

POSTMASTERS.

J. Knox Corbett, to be postmaster at Tucson, in the county of Pima and Territory of Arizona.

John W. Archibald, to be postmaster at Prescott, in the county of Yavapai and Territory of Arizona.

Hallam G. Williamson, to be postmaster at Albuquerque, in the county of Bernalillo and Territory of New Mexico.

Jacob Weltmer, to be postmaster at Santa Fé, in the county of Santa Fé and Territory of New Mexico.

John A. Place, to be postmaster at Oswego, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Henry C. Hammond, to be postmaster at Brockport, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

Justin M. Moody, to be postmaster at Waterbury, in the county of Washington and State of Vermont.

Charles W. L. Hayward, to be postmaster at East Weymouth, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

John Lovejoy, to be postmaster at Rockland, in the county of Knox and State of Maine.

Frank E. Helvey, to be postmaster at Nebraska City, in the county of Otoe and State of Nebraska.

James B. Hartwell, to be postmaster at Hastings, in the county of Adams and State of Nebraska.

Samuel L. Andrews, to be postmaster at Crete, in the county of Saline and State of Nebraska.

William Cochran, jr., to be postmaster at Milan, in the county of Sullivan and State of Missouri.

Sumner A. Whitehead, to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan.

William P. Moulton, to be postmaster at Stuart, in the county of Guthrie and State of Iowa.

Noyce B. Smith, to be postmaster at Kilbourn City, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin.

Newman C. Nash, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lincoln and State of South Dakota.

Joshua E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of South Carolina.

John C. Reid, to be postmaster at Cuyahoga Falls, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio.

Milton B. De Shong, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Ashland and State of Ohio.

John H. Fellows, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine.

Jonas Myers, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Fulton and State of Indiana.

Mark L. De Motte, to be postmaster at Valparaiso, in the county of Porter and State of Indiana.

William H. Breeding, to be postmaster at Edinburgh, in the county of Johnson and State of Indiana.

Frederick G. Diefenbach, to be postmaster at Blue Island, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Mark L. Doughty, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of St. Francois and State of Missouri.

William C. Adams, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in the county of Pike and State of Indiana.

George Woodruff, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois.

Joseph H. Weeks, to be postmaster at Upper Alton, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1890.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Bureau of Provisions and Clothing.

Pay Director Thomas H. Looker, to be Chief of the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing, and Paymaster-General in the Department of the Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 26, 1890.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

CORRECTIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on page 2673 of the RECORD, under reports filed, it appears that as a member of the Committee on Printing I reported a concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 2,500 extra copies of the report of the health officer of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. As a fact the concurrent resolution was passed by the House of Representatives and was not referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Journal so shows.

Mr. CARLISLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the

House to a clerical error in an amendment offered by myself on yesterday and agreed to by the House when the world's fair bill was under consideration. In the preparation of the amendment the word "said" is written instead of the word "such." I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed, in engrossing the bill, to substitute the word "such" for the word "said." The meaning is plain in the amendment, and it is a mere clerical error.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made as requested.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER. An enrolled bill was submitted to the House on yesterday evening in such condition that the Chair thinks it should be again submitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 325) to establish two additional land offices in the State of Montana.

SPECIAL ORDER.

Mr. CANNON. As a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, I report back the following resolution with a substitute, the adoption of which is recommended by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Wednesday, March 26, immediately after the approval of the Journal, be set apart for the consideration in the House of the bill for the admission of Wyoming, and that, unless previously ordered by the House, the previous question shall be deemed ordered on the engrossment, third reading, and final passage of the bill at 4 o'clock p. m. of that day.

The committee offer the following as a substitute:

Resolved, That to-day, immediately after the passage of this resolution, the House enter upon the consideration of the bill for the admission of Wyoming, and at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes take a recess until 11 o'clock Thursday next; and at 1 o'clock of that day the previous question be considered as ordered on the three amendments proposed by the minority and on the bill to its passage.

