall be glad to address myself to it.

Mr. MONDELL. I simply asked the gentleman if he excepts the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. MILLER. If I have the time, I will address myself to that; but for the present I must continue. The men who framed the Constitution under which we live, under which we have grown strong, under which we claim we have become the greatest people in the world, must have had some elements of wisdom. It was framed by our forefathers. I understand it is not exactly fashionable now to follow the wisdom and pay heed to the advice of our grandfathers. It has been stated in effect by high authority that the wisdom of the present is quite sufficient unto itself. But, Mr. Speaker, I am old-fashioned enough to be glad for the heritage from our fathers. In all ages the present is little more than the accumulation of all the past. That is inevitably so in days of progress.

Therefore I am not ashamed or afraid of the wisdom of our grandsires. I am not ashamed of the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution. They wrote into that document not theoretical considerations, such as John Locke wrote into his proposed government for Utopia. They gathered, as we have heard it said time and again, from the experience of a thousand years of human effort, put it into concrete form, and gave it to the world as a working Constitution for an enlightened and self-governing people.

Now, this question was before them in 1787. In the Constitution they then framed, and under which we have since lived, they said we shall leave to the legislatures of the respective States to determine how and by whom shall be chosen electors of the President of the United States. They said the qualifications of those who shall vote for Members of the National House of Representatives shall be the same qualifications as are required of those who vote for the popular branch of the State legislature. We recognized the wisdom of that two or three years ago when we wrote the same language, almost word for word, in the amendment to the Constitution providing for the popular election of United States Senators.

I find, Mr. Speaker, at least I find it to my satisfaction, that of all the great and distinguished men whose wisdom and whose knowledge illuminated the constitutional convention that probably the man who had the clearest mind, the man who displayed the highest constructive statesmanship, the man who wrote most into the Constitution that we have was James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. He was the champion also of popular government. He was the champion of free institutions, and definitely labored to shape the structure of government to that end.

When there came up the question whether or not the Members of this body, the House of Representatives, should be elected by the legislatures of the respective States or by the people of the United States Mr. Wilson was the great champion of the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. In the great argument which he presented in behalf of popular election by the people he used this language, as recorded by Madison:

Mr. Wilson contended strenuously for drawing the most numerous branch of the legislature immediately from the people. He was for raising the Federal pyramid to a considerable altitude, and for that reason wished to give it as broad a basis as possible. No government can long subsist without the confidence of the people. In a republican government this confidence was peculiarly essential.

Those are immortal words, as immortal as the principle of free institutions. Mr. Wilson was the moving spirit of the subcommittee that finally drafted the Constitution. When this paragraph was brought before the convention for consideration the question at once arose as to the qualifications of those who should vote for the Members of the House of Representatives. There were many compromises in the Constitution, because there were many, often radically, divergent views.

But upon this point there is no compromise, because there were no divergent views. The gentlemen from Massachusetts joined hands with the gentlemen from South Carolina, the delegates of all the States united in saying that we should leave to the respective States the absolute power to decide who in those States should be the electors. Note well that these wise fathers of ours were unanimous in the opinion that the States should decide as to the qualifications of voters on all State and local matters, and also the qualifications for voters on national matters, and in the election of national officers, merely specifying that anyone who votes in the State for members of the State legislature shall have a right to vote for a Member of Congress, and only such. When this important paragraph was reached in the convention Mr. Wilson said:

This part of the report was well considered by the committee. We did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all of the States.

Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons at the same time to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature.

That language and that wisdom was all-sufficient with the framers of the Constitution.

This proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, must be designed as a strong arm to force woman suffrage into States that are opposed to it. Its advocates frankly say so. I say that is undemocratic, unrepublican, contrary to the vital spirit of our free institutions. It is easy to ask a short cut when we are impatient of proceeding in a legal and orderly way, but the forces of human progress are the forces of evolution, and under the great guiding hand of Providence they are necessarily, as they ought to be, slow that they may be right.

If I were at this hour a member of a State legislature and it was proposed to submit to my State the right to vote upon this question, I would vote for it because I believe the people of every State ought to have the right to decide whether the franchise shall be extended to women; but, Mr. Speaker, this does not even propose that the people of the States shall have a right to vote upon it. It is a short cut that will cut out and prevent a popular expression of the will of the people. [Applause.]

Such a deep, radical, revolutionary change as this can never be successful or permanent unless adopted by an affirmative vote of the people. This amendment, should it carry, would go to the State legislatures, to be voted upon by these organizations. It would never be submitted to or accepted by the people. I am strongly of the opinion that each State should settle this question for itself; that a campaign should be waged in the State, one in which the women opposed to woman suffrage will be heard on even terms with those who advocate it, and a fair expression of the will of the people ascertained.

Those advocating this short-cut procedure should pause to reflect. Supposing this amendment was proposed by the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States. It just happens that on this question those States which surely would not ratify, though only 11 in number, nevertheless contain more than one-half our population. Some of these States doubtless would acquiesce; others would resent it bitterly. Woman suffrage would be extended to one-half, or a large part, of our population by the instrumentality of force. By the use of force resistance to the change would be intensified. You can often lead when it is fatal to try to drive. The use of force to extend the franchise is not the operation of free institutions, but the activity of tyranny, and should never be attempted in a Government like ours.

The gentleman from Wyoming mentioned the fifteenth amendment. An unfortunate suggestion on his part. In all our history the only instance where we have in the least departed from our scheme of government and the rule laid down in the Constitution is when we adopted the fifteenth amendment. Mr. Speaker, the one part of our Constitution and amendments thereto, and the only part, that is an absolute failure and of no force and effect is the fifteenth amendment. It failed and it was certain to fail, because it did not express the mind and sense of the people among whom it was to be enforced. I believe the negro should be allowed to vote, but all the world knows the negro does not vote in the South, though the fifteenth amendment has been adopted for more than 50 years. Our experience there should give us pause here. Law must come from the people; it can not be superimposed upon the people and our free institutions be preserved. Any law to be of value or to long endure must be a concrete expression of the mind and sense of the people. As the voting privilege is the most vital of all State and National matters, so it must conform to the desires of the people among whom it is to be employed. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having some time ago expressed myself as in favor of this pending resolution, a question has been propounded to me as to how I can reconcile my action in voting for this resolution with my action in voting against the Hobson prohibition resolution. My answer has been and is that I voted against the Hobson resolution because it tended to deprive the people of personal liberty, a right granted to them by the Constitution of the United States. Contrary to the Hobson resolution, this resolution which we are now considering tends to extend personal and political liberty and give to one-half of the population of the United States a right and a privilege to which, in my opinion, that half of our citizenship is entitled, and which up to the present time has been denied them.

For that reason I shall vote, as I have stated, in favor of this resolution. As a Democrat who believes in progressive legislation, I deem it my duty and my party's duty to stand for progressive legislation. My State has already granted partial suffrage to women, and I shall follow the dictum of the law of my State.

The Democratic Party has been successful in the last two campaigns because the people of the country believe that our party has given them the progressive legislation they demanded. I believe that it would be unwise for us to refuse to continue this policy in the present instance.

Mr. Speaker, when the woman-suffrage bill received a majority of the votes in the house of the Illinois State Legislature the people of Illinois were surprised; when the majority of the votes cast in the senate were in favor of that law, the people were amazed; and when the Democratic governor of the State affixed his signature to the bill, making it a law, giving equal suffrage to the women of Illinois, they were alarmed.

Notwithstanding the fact that from a political point of view a great many Democrats questioned the wisdom of this legislation, in the State of Illinois it is now admitted that the party has not suffered. The fears which were in the hearts of many that the young but energetic Bull Moose Party would be greatly benefited and would receive the votes of the women of Illinois were groundless and did not materialize. The majority of the women demonstrated their appreciation and remained loyal to the Democratic Party which secured for them this privilege in our State. I feel satisfied that the experience of Illinois, and particularly of the city of Chicago, will be that of other States.

Among the arguments originally advanced against the extension of suffrage to women was that the majority of the women did not want the ballot; that they were not asking for suffrage; and that if it were given to them only a few would avail themselves of the privilege. These contentions have been shown to be erroneous, for in the city of Chicago over 200,000 women registered in the first registration and nearly 160,000 voted in the first election. I wish to assure the House that the votes of these women were carefully and judicially cast, and as intelligently as those cast by the male voters.

I am free to admit that I was doubtful of the wisdom of this legislation, but whatever doubt existed in my mind has been wiped out by the two primaries and elections held in our State since women were granted the right of suffrage. In several of the local wards where women were candidates against men for

the position of alderman the women voters cast more votes for the men than for the women candidates. Similarly, in Colorado and other States a large majority of the women, contrary to predictions, voted against prohibition, thus demonstrating their broad and liberal views. I have the utmost confidence, in the light of recent experiences, that they will continue to assist in the election of those men to office who are best fitted and most deserving, and will support and work for legislation which is for the best interests of the masses and the Nation.

Notwithstanding the fact that it is six weeks before the coming primary election to select a mayor for the city of Chicago, the women are now preparing to take an active part in that primary, and the reports I am receiving satisfy me that they are appreciative of him who has aided their cause and who for years has recognized them by appointing them to important positions in the city—the great five-time mayor of Chicago, Carter H. Harrison

I have a letter from him on this subject which is worthy of careful consideration and which I shall read as a part of my remarks:

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
City of Chicago, January 7, 1915.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND SABATH: I feel that you are well acquainted with my views on the question of granting equal suffrage to woman, and sincerely hope that you will aid in whatever way you can to further the cause.

The experiences of our great city have shown clearly that the women are desirous of being given the right of suffrage, and that when it is given them they will ably take advantage of the opportunity.

I will personally appreciate whatever you do, and your vote in favor of this resolution will mean approval of my stand and that of the majority of the thinking people of our city.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely, yours, CARTER H. HARRISON.

Mr. Speaker, many a man in public life has questioned his wisdom in appointing women to important positions, but in every instance the women so placed, whether in the office of the superintendent of public schools or as members of the board of education, whether as head of the new department of public welfare or as policewomen, have demonstrated their capacity to perform any public duty assigned to them not only with credit to themselves but with benefit to the community.

I believe that the good and public-spirited women of Chicago will demonstrate to the country at large that they appreciate the recognition which Mayor Harrison has given them by casting their votes for him not only in the primary but also in the election. The old accusation that they can be easily led and misled will be disproved beyond any doubt in our city.

Mr. Speaker, as experience is the best teacher, I have laid these facts before the House and hope that what I have said will demonstrate that woman suffrage is not only just but expedient. In a democracy in which the people are supposed to govern themselves the ballot is the direct method of self-expression. A government which denies expression to one-half of the people can not be termed a democracy.

The claim that suffrage is an integral part of democracy is based on the argument of Jefferson that the whole community governed. Fitness is not a test for suffrage. American democracy is not based upon the assumption that individuals are wise or virtuous, but upon the idea that two heads are better than one; that the whole is greater than any of its parts; that the whole community is wiser than a part of the community.

This is a day of progress. A democracy can not progress unless its people are growing in intelligence and moral force. Why do my colleagues desire to block the path of development of one-half of the citizenship of the United States?

In conclusion I wish to quote Justice David J. Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court:

The real question is a practical one. How does woman suffrage work when tried? In this Nation nine States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, California, Washington, Kansas, Arizona, and Oregon, and the Terriory of Alaska—have granted full suffrage, and in at least the first six of them it has been in existence long enough for substantial results.

One thing is true of all—there has been no organized effort to repeal the grant. Whatever may be isolated opinions, the general mass of the voters are satisfied. Indeed, few have expressed antagonistic views. If the citizens of these States find nothing objectionable in woman suffrage, a natural conclusion is that no injury has resulted. Especially is this true when the declarations of its friends in its favor are many and strong.

The change in the position of women in the past 50 years must be noticed. Then the only vocations open to her were teaching and sewing. But within the last half century she has entered into active outdoor life and is no longer a necessary home body. Not that home has lost its charms or that it will ever cease to be the place which she most loves and where she reigns supreme, but choice or necessity has driven her into varied pursuits, many of them calling for familiarity with public affairs and executive ability.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me, of course it is impossible for me to make an argument upon this question. I am for this resolution, and yet I have very great respect for the opinions of those who believe that the matter should be controlled by the States; but I can not agree with those who have suggested that the good women of this country have not the qualifications to cast the ballot. I recall that years ago my people crossed the plains. Driven by the fates of war, we crossed the plains in a 90-day trip. I was only a child, but I have heard the story so often from my mother's knee about the hardships the women endured at that time that I can not concede to any man the right to say that the women who endured the hardships that they did in this country, that the women who bear the burdens that they do in this country, who have the qualifications to raise the men who are the voters in this country, are not as well qualified as you or I or any other man to cast the ballot in this country. It is my judgment, Mr. Speaker, that the women of this country have a keener sense of morality, a more vital sense of sentimentality. In my judgment they will purify the politics of this country, and they will carry sentiment to the polls more than men; and, sir, every act of men's lives is born of sentiment. No good, pure act is done by man or woman which is not guided by sentiment, and women in most of the States, or some of the States at least, vote in the school matters; they take part in the election of school trustees; they direct the building of schoolhouses. If they can do that, and raise the young, and raise men, then they are qualified to cast a vote upon any question that may arise before the American people. [Applause.]

Suffrage, Mr. Chairman, depends fundamentally upon the fact that the individual members of the human race were created free and equal and that the consent of the governed is the essential requisite in any republican form of government.

Our constitutions are "man made," but before the Constitution of the United States or of any State of the Union became effective it was submitted to the people for ratification. In most instances the question of ratification was left to only half of the people—that is, the male portion of the Union or of the State. In other words, the Constitution itself granted a privilege to a limited portion of the population to exercise the right of franchise. If, with the formation of this Government or the formation of the government of any of the States, this privilege had been granted to the women of the community, I think none would doubt that they had both the legal and a moral right to exercise the right of franchise.

I quite agree that the right to vote is solely a "privilege," and the proponents of this measure are here to-day asking that the privilege conferred upon the male portion of the human race, so far as this country is concerned, exercised since the founding of this Government, shall be extended likewise to the woman.

As I view the matter, the women have a fundamental moral right to vote, but they have not the legal right, and the only reason they have not that legal right is because our Constitution and laws have been made by the other half of the population, and they have been too selfish to permit the enactment into law of the privilege of the franchising of women.

I grant you there is much difference of opinion upon this important and public question and that there is much public sentiment held by men and women who maintain the position that women should not vote. Yet I maintain that the woman has as much absolute fundamental right as a man when it comes to a question of exercising this privilege. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I indulge the belief that the politics of this country would be very much improved and purified if that half of our population, which we all admit surpass in virtue, in purity of thought and action, and in moral standards, were permitted to vote.

The question of how women would vote should not enter into this discussion nor warp any man's judgment. The whole question is a question of "moral right." When a man is qualified under the law to vote he is permitted to vote as he pleases and we throw around him every possible safeguard to prevent any interference with him in the exercise of that high privilege. His vote is his own, and when he uses it in good faith his vote is right because the law makes him the sole judge on the question. I grant you that his vote may not be cast in the interests of the public welfare or for that individual best qualified or equipped to hold the office for whom he votes, but he still has the right to cast that vote as he pleases. In my judgment, the female portion of our country have essentially the same qualifications as the male and are in all respects the same except in sex, and yet we deny to them the right to exercise

this high privilege. As I suggested, our laws are men-made. We have thus far denied her this privilege, and under the law we have the power to continue to deny it, and we stand here to-day exercising the "privilege" which our forefathers gave to us, that of making the laws and of continuing to make them in such manner and fashion as to deny those equally qualified with ourselves a like privilege with ourselves. We say, in effect, to the women of this country, you shall be governed by the laws we make. You may own, buy, and sell real estate, do business in the commercial world, make contracts, collect wages, enter into marriage relations, raise your children, help pay the taxes, and generally bear your share of the burdens of the Government, be amenable to the laws of the land, but you shall have no voice or vote in the determination of what the laws shall be. Such a situation is simply the doctrine of force. I can see no other explanation, no logical reason for it or sense to it, except as suggested that the men of the country have the power and hesitate to divide that power with the women.

This great movement for woman suffrage convinces me that civilization is advancing and that it can be only a comparatively short time until universal suffrage will be recognized by all the leading nations of the earth. It is simply a part of the continual and eternal march of progress of the human race toward a genuine democracy. The present civilization can not, and will not, much longer permit the physically stronger half of the human race to ignore the plain rights of the weaker half. It has been very well said upon the floor of the House:

> The disfranchisement of woman is a brutal usurpation of power, a relic of primitive barbarity, when might made right, which has become unworthy of chivalrous modern manhood.