The substitute was agreed to; and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REMONSTRANCES AGAINST EXPENDITURES FOR WAR-LIKE PURPOSES.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following memorial; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Remonstrance of Back Creek, Fairmount, Deer Creek, and Marion Monthly Meetings of Friends of Grant County, Indiana, against proposed large expenditures of public money for naval, coast defense, and other warlike measures.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your petitioners of Deer Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, Grant County, State of Indiana, numbering 225 adult persons, respectfully, but earnestly, entreat your honorable bodies to reject the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee, and other measures which propose a large expenditure for the Navy and so-called coast defenses and other warlike preparations, all of which we believe are a menace to the peace and security of the nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced the passage of bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; in which concurrence was requested:

A bill (S. 3025) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to gather full and authentic information as to the present condition and preservation of the fur-seal interests of the Government in the region of Alaska, as compared with its condition in 1870; also full information as to the impending extinction of the sea-otter industry, and kindred lines of inquiry, etc.;

A bill (S. 2860) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building in Houston, Tex., and to provide a cistern, heating apparatus, etc., for said building; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 46) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to remove the naval magazine from Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, and to purchase a site and erect a naval magazine at some other point, and for other purposes.

ADMISSION OF WYOMING.

Mr. BAKER. I call up the bill for the admission of Wyoming. The bill has been read in Committee of the Whole, and I do not suppose it is necessary to read it again.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard that bill read, and I think it should be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of the Territory of Wyoming did, on the 30th day of September, 1889, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution, which constitution was ratified and adopted by the people of said Territory at the election held therefor on the first Tuesday in November, 1889, which constitution is republican in form and is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas said convention and the people of the said Territory have asked the

admission of said Territory into the Union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Wyoming have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 2. That the said State shall consist of all the territory included within the following boundaries, to wit: Commencing at the intersection of the twenty-seventh meridian of longitude west from Washington with the forty-fifth degree of north latitude and running thence west to the thirty-fourth meridian of west longitude; thence south to the forty-first degree of north latitude; thence east to the twenty-seventh meridian of west longitude, and thence north to the place of beginning.

SEC. 3. That until the next general census, or until otherwise provided by law, said State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the election of the Representative to the Fifty-first Congress and the Representative to the Fifty-second Congress shall take place at the time and be conducted and certified in the same manner as is provided in the constitution of the State for the election of State, district, and other officers.

SEC. 4. That sections numbered 16 and 35 in every township of said proposed State, and, where such sections, or any parts thereof, have been sold or otherwise disposed of by or under the authority of any act of Congress, other lands equivalent thereto, in legal subdivisions of not less than one quarter-section, and as contiguous as may be to the section in lieu of which the same is taken, are hereby granted to said State for the support of common schools, such indemnity lands to be selected within said State in such manner as the Legislature may provide, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That section 5 of the act of Congress of August 9, 1888, entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of the school and university lands in the Territory of Wyoming, and for other purposes," shall apply to the school and university indemnity lands of the said State of Wyoming so far as applicable.

SEC. 5. That all lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be disposed of only at public sale, the proceeds to constitute a permanent school fund, the interest of which only shall be expended in the support of said schools. But said lands may, under such regulations as the Legislature shall prescribe, be leased for periods of not more than five years, in quantities not exceeding one section to any one person or company; and such land shall not be subject to pre-emption, homestead entry, or any other entry under the land laws of the United States, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, but shall be reserved for school purposes only.

SEC. 6. That fifty sections of the unappropriated public lands within said State, to be selected and located in legal subdivisions as provided in section 4 of this act, shall be, and are hereby, granted to said State for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the capital of said State.

SEC. 7. That 5 per cent. of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State.

SEC. 8. That the lands granted to the Territory of Wyoming by the act of February 18, 1881, entitled "An act to grant lands to Dakota, Montana, Arizona, Idaho, and Wyoming for university purposes," are hereby vested in the State of Wyoming, to the extent of the full quantity of 72 sections to said State, and any portion of said lands that may not have been selected by said Territory of Wyoming may be selected by the said State; but said act of February 18, 1881, shall be so amended as to provide that none of said lands shall be sold for less than \$10 per acre, and the proceeds shall constitute a permanent fund to be safely invested and held by said State and the income thereof be used exclusively for university purposes. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university. The section of land granted by the act of May 23, 1888, to the Territory of Wyoming for a fish hatchery and other public purposes shall, upon the admission of said State of Wyoming into the Union, become the property of said State.

SEC. 9. That the penitentiary at Laramie City, Wyo., and all lands connected therewith and set apart and reserved therefor, and unexpended appropriations of money therefor, are hereby granted to the State of Wyoming.

SEC. 10. That 90,000 acres of land, to be selected and located as provided in section 4 of this act, are hereby granted to said State for the use and support of an agricultural college in said State, as provided in the acts of Congress making donations of lands for such purpose.