It is claimed that many women do not want the ballot and would not vote if the opportunity presented itself. Of course until this privilege is extended and the result determined by experience no man can justifiably say just what proportion of the women of the country desire the ballot or would exercise the right if conferred upon them. But assuming that a considerable portion of the women should not exercise the privilege, I still answer that right and justice can not be estimated in numbers, and if any of the women desire the ballot and are fundamentally entitled to it, then it should not be denied to them. And in our form of government all people qualified by character and intelligence should be permitted to use the privilege.

At the recent election in my State 40,000 registered voters failed to exercise that high privilege. And yet would anyone argue that because of the failure of practically one-third of the qualified electors to take advantage of the privilege that he or they or any portion of the now qualified electors should be deprived of the right of franchise?

It has been suggested that women who vote should be compelled to bear arms or do police duty or render other similar service to the country; but you will admit that many men are accorded the right of franchise who are incapable of bearing arms or do police duty. And when it comes to war, I think you will agree with me that no portion of our people bear a greater burden than do the women. When the fighting men are at the front or in the trenches the women are tending the stock, raising the crops, paying the taxes, rearing and educating the children, furnishing them food, powder, and shell; and yet we deny to them the right to have any voice in saying when war shall be declared.

In my State we are mining copper and coal, and every day thousands of men take their lives in their own hands and go into the bowels of the earth to dig out its treasures. And every year, every month, and almost every day we see some of these men brought to the surface a corpse—the son of some good woman, the brother of some good woman, the husband of some good woman. And yet we deny to any of these women the right to have a voice in the making of the laws that might have protected the lives of these unfortunates.

It has been suggested that equal suffrage would increase the number of electors who are poorly qualified mentally to exercise this right. In answer I wish to say that more girls than boys attend the public schools and, in my judgment, are as well educated as men, and the statistics show that of the criminals of the country only one of every twenty is a woman. And I think that everyone will admit that if the women of the country had a voice in the making of the laws they would take as much interest and exercise as wholesome an interest in the enforcement of the law as does the man. To those who believe that the woman's social sphere is in her home I am in perfect accord, and yet I indulge the belief that the few hours devoted to the casting of the ballot would not deprive the home of the presence of the woman to any material extent. And with the influence and exercise of that ballot the home would be very much better protected. [Applause.]

The 1910 census report shows that over 8,000,000 women in this country are now engaged in gainful pursuits. A large percentage of these women are not only dependent upon themselves but have others dependent upon them. They go out and compete with the world for their daily bread, and it seems incomprehensible that they should not have a voice in the making of the laws and the choosing of the public servants and the expenditure of the public fund.

Some one on this floor has spoken in derision of the emancipated women; and why, I ask, should not all the women of the land be emancipated? No one will deny that they now enjoy many more rights and privileges than they did in the day of our forefathers. Why not make the emancipation complete, and this talk of emancipated women would then disappear in this and all other discussions? Except on the one question—the right of franchise—she has already been emancipated, and that one right is denied to her not because of any physical infirmity, because, as heretofore suggested, she performs many of the arduous physical duties of her brother. Surely it is not because of mental weakness, because in the schools and colleges she competes with and wins equally high honors with her brother. Surely not because of lack of moral character. No one, however much he be opposed to this resolution, would make that suggestion. Every man, I think, within the sound of my voice will admit that she possesses at least an equal share of morality, and many of us freely admit she possesses much more. Surely it can not be because of lack of patriotism. The history of the land is full of evidence of her heroic self-sacrifice, not only in times of war but in times of peace. We do not relieve her from any burdens of taxation; we do not relieve her from burdens for any violation of the law, for her punishment is the same as that of men.

Now, if she possesses the qualifications above stated, why, I ask you in all candor, should she not be accorded the right to vote? And the only answer is that she is a woman; that she differs from us in sex. Is there any reason why sex should be a barrier against voting. It is not a barrier against conducting a business, or managing a farm, or editing a paper, or writing a book, or clerking in a store, or teaching in schools, or practicing medicine, or following the profession of the law, or working in a factory. We do not consider the question of sex when we impose a tax or inflict a legal punishment or build schoolhouses for the education of the young. And if all these things be so, why not make intelligence rather than sex the test of citizenship? Why not make intelligence and morality and civic virtue a standard of excellence in this country? And when you do you must of necessity accord to women at least an equal privilege with the men.

Eleven States of the Union have already granted its women full suffrage. A partial right in this direction has been granted in about 20 of the others. It will be recalled that less than 50 years ago not a State in the Union accorded this privilege to this part of its population. The progress thus shown is nothing short of remarkable and must have some foundation other than that of maudlin sentiment. It is based upon developing reason and conscience, upon the principle of right and justice and an awakening civic righteousness. It is growing and will continue to grow, and the man who stands in the way will sooner or later find himself standing alone.

I realize that there is ever present the temptation to engage in the recital of the achievements of the women in the different lines of endeavor to prove and justify her right to the ballot. Time will not permit me to partake in any such recital. The whole history of our country and of the world will furnish a rich record of information of the part woman has played in the government and the affairs of men. From the very earliest days of our civilization down to this moment she has played an active and often controlling part in both the domestic and governmental affairs of nations. Statesmen have paid homage to her ability and power. Authors, poets, and sculptors have done likewise. Every succeeding period of the world's history has been marked by her achievements and recorded in poetry, art, and literature. There is no field of human endeavor, however humble or exalted, in which she has not played her part and influenced the history of the time. All the world recognizes that she is potential in molding public opinion, instilling the principles of good citizenship into the youth, husbands, and fathers of the land; that in all charitable, philanthropical, and humanitarian works she is always in the lead.

It has been suggested that in the equal suffrage States no improvement is perceptible in its politics or its policies. This may be an accurate statement of facts; but, on the other hand, I challenge any opponent of this resolution to point to a State where

equal suffrage exists and prove that its policies or politics have in any manner retrograded since women were clothed with the right to vote. It may be only a coincidence, but it is my observation that those influences largely inimical to clean politics have been universally found opposed to woman suffrage. Those interests that desire for their own selfish ends to control political conventions and elections—to name the men who shall execute the law—are almost invariably opposed to equal suffrage.

For my part, I am not afraid that politics will be polluted by the participation of women, nor am I afraid that the good women of this country will be polluted by their participation. On the other hand, I am morally certain that the women will preserve their own high standard and that they will have a tendency to raise the standard of our politics and politicians and the men chosen to make and enforce the laws.

As I said in the beginning, I have very great respect for those who maintain that this is a State question, and I would personally prefer that the matter be left to the States, and I maintain that in the submission of this constitutional amendment it is being largely left to the States, because three-fourths of the States themselves must ratify the amendment before it becomes effective. This amendment does not confer the franchise upon the women. It only submits the matter to the several States, that they, in turn, may say whether or not they desire its ratification.

For these reasons I feel myself impelled to vote for the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I voted with the majority of the Democrats of this House in caucus against this proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution giving the women the right to vote, and I shall vote against it on the floor of the House here to-day. I do so because I consider this question a State and not a Federal question. The Democratic Party has always stood for the right of the States to control suffrage, and I do not see any good reason why we should be asked to reverse ourselves on this fundamental principle of local government and home rule. I would not under any circumstances vote to take that right away from my State and surrender it to the Federal Government, nor would I want to attempt to dictate to any other State in what manner they shall control their suffrage. If the women of Louisiana want the right to vote, let them appeal to the legislature for an amendment and submit it to the people of Louisiana, and let us not take this privilege away from the women of any other State of this Union.

We have had our experience with the Federal Government before, when the negro man was given the right to vote, and I do not think that my people would want to take chances with a measure of this kind which would reopen the old sore and compel us to assume the burden of eliminating the negro woman's vote.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentlemen on the other side if they will consume some time?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, how many speeches remain?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have only one.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have two minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] has two minutes, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] five minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] three minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] two minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the arguments that have been advanced to-day in favor of this resolution are arguments that should be submitted to the voters and the electors of the States for their consideration in determining the feasibility of adopting woman suffrage in the States. No argument has been advanced to show why this should be a national question. No reason has been advanced here to show wherein the rights of the States having woman suffrage are invaded, but there have been strong arguments advanced why this power should not be exercised nationally. There is a citizenship of the State and a citizenship of the Union. I believe in a Federal Union of self-governing States, and believing so is my reason for opposing this resolution.

I would not dissent from allowing women alone to have exclusive management of the schools, but adopt this amendment and you forbid the States to delegate to women alone the right to run the schools of the country. You prevent the States from determining who shall be qualified electors to vote for medical and health officers or other special officials. Under this amendment you must grant to women and to men alike the same privilege.

No amendment in the history of the country has been submitted for ratification without a strong sentiment throughout the country demanding action. Every amendment that has been proposed has been adopted within two years after its submission—most of them within a year, save the eleventh amendment, which required three years, and yet with only 11 States having adopted universal woman suffrage the proponents come here and say that we should dangle this proposition in the air to be used as a football in national politics, to overcloud other issues, State and National, until perchance three-fourths of the legislatures ratify it. Until the proponents can show that the rights of the States are infringed by withholding this amendment, until they can advance some reason for it being considered nationally, the old idea of State sovereignty, so far as the suffrage is concerned, should remain unimpaired. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment should become a part of the Constitution of the United States it is in effect self-enforcing, and in that respect different from the prohibition amendment upon which we recently voted. The Committee on Rules, supported by a vote of the House, has thought it wise to submit to this body the pending resolution in order that this body may express itself upon that resolution. The same reasoning ought to cause this body to pass the question on to the States, because submitting it here were an idle ceremony. No vote that we take here settles it as a part of the Constitution, and if there were reason for the Committee on Rules to bring the matter before the House and for the House to take it under consideration, then there is that stronger reason for letting the only bodies which can determine it determine it in the constitutional method.

Nearly every gentleman who has spoken against the resolution has asserted that the women of the country did not desire the voting privilege. Ah, if that be true, there is no danger in submitting the question to a vote in the States. Three-fourths of the States must ratify the amendment before it becomes a part of the Constitution, and it will not be ratified by any State until the men of the State believe that the women of the State want the privilege. [Applause.] Every man knows how one or more women think upon this subject. I have always maintained that when the women wanted the right to vote the men would grant the privilege. It will not be granted unless the women want it. Let us give them a chance. [Applause.]

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. VAUGHAN. To offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. This is not the proper time.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution under consideration and shall vote against it, not because of a lack of confidence in American womanhood on my part, for no man on the floor of this House or elsewhere has a higher regard for the womanhood of this country than I have. I do not agree with statements that have been made here to-day that women are not capable of self-government and that their participation in politics would lower the standard of womanhood. I believe that my wife, my mother, and my sisters are as capable of self-government as I am, and I believe that if they were given the ballot and should exercise it that they would maintain on the political field and in the booth that high standard of womanhood which characterizes their everyday life in their homes and social circles, and that this standard would be maintained by all good women.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it to be my duty to force that responsibility which necessarily goes with the elective franchise upon them and upon a majority of the women of this country against their will. I was taught when a schoolboy that with every right there is a corresponding duty, which I have found to be true in every respect. If we give to woman the right of the ballot, it will be her duty to exercise that right, and I am of the opinion that the great majority of the mothers of America do not want to spend their time, their thought, and their energy in the exercise of that duty, but that they believe that they have more important duties to perform, the performance of which will be of more comfort to them, more value to the country, and a greater blessing to humanity than their participation in politics; and so long as they entertain that belief they will not vote if given an opportunity to do so.

It is true, of course, that certain classes, or a certain per cent of the women of every State, would vote if permitted to do so. But let us analyze the proposition, and see what class or what per cent of the women are demanding the franchise and would exercise it; and I desire to say here that this analysis shall be made in a spirit of absolute fairness and that my remarks shall be conducted in the same spirit. Let us see, first, who is behind this agitation. Is it a majority of the good women of the country? Every man here knows that it is not. However, in fairness to the proponents of this resolution, and in justice to the truth, I will say that many of those advocating equal suffrage are among the best women of the country, but constitute only a small per cent of that class; a majority, and a very large majority, of the better element of women being opposed to it, who would not vote if given an opportunity. On the other hand, the inferior element of the white women, and a great majority of the colored women, throughout the length and breadth of the land would vote if permitted to do so. Then what condition would arise? Would the standard of the electorate be raised? No; it would be lowered. What would be the result in the great centers of population with the ballot placed in the hands of women, with the large majority of the better element of them failing to exercise it, and the inferior element grasping every opportunity to exercise it?

Ah, Mr. Speaker, that question answers itself. Under conditions of that character the candidate for office who is most popular in the colored wards or the greatest chieftain of the red-light districts would in many instances be the winning candidate. It would mean, in short, the lowering of political standards, the encouraging of corrupt politics, corrupt elections, and corrupt and immoral officials, all of which our country East, West, North, and South is fighting to prevent.

I am not laying this charge at the threshold of genuine American womanhood. But I do lay it at the door of a majority of those who at this time and, in my opinion, for generations to come would be the dominant element of their sex in politics or the exercise of the franchise. I am not casting any reflection upon true womanhood, and trust that I may not be so understood. I give to the good women of my country every credit and every compliment that it is possible for man to give to them. They show great skill and ability in the promotion of education. Some of the greatest educators of the world are women. Many of them are to-day serving in the capacity of State or county superintendent of public instructions with marked ability. Some five or six women are serving and have served as county superintendent of schools in the district which I represent, and their efforts and achievements have not been excelled by men in the same capacity. The campaign against adult illiteracy was launched in my State and my district by a woman, and was conducted by her with such marked success that the legislature of the State created an illiteracy commission, of which she was made president; and the work of that commission under her supervision is to-day attracting nation-wide attention. But these women and others like them thro ghout the land have not performed their noble work and achieved their high ideals by the use of the ballot, but they have done so by their intelligence and the proper exercise of their God-given influence over men, and their ability to lead in woman's natural sphere.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the good women contribute more to the moral uplift of the country than men; I know that they do more toward the purification of society than men; I know that they do more for the upbuilding and maintenance of the church than men; I know that they exert a refining influence over men wherever they come in contact with them; I know that the good mothers of our land have done more for humanity than have all the individual efforts and moral and civic institutions of men combined. Ah, yes, they have played their part in the struggles of State, and have played it without the ballot. They have played their part in the prosecution of war, and have played it without the sword. The mother who bore the statesman and directed his youthful feet in the paths of rectitude played a greater part in the affairs of State than the son who drafted the laws for his and her protection. The mother who bore the son and gave him the strength to go to the battle field, and prayed God, as she sent him forward, to give him courage to fight and to die, if need be, in defense of that which he believed to be right, played a greater part in war than the son who bore the saber. She has played her part in society and State, and has played it well. She has directed her energies in the right course as God has decreed that she should, and has not exerted them in vain. And, Mr. Speaker, if that type of womanhood, if that class of women, should come to the belief that they could better serve humanity with the franchise than they have without it and should ask for the ballot, I would want to be first to say give it to them. Yes, in the name of justice, gratitude, and honesty give it to them without delay. But they have not reached that conclusion. They have not made that request. They still believe that they can better perform that high function of motherhood, which outshines the most glittering gems of statesmanship, by and through the methods employed by them since the birth of humanity, namely, woman's influence and mother's love.

Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that there are no mothers, no true wives, nor no pure women advocating woman suffrage. A charge of that kind would be unkind, ungentlemanly, and untrue. There are good women behind this movement, but they are hopelessly in the minority when compared with the numbers against it who do not want the ballot, and who would not exercise it if they had it; who do not want to assume political responsibilities, because they have greater responsibilities; who have no political ambitions, because they have greater, higher, and nobler ideals. And so long as that great and overwhelming majority of women do not want the ballot, I for one shall not accede to the demands of a small minority; for, as I have previously stated, the right of the ballot carries with it the duty to exercise it; and should I vote to give to woman the ballot, I would then feel it my duty as a citizen to urge upon her the necessity of her exercising it, not only the necessity but her absolute and imperative duty to do so. And being unwilling to force such responsibilities upon womankind, I shall vote against the resolution.

And then, Mr. Speaker, there is still another pronounced objection to the passage of this resolution, the purpose of which is to amend the Constitution of the United States. Article V of the Constitution provides that the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution, or on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, and so forth. This provision is evidence that the framers of the Constitution believed that it should not be amended except when there should be a demand of at least two-thirds of the people for such an amendment. I have seen no evidence that there is such a demand for this proposed amendment. The framers of the Constitution realized that the time would come when human progress or human events would render necessary the enactment of laws forbidden or not warranted by the Constitution, and for that reason provided by this article for its amendment. But that same Constitution left with the several States the right for each to control its own elective franchise, which, sir, in my opinion, was the most sacred and fundamental right delegated to or reserved by the States, for the progress and well-being of each State depends upon the proper use of the elective franchise by the State. The fathers of our Constitution well saw that the States could each handle their elective franchise better than the Federal Government could handle it for them. Hence the franchise was left to the States; and for Congress to interfere with that right would, in my opinion, be a stroke at the most vital fibers of statehood and a breach of good faith on the part of the Federal Government with the States. Under the franchise as reserved by the States, 11 States have granted full suffrage to women, and under it each State could do likewise if the electorate so desired. Then why all this turmoil and effort to amend the Constitution of the United States to give to each State a privilege which it already has?

Ah, Mr. Speaker, we know why. We are told by many women of the States which now have woman suffrage that the ballot was granted to them by the male electorate on the solicitation of the minority and against the will of the majority of the women. But in the other 37 States of the Union men have not been so easily influenced, or coerced, as the case may be, by the minority, but have regarded the wishes of the majority, thereby refusing to grant woman suffrage except in the State of New Jersey, where it was granted and later withdrawn by the consent of the women. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we see a double motive behind this effort on the part of its proponents. The first one is to attempt to extend woman suffrage to all the States by its adoption by three-fourths of the States through an amendment to the Federal Constitution, and the second is to make it impossible for any State to withdraw the ballot from woman, though its withdrawal might be desired by a majority of both male and female voters, by making it a national instead of a State franchise. Mr. Speaker, these ladies are nobody's fools, if they are few in number. They know what they want, and know how to fix it so they can keep it after they get it, whether anybody else wants them to keep it or not. But they have not learned the best course to pursue to get it or to make it beneficial to humanity after they get it. Their campaign has been in the main an effort to induce the male electorate, either by persuasive or coercive methods, and sometimes by the

employment of both, to extend to them the franchise, without urging upon their own sex the necessity of their exercising the ballot if received. The campaign was started wrong and has been conducted wrong. Let me suggest to those ladies who are pressing this movement to go to their own sex, and especially to that element of their own sex who assume the burdens of real and genuine motherhood and the responsibilities of home-making, and present your arguments to them, at the same time explaining to them that if they receive the ballot they take upon themselves an obligation to exercise it. Expound to them the doctrine of woman's political rights as strongly as you care to, provided you expound with equal force and fairness the doctrine of woman's political responsibilities if given the ballot, and then let them answer for themselves. And if they answer in the affirmative my love for American womanhood and my confidence in American manhood prompts me to believe that the ballot will be given by men as freely as it will be accepted by women in every State of the Union and never withdrawn by a single State if exercised by the better element of women.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that a majority of both the men and women of Kentucky are opposed to woman suffrage. If they ever change their minds and decide that they want woman suffrage, they can get it within and under the authority of their own State. If they never decide that they want it, it should never be forced upon them by other States, and I for one stand ready to protect them against such invasion. [Applause.]

[Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado addressed the Souse. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (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 said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is an amendment in order until the whole section has been read?

Mr. CULLOP. This is a paragraph.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that this is a separate proposition. It is as broad as it is long, anyway. The gentleman from Indiana will state his amendment.

Mr. CULLOP. In line 4, strike out the words "the legislatures" and insert the word "conventions"; and in line 6 strike out the word "legislatures" and insert the word "conventions."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amend, in line 4, by striking out the words "the legislatures" and inserting the word "conventions."

In lines 6 and 7, strike out the word "legislatures" and insert the word "conventions."

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is that, if this is submitted to the voters of this country for ratification, it shall not be mixed with any other question, political, moral, or economical.

This is an important proposition. None more important will be submitted to this Congress. It is for the purpose of extending the right of the franchise to more than 18,000,000 voters in this country. If submitted, it ought to be submitted as an individual proposition, so that each voter in this country may go to the ballot box and express his sentiments upon this question without having it involved with other questions. If it be submitted to the legislatures of the States, it will then be mixed with other political questions, so that when the voter is voting for a member of the legislature other questions will complicate the issue and we will not have a fair expression of the people upon this question. But if it be submitted to the conventions of the several States, then each voter when he votes upon this question will not have it mixed with any other question to be determined at that time.

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

Mr. CULLOP. For a brief question only, as I have but five minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman must realize that the Congress can not order conventions to be called in the States. I want to ask him if he recognizes the fact that the legislature——

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will allow me to answer his first statement, I will say that he is mistaken upon that proposition. The Constitution provides that when Congress submits this question it shall submit it either to the conventions of the several States or to the legislatures. Both of these ways are provided by Article V of the Constitution for the submission of questions of this kind.

Mr. HOBSON. Does it——

Mr. CULLOP. I should be glad to yield if I had the time, but I have not. So that the gentleman is mistaken as to what the Constitution provides upon this question. The 18,000,000 voters who are to be enfranchised if this amendment be adopted will be able to turn the tide of power in this great Republic. Their strength will be sufficient to control the election of not only the Members of the House but the Chief Executive of the Nation. When this question is submitted it ought to be submitted in such a manner that it will not be mixed with other questions, so that each individual voter will have no other question to pass upon except the question whether this right shall be extended or not.

If gentlemen who are pressing this question really desire a fair expression of the people on it, they should vote for the adoption of this amendment. The vote on it will determine how many of us will vote on the adoption of the resolution. For one I want to see this question when submitted to be free from all complication, so that every voter will have it as the only question to decide at the ballot box. If this method is to be adopted, then many will vote for the submission of this resolution who otherwise will vote against it. I am among that number, and hence my interest in offering this amendment. But if it is to be submitted to the legislatures for ratification, where it can be used for the purpose of enacting or defeating the enactment of other legislation, then I shall not give my support to submit it. We all know how this important proposition would be used if submitted for ratification to the legislatures. It would become a valuable asset for the passage or defeat of other measures pending in the legislature; it would be treated as a common trading stock in the logrolling processes usually employed in their legislative procedures. I for one do not want it prostituted to any such purpose, but I do want to see it submitted free from all entangling alliances with other questions, so that each voter can by his ballot express himself either for or against the proposition.

If this amendment be adopted he can then do so, and if it be adopted I shall vote to submit the proposition to the people to be voted on. This consideration has impelled me to offer it, and I have done so with the hope it will be adopted so the amendment can be submitted for a direct vote of the people. It is a fair proposition, and the friends of this measure should support it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not share the views of some of the distinguished gentlemen who have arrayed themselves here against woman suffrage. I do not believe, as they seem to believe, that the women of this country are not qualified for the right of franchise; but, on the contrary, I believe they are qualified for it and would use it to good advantage. I do not believe, as some of them seem to believe, that it would pull them down into the mire of dirty politics; on the contrary, if we have dirty politics, they would cleanse the same and elevate the standard of politics to the high plane they occupy. They would purify the political atmosphere of the country and elevate the standard and bring about better conditions in this country; inaugurate a higher standard of citizenship and a better class of civic conditions. I have faith in their ability, intelligence, and patriotism, so much so that I believe the day they are given the right of franchise will be the dawning of a better day for this Republic. Recently I heard one of the distinguished men of our country make a notable address. During the course of his remarks he stated that not long since he visited a penitentiary located in a large city in one of the States of the Union, and there he found 5 per cent of the prisoners were women and 95 per cent were men; that in the same city he visited one of the leading churches and found of the persons present 95 per cent were women and 5 per cent were men. The conclusion inevitably would follow that if the women have sense enough to keep out of the penitentiary and morality enough to attend church in such proportions they evidently have ability enough to be clothed with right of suffrage and use it to best advantage for the welfare of the country and the elevation of the standard of government. I do not believe anything but good would result from the grant of the right to them. At least the people should have the opportunity to vote on this question unmixed with any other proposition.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment will be simply to cripple the submission of the amendment to the Constitution. I know that the Constitution gives Congress

the right to submit a constitutional amendment either to the legislatures of the States or to conventions of the various States, as Congress may determine, one or the other method. But if Congress adopts for the first time in our constitutional history the method of submitting a proposed amendment to conventions, it means, in my judgment, that we are submitting it to two separate votes in every State, for there is no way provided for calling conventions, providing for the time, place, and expense, but by the favorable action of the legislatures of the States.

Therefore, in order to get favorable action in any State it will be necessary for the legislature to act favorably in calling a convention and providing the expense, time, and manner therefor, and then that convention, when called, must act favorably on the amendment itself. So the direct effect of the amendment is to compel the submission of the constitutional amendment to two votes in every State in the Union. That has been the universal judgment of Congress in every amendment that has been submitted, so that no proposed amendment has been submitted to conventions instead of legislatures.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he is not in favor of a vote on this by the people, and if the Cullop amendment is not the only way that the people can act on the question under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that he and I voted for the sixteenth amendment and the seventeenth amendment and submitted them both to the legislatures and not to the conventions of the States. When we did so we did not admit that we were denying the right of the people to vote on these amendments. We submitted to the people the question whether they should vote for direct election of United States Senators, and we submitted it to the legislatures. We submitted the question whether they would have an income tax to the legislatures, and there was no claim that we were denying the people the right to vote.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Missouri has no right to state how I voted upon those amendments. My record speaks for itself. When the gentleman talks about the people passing on a question, why is not the gentleman willing to have the question presented squarely to the people on that proposition?

Mr. BORLAND. I think I am, and I think the effect of the gentleman's amendment is to compel the people to vote twice on the same proposition.

Mr. WEBB. I move that all debate be now closed on this amendment.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman move the previous question?

Mr. WEBB. That is the effect of it; yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Cullop amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CULLOP) there were 108 ayes and 142 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it now in order to move to strike out the enacting clause?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the resolution may first be read in full, with the right of amendment to the first paragraph after the resolution is read.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is what I object to. We do not want any more amendments offered.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Is it not in order to perfect the resolution first?

The SPEAKER. The motion to strike out the enacting clause is in order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the resolution may be reported, with the right still remaining to amend the first paragraph. That would cover the enacting clause.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will be frank with the gentleman from Illinois. I have understood that an amndment would be proposed that would have no chance for passage; that it would be useless to propose and useless to be voted upon. I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield? I understand the gentleman is on the Committee on Rules, and that he was not averse to reporting the special rule. He has expressed a willingness to have the question squarely voted on, and the friends of the resolution would feel that they never had had a square vote on the resolution itself if the enacting clause were stricken out before we reach the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Alabama, I will state that I am a member of the Committee on Rules. I was opposed to the reporting out of the resolution from the beginning. I was not present when the resolution was voted out, being detained at my home by personal illness. Had I been here, I should have voted against reporting the resolution out. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the enacting clause, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule.

A motion to strike out enacting words of a bill—

And, of course, the same thing applies to a joint resolution—

shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to its rejection.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I retain the floor, but I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has possession of the floor.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMS. Is a motion to strike out the enacting clause debatable after the previous question has been ordered?

Mr. MANN. But it has not yet been ordered.

Mr. SIMS Is it debatable anyway?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. Of course; like any other amendment.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentleman from Tennessee has the right to make his motion, and I understand his motives, which are worthy; but, for one, I would like to see a clear-cut vote on this proposition. [Applause.] I would like to have a vote yea or nay on the Mondell amendment, and, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote "nay," and I hope that nothing will occur here to-day which will give anyone the opportunity to say hereafter that we have evaded this important issue. Our action should not be subject to misconstruction, and, while that rule says that the striking out of the enacting clause is equivalent to a rejection of the amendment, yet I think we ought to walk up fairly and squarely and vote upon the amendment. Therefore I shall vote against striking out the enacting clause, and if we succeed in voting that motion down, then I shall vote against the Mondell resolution, so that there can be no misunderstanding of my attitude.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee on ordering the previous question.

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman has not the floor to yield. This is under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to come to a direct vote on the Mondell resolution, but I am not willing that there should be any further votes on amendments to the proposed amendment to the Constitution. I move to strike out the enacting clause, and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 169, not voting 48, as follows:

YEAS—207.

Abercrombie	Beall, Tex.	Burke, Wis.	Carter
Adamson	Blackmon	Burnett	Church
Aiken	Borland	Byrnes, S. C.	Clancy
Ashbrook	Bowdle	Byrns, Tenn.	Clark, Fla.
Aswell	Broussard	Calder	Cline
Bailey	Brown, W. Va.	Callaway	Coady
Baltz	Browne, Wis.	Candler, Miss.	Collier
Barchfeld	Brumbaugh	Cantor	Connolly, Iowa
Barkley	Buchanan, Tex.	Cantrill	Conry
Bartholdt	Bulkley	Caraway	Crisp
Bartlett	Burgess	Carew	Cullop
Beakes	Burke, Pa.	Carlin	Davenport

Decker	Gray	Lewis, Md	Sherley
Dent	Green, Iowa	Lieb	Sherwood
Dies	Gregg	Linthicum	Sims
Difenderfer	Griffin	Lloyd	Sisson
Dixon	Gudger	Lobeck	Slayden
Donovan	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lonergan	Small
Dooling	Hamlin	McGillicuddy	Smith, N. Y.
Doremus	Hardy	McKellar	Smith, Tex.
Doughton	Harris	Maguire, Nebr.	Sparkman
Driscoll	Harrison	Mahan	Stedman
Dupré	Hart	Metz	Stephens, Miss.
Eagle	Hay	Montague	Stephens, Nebr.
Edwards	Hayden	Moon	Stephens, Tex.
Estopinal	Heflin	Morgan, La.	Stout
Evans	Helm	Morrison	Sumners
Fairchild	Henry	Mulkey	Talbott, Md.
Fergusson	Hobson	Murray	Taylor, Ark.
Ferris	Holland	Oldfield	Thacher
Fields	Houston	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Finley	Howard	Page, N. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Fitzgerald	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer	Tribble
Flood, Va.	Hull	Park	Tuttle
Floyd, Ark.	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. J.	Underhill
Fordney	Jacoway	Parker, N. Y.	Underwood
Gard	Johnson, Ky.	Patten, N. Y.	Vaughan
Gardner	Johnson, S. C.	Phelan	Vinson
Garner	Kennedy, Conn.	Post	Vollmer
Garrett, Tenn.	Kent	Pou	Walker
Garrett, Tex.	Key, Ohio	Price	Wallin
George	Kindel	Quin	Watkins
Gerry	Kinkead, N. J.	Rauch	Watson
Gill	Kirkpatrick	Rayburn	Weaver
Gittins	Kitchin	Reilly, Conn.	Webb
Glass	Konop	Reilly, Wis.	Whaley
Godwin, N. C.	Korbly	Riordan	Whitacre
Goeke	Lazaro	Rouse	White
Goodwin, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Rucker	Wingo
Gordon	Lee, Pa.	Russell	Witherspoon
Goulden	Lesher	Sabath	Young, Tex.
Graham, Ill.	Lever	Shackleford	

NAYS—169.

Adair	Esch	Knowland, J. R.	Rogers
Alexander	Farr	Lafferty	Rubey
Anderson	Fess	La Follette	Rupley
Anthony	FitzHenry	Langham	Seldomridge
Austin	Foster	Langley	Sells
Avis	Fowler	Lenroot	Sinnott
Baker	Francis	Lindbergh	Slemp
Barnhart	Frear	Logue	Sloan
Bathrick	French	McAndrews	Smith, Idaho
Bell, Cal.	Gallagher	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Md.
Booher	Gallivan	McKenzie	Smith, J. M. C.
Borchers	Gillett	McLaughlin	Smith, Saml. W.
Britten	Gilmore	MacDonald	Smith, Minn.
Brockson	Good	Madden	Stafford
Brown, N. Y.	Gorman	Maher	Steenerson
Browning	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Stephens, Cal.
Bryan	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Stevens, Minn.
Buchanan, Ill.	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Stevens, N. H.
Burke, S. Dak.	Griest	Miller	Stone
Butler	Guernsey	Mitchell	Stringer
Campbell	Hamill	Mondell	Sutherland
Carr	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore	Switzer
Cary	Haugen	Morgan, Okla.	Taggart
Casey	Hawley	Moss, Ind.	Talcott, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Mott	Tavenner
Connelly, Kans.	Helgesen	Murdock	Taylor, Ala.
Cooper	Helvering	Neeley, Kans.	Taylor, Colo.
Copley	Hensley	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Temple
Cramton	Hinds	Nolan, J. I.	Thomson, Ill.
Crosser	Howell	Norton	Towner
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Hair	Treadway
Danforth	Hulings	Paige, Mass.	Vare
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Patton, Pa.	Volstead
Deitrick	Johnson, Wash.	Peterson	Walsh
Dershem	Kahn	Platt	Walters
Dickinson	Keating	Plumley	Williams
Dillon	Keister	Porter	Winslow
Donohoe	Kelley, Mich.	Prouty	Woods
Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey	Young, N. Dak.
Drukker	Kettner	Raker	
Eagan	Kiess, Pa.	Reed	
Edmonds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Roberts, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—48.

Ainey	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Roberts, Nev.
Allen	Hinebaugh	Loft	Rothermel
Barton	Hoxworth	McClellan	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Igoe	Manahan	Scott
Brodbeck	Johnson, Utah	Morin	Scully
Bruckner	Jones	Moss, W. Va.	Shreve
Claypool	Kennedy, Iowa	O'Brien	Stanley
Dale	Kennedy, R. I.	Oglesby	Ten Eyck
Dunn	Kreider	Padgett	Townsend
Elder	L'Engle	Peters	Wilson, Fla.
Faison	Levy	Powers	Wilson, N. Y.
Falconer	Lewis, Pa.	Ragsdale	Woodruff

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. TEN EYCK with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. DALE with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. O'BRIEN with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. MCCLELLAN with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. JOHNSON of Utah.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. BARTON.

Mr. IGOE with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the House vote now on the Mondell amendment, without any further intervening motion or amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And let the Mondell amendment be read.

Mr. HENRY. Let the Mondell amendment be read and the House proceed to vote on it without further intervening motion or amendment.

The SPEAKER. What goes with the gentleman's motion to strike out the enacting clause?

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman withdraws that.

Mr. MANN. He can not withdraw it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HENRY. By unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman is submitting a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the Mondell resolution shall be read and voted on without any intervening motion.

Mr. MANN. I suppose what the gentleman wants to do is to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending motion?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And let the resolution be read to the end as one paragraph, and at the end the previous question be considered as ordered upon the entire resolution?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; that is the effect of it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Without any amendment?

Mr. HENRY. Without any amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.] The Clerk will report the Mondell resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (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 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. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. MANN, and Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from North Carolina all demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 204, not voting 46, as follows:

YEAS—174.

Adair	Curry	Gorman	Kent
Alexander	Davenport	Graham, Pa.	Kettner
Anderson	Decker	Green, Iowa	Kiess, Pa.
Anthony	Deitrick	Griest	Kinkaid, Nebr.
Austin	Dershem	Guernsey	Kinkead, N. J.
Avis	Dickinson	Hamill	Kirkpatrick
Baker	Dillon	Hamilton, Mich.	Knowland, J. R.
Barnhart	Doolittle	Hamlin	Lafferty
Bathrick	Drukker	Hart	La Follette
Bell, Cal.	Eagan	Haugen	Langley
Borchers	Edmonds	Hawley	Lindbergh
Borland	Evans	Hayden	Lloyd
Britten	Farr	Hayes	Logue
Brown, N. Y.	Fergusson	Helgesen	McAndrews
Bryan	Ferris	Helvering	McGuire, Okla.
Buchanan, Ill.	Fess	Hensley	McKellar
Butler	FitzHenry	Hill	McKenzie
Campbell	Fordney	Hobson	McLaughlin
Carr	Foster	Howell	MacDonald
Casey	Fowler	Hughes, W. Va.	Madden
Chandler, N. Y.	Francis	Hulings	Maher
Church	Frear	Humphrey, Wash.	Mann
Clancy	French	Johnson, Wash.	Mapes
Cline	Gallagher	Kahn	Martin
Connelly, Kans.	Gallivan	Keating	Metz
Copley	George	Keister	Mitchell
Cramton	Gilmore	Kelley, Mich.	Mondell
Crosser	Good	Kelly, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.

Moss, Ind.	Rainey	Sinnott	Tavenner
Mott	Raker	Slemp	Taylor, Colo.
Murdock	Reilly, Conn.	Smith, Idaho	Taylor, N. Y.
Neeley, Kans.	Roberts, Mass.	Smith, Md.	Temple
Neely, W. Va.	Rogers	Smith, J. M. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Nelson	Rubey	Smith, Saml. W.	Thomson, Ill.
Nolan, J. I.	Rucker	Smith, Minn.	Towner
Norton	Rupley	Smith, N. Y.	Treadway
O'Hair	Russell	Steenerson	Vare
O'Shaunessy	Sabath	Stephens, Cal.	Volstead
Palmer	Scully	Stevens, N. H.	Walters
Patton, Pa.	Seldomridge	Stone	Williams
Peterson	Sells	Stout	Woods
Phelan	Shackleford	Stringer	Young, N. Dak.
Porter	Sherwood	Sutherland	
Prouty	Sims	Taggart	

NAYS—204.

Abercrombie	Davis	Henry	Price
Adamson	Dent	Hinds	Quin
Aiken	Dies	Holland	Ragsdale
Ashbrook	Difenderfer	Houston	Rauch
Aswell	Dixon	Howard	Rayburn
Bailey	Donohoe	Hughes, Ga.	Reed
Baltz	Donovan	Hull	Reilly, Wis.
Barchfeld	Dooling	Humphreys, Miss.	Riordan
Barkley	Doremus	Jacoway	Rouse
Bartholdt	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Sherley
Bartlett	Driscoll	Johnson, S. C.	Sisson
Beakes	Dupré	Kennedy, Conn.	Slayden
Beall, Tex.	Eagle	Key, Ohio	Sloan
Blackmon	Edwards	Kindel	Small
Booher	Esch	Kitchin	Smith, Tex.
Bowdle	Estopinal	Konop	Sparkman
Brockson	Fairchild	Korbly	Stafford
Broussard	Fields	Langham	Stedman
Brown, W. Va.	Finley	Lazaro	Stephens, Miss.
Browne, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Stephens, Nebr.
Browning	Flood, Va.	Lee, Pa.	Stephens, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Floyd, Ark.	Lenroot	Stevens, Minn.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gard	Lesher	Sumners
Bulkley	Gardner	Lever	Switzer
Burgess	Garner	Lewis, Md.	Talbott, Md.
Burke, Pa.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lieb	Talcott, N. Y.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garrett, Tex.	Linthicum	Taylor, Ala.
Burke, Wis.	Gerry	Lobeck	Taylor, Ark.
Burnett	Gill	Lonergan	Thacher
Byrnes, S. C.	Gillett	McGillicuddy	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Gittins	Maguire, Nebr.	Tribble
Calder	Glass	Mahan	Tuttle
Callaway	Godwin, N. C.	Miller	Underhill
Candler, Miss.	Goeke	Montague	Underwood
Cantor	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Vaughan
Cantrill	Gordon	Moore	Vinson
Caraway	Goulden	Morgan, La.	Vollmer
Carew	Graham, Ill.	Morrison	Walker
Carlin	Gray	Mulkey	Wallin
Carter	Greene, Mass.	Murray	Walsh
Cary	Greene, Vt.	Oldfield	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Page, N. C.	Watson
Coady	Griffin	Paige, Mass.	Weaver
Collier	Gudger	Park	Webb
Connolly, Iowa	Hamilton, N. Y.	Parker, N. J.	Whaley
Conry	Hardy	Parker, N. Y.	Whitacre
Cooper	Harris	Patten, N. Y.	White
Cox	Harrison	Platt	Wingo
Crisp	Hay	Plumley	Winslow
Cullop	Heflin	Post	Witherspoon
Danforth	Helm	Pou	Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—46.

Ainey	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Rothermel
Allen	Hinebaugh	Loft	Saunders
Barton	Hoxworth	McClellan	Scott
Bell, Ga.	Igoe	Manahan	Shreve
Brodbeck	Johnson, Utah	Morin	Stanley
Bruckner	Jones	Moss, W. Va.	Ten Eyck
Claypool	Kennedy, Iowa	O'Brien	Townsend
Dale	Kennedy, R. I.	Oglesby	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Kreider	Padgett	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	L'Engle	Peters	Woodruff
Faison	Levy	Powers	
Falconer	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the joint resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada and Mr. MOSS of West Virginia (in favor of suffrage amendment) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. HOXWORTH and Mr. JOHNSON of Utah (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. IGOE (against).

Mr. WOODRUFF and Mr. FALCONER (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. WILSON of Florida (against).

Mr. SHREVE and Mr. DUNN (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. SAUNDERS (against).

Mr. PETERS and Mr. LEVY (for suffrage amendment) with Mr. BELL of Georgia (against).

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. HINEBAUGH (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. MORIN (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARTON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. PADGETT, for one day, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of the Atlantic Canning Co.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Patents to exchange printed copies of United States patents with the Dominion of Canada.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6309) to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1275), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5434) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits to the occupants of certain unpatented lands on which oil or gas has been discovered, and authorizing the extraction of oil or gas therefrom, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1277), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 20814) to place Candler and Evans Counties, Ga., in the eastern division of the southern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 20815) proposed as a substitute for (H. R. 18666) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, or a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 20816) for the prevention of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of such edible alimentary pastes as macaroni, spaghetti, vermicelli, and noodles containing any artificial coloring matter, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 20817) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20818) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL: A bill (H. R. 20819) to fix the compensation of assistant appraisers of merchandise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 20841) to provide for a low rate of interest and long-time loans in aid of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 401) looking toward an international peace conference at The Hague after the close of the present war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 20820) granting a pension to Ellen Rohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 20821) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 20822) for the relief of Homer Rock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 20823) granting a pension to Lorilla M. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 20824) granting a pension to William Leishing; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 20825) granting an increase of pension to Matilda C. Boulden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 20826) granting a pension to Mary M. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 20827) granting a pension to Ada A. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 20828) for the relief of James Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 20829) granting a pension to Charles Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 20830) granting an increase of pension to Susan O. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 20831) for the relief of Frances A. Bliss; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20832) for the relief of D. C. Darroch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 20833) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 20834) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Gladwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 20835) granting an increase of pension to George Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 20836) granting an increase of pension to James Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 20837) granting a pension to John C. Rowland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20838) providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 20839) granting an increase of pension to Linda Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20840) granting an increase of pension to Francis King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 20842) granting an increase of pension to Sidney W. Wox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20843) granting an increase of pension to William H. Caunoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 20844) granting a pension to Margaret C. Pyles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20845) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Wescott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 20846) granting a pension to Westley J. Brasier, alias William J. Brasier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of sundry citizens of Montgomery County, Mo., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of E. S. Seaman, of Wilmore; and of Bantley & Mine, Portage Supply Co., and E. S. Lindsey, of Portage, all of the State of Pennsylvania, asking for the passage of House bill 5308, a bill providing for the taxation of mail-order houses for local purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of Eugene J. Helber and 27 citizens of Washtenaw County; John Bork and 37 citizens of Wayne County; H. A. Brauer and 38 citizens of Ann Arbor; Fred T. Kipf and 34 citizens of Monroe; Christian Gensley and 19 citizens of Ann Arbor; F. Thrun and 80 citizens of Ann Arbor; Julian R. Trojanowski, president, and Christian Martin, secretary, of the Stadt-Verband, of Ann Arbor; Carl F. Stark, president, and Fred C. Scholl, secretary, of the Workingman Society of Adrian; Joseph Biskupski, president, and Carl Marx, secretary, of the St. Joseph's Benevolent Society, of Adrian; F. T. Stark, Henry D. Duerr, Carl J. Erhart, and Joseph Ehrlich, Adrian, all of the second congressional district of Michigan, in favor of prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Petition of 65 citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, to prevent the shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Rev. C. Lescow and 14 other citizens of Woodland, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Mr. W. Stauber and 18 other citizens of the city of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, etc., from this country to European countries now at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of August Lau and 14 other citizens of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for the passage of a law to prohibit the sale and exportation of war material from the United States to belligerent European nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Emil Morenzun, of Theresa, and A. F. Nicolaus and 128 other citizens of Fort Atkinson, both in the State of Wisconsin, asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Edwin C. Beske and 35 other citizens of Atwater, Dodge County, and A. C. Kukhaefer and 22 other citizens of Thiensville, both in the State of Wisconsin, asking for the passage at this session of House joint resolution 377, to levy an embargo upon and prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, etc., to any of the European countries now engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. M. H. Pankow and 55 other citizens of Waterloo, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petitions of Lane Local Branch of the German-American Alliance of South Dakota, and sundry citizens of South Dakota, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petitions of citizens of the State of New York, relative to violation of the spirit of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Montclair and the New Jersey Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage, protesting against suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to violation of strict neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of citizens of Unionville Center, Ohio, favoring passage of House Joint Resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of citizens of Texas, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Rev. A. S. Arnold, Woonsocket; Sarah J. Eddy and Lillian Wheeler, Bristol Ferry; Harriet Taft, Lillian Brown, Elizabeth A. Jennings, Mrs. Harriet J. Bosworth, and Helen Bowen Jones, Providence; Dr. Kate S. Stanton, Hannah C. Bacheller, Henry C. Bacheller, Mrs. A. F. Squire, M. Anna Ford, Mrs. George G. Keating, Elizabeth H. Tromburne, Harriet F. Riggs, Mrs. I. S. Buffum, Rebecca T. Bosworth, Rachel W. Bertram, Mary F. Leavitt, Wayant H. Easter, Mrs. Robert Herrick, Marie F. Cottrell, and Miss Blanche Leavitt, Newport; Miss Elizabeth Jennings, Miss C. Isabelle Lee, and Miss Julia E. Wilock, Newport, all in the State of Rhode Island, urging the passage of legislation providing for equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Mary F. Leavitt, Blanche Leavitt, Margaret H. Easton, Lillian Wheeler, Kate S. Stanton, M. D., Mrs. James Griswold Wentz, Sarah J. Eddy, all of Newport, R. I., in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Jennings, C. Isabelle Lee, and Julia E. Welock, of East Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolution of Mrs. Adeline Hall Williams, chairman executive committee of the Cosmopolitan Club, councilor of the national committee on prisons and prison labor, in re bill to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of James J. O'Reilly and Thomas Carroll, of Kingston, and Jacob Stotz, of Hunter, N. Y., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit exportation of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, telegrams from E. P. Babcock, Mrs. E. P. Babcock, S. B. Hamilton, Mrs. S. B. Hamilton, E. B. Whiting, Mrs. F. E. Boyle, A. B. Hopkins, E. Hopkins, C. H. Whiting, all of Canaan, N. Y.; J. H. Cox, N. Brooks, M. D., Mrs. S. J. Tilden, Louise Highland, Stanley H. Watson, Lena R. Smith, Sydney R. Smith, all of New Lebanon, N. Y., urging passage of suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from Mrs. John W. Gillette, Mrs. Robert Evans, and Alice Seymour, all of Hudson, N. Y., urging vote against suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHAN: Resolutions adopted by the Cosmopolitan Club, of South Manchester, Conn., favoring the passage of the bill to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Norwich, Conn., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Electrical Supply Jobbers' Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Calumet Singing Society, of Chicago, Ill., favoring legislation to enable the President to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war, excepting foodstuffs alone, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Friends of our Native Landscape, favoring creation of Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE: Petitions of 2,518 citizens of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the exportation from the United States of articles of warfare and urging legislative action preventing its continuance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: Petitions of citizens of Barton and Reno Counties, Kans., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Resolutions of 28 fraternal and other organizations in the city of San Francisco, Cal., comprising a total membership of 34,426 citizens, favoring the passage of House bill 5139, providing for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions from sundry citizens of the city of San Francisco, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the exportation of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition from B. Greenberg, E. L. Duell, H. Wilensky, D. V. Brennan, M. H. Brennan, V. Gram, and Edw. Richardson, all of Devils Lake, N. Dak.; Ch. Freedman, of Starkweather, and John Henley and others, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., in opposition to the illiteracy clause in the Burnett immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 15182, for increase of pension to E. T. Connelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Fred McNaughton, W. N. Ells, A. E. Mason, and other citizens of New York, favoring Senate bill 3672, to make certain improvements in Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PLATT: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Charles Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr RAINEY: Petition of German Roman Catholic Union of Illinois, against sale of munitions of war to nations engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of St. Joseph Benevolent Society, of Brussels, Ill., favoring religious freedom in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Garage Owners' Association of Illinois, favoring the Stevens bills (H. R. 13305); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of citizens of the State of California, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 539); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 279 citizens of the State of Kentucky, favoring the adoption of House resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Union League of Italian-Americans of the United States, against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of 126 members of Ambrosius Maennerchor, of Chicago, Ill., favoring strict neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of the New Jersey State League of Building and Loan Associations, urging amendment to the war-revenue law exempting building loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mr. Lloyd, of Matawan, N. J., relative to armaments of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Papers to accompany H. R. 2854, granting pension to Sarah E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of David Vogt and two citizens, of Coldwater, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Andrew Gladwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of Paris Hill Church and Sunday School, for a federation of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of thirty-third congressional district of New York, favoring passage of Senate bill 3672, for improvement of Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 750 American citizens, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEY: Petition of citizens of Charleston and Orangeburg, S. C., protesting against violation of spirit of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Worcester, Mass., relative to woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 13, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee with fullest and freest self-expression, because Thou art love. We would not cloak nor hide our sins from Thee. We would not deceive ourselves concerning our own weakness. Before Thee we would come laying bare our hearts, lifting them up to the source of light and truth and power, asking Thee to breathe upon us and give us the influence of Thy spirit. All about us error and truth contend together, darkness and light struggle for supremacy; but Thou art the source of truth; Thou art the fountain of life. To Thee we come and pray that our path may be illumined by Thy presence, that we may discern the right from the wrong, and lay ourselves upon Thine altar, that Thou mayest use us for the glory of Thy name and the advancement of all the interests of this great Nation this day. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washburn, Me., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Governor Weare Council, No. 15, Order United American Mechanics, of Seabrook, N. H., praying for the passage of the pending immigration bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.