SEC. 11. That in lieu of the grant of land for purposes of internal improvement made to new States by the eighth section of the act of September 4, 1841, which section is hereby repealed as to the State of Wyoming, and in lieu of any claim or demand by the said State under the act of September 28, 1850, and section 2479 of the Revised Statutes, making a grant of swamp and overflowed lands to certain States, which grant it is hereby declared is not extended to the State of Wyoming, and in lieu of any grant of saline lands to said State, the following grants of land are hereby made, to wit:

To the State of Wyoming: For the establishment and maintenance and support in the said State of the insane asylum in Uinta County, 30,000 acres; for the penal, reform, or educational institution in Carbon County, 30,000 acres; for the penitentiary in Albany County, 30,000 acres; for the fish hatchery in Albany County, 10,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum in Laramie County, 30,000 acres; for the poor farm in Fremont County, 30,000 acres; for a miners' hospital, 30,000 acres; for normal schools, 100,000 acres; for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions, 210,000 acres; making a total of 500,000 acres.

SEC. 12. That the State of Wyoming shall not be entitled to any further or other grants of land for any purpose than as expressly provided in this act; and the lands granted by this section shall be held, appropriated, and disposed of exclusively for the purposes herein mentioned, in such manner as the Legislature of the State may provide.

SEC. 13. That all mineral lands shall be exempted from the grants made by this act. But if sections 16 and 35, or any subdivision or portion of any smallest subdivision thereof in any township, shall be found by the Department of the Interior to be mineral lands, said State is hereby authorized and empowered to select, in legal subdivisions, an equal quantity of other unappropriated lands in said State in lieu thereof, for the use and the benefit of the common schools of said State.

SEC. 14. That all lands granted in quantity or as indemnity by this act shall be selected, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, from the surveyed, unreserved, and unappropriated public lands of the United States within the limits of the State entitled thereto. And there shall be deducted from the number of acres of land donated by this act for specific objects to said State the number of acres heretofore donated by Congress to said Territory for similar objects.

SEC. 15. That the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Territory for defraying the expenses of the said convention and for the payment of the members thereof, under the same rules and regulations

and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislatures, and for the elections held therefor and thereunder. Any money hereby appropriated not necessary for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 16. That the said State, when admitted as aforesaid, shall constitute a judicial district, the name thereof to be the same as the name of the State; and the circuit and district courts therefor shall be held at the capital of the State for the time being, and the said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the eighth judicial circuit. There shall be appointed for said district one district judge, one United States attorney, and one United States marshal. The judge of said district shall receive a yearly salary of \$3,500, payable in four equal installments, on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October of each year, and shall reside in the district. There shall be appointed clerks of said courts in the said district, who shall keep their offices at the capital of said State. The regular terms of said courts shall be held in said district at the place aforesaid on the first Monday in April and the first Monday in November of each year, and only one grand jury and one petit jury shall be summoned in both said circuit and district courts. The circuit and district courts for said district, and the judges thereof, respectively, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction, and perform the same duties required to be performed by the other circuit and district courts and judges of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations. The marshal, district attorney, and clerks of the circuit and district courts of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein, shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully possessed and required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States; and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the fees and compensation allowed by law to other similar officers and persons performing similar duties in the State of Oregon.

SEC. 17. That all cases of appeal or writ of error heretofore prosecuted and now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States upon any record from the supreme court of said Territory, or that may hereafter lawfully be prosecuted upon any record from said courts, may be heard and determined by said Supreme Court of the United States. And the mandate of execution or of further proceedings shall be directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to the circuit or district court hereby established within the said State from or to the supreme court of such State, as the nature of the case may require. And the circuit, district, and State courts herein named shall, respectively, be the successor of the supreme court of the Territory, as to all such cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein; and that from all judgments and decrees of the supreme court of the Territory mentioned in this act, in any case arising within the limits of the proposed State prior to admission, the parties to such judgment shall have the same right to prosecute appeals and writs of error to the Supreme Court of the United States as they shall have had by law prior to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 18. That in respect to all cases, proceedings, and matters now pending in the supreme or district courts of the said Territory at the time of the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming and arising within the limits of such State, whereof the circuit or district courts by this act established might have had jurisdiction under the laws of the United States had such courts existed at the time of commencement of such cases, the said circuit and district courts, respectively, shall be the successors of said supreme and district courts of said Territory; and in respect to all other cases, proceedings, and matters pending in the supreme or district courts of the said Territory at the time of the admission of such Territory into the Union, arising within the limits of said State, the courts established by such State shall, respectively, be the successors of said supreme and district Territorial courts; and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such circuit, district, and State courts, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law; but no writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding now pending, or that prior to the admission of the State shall be pending, in any Territorial court in said Territory shall abate by the admission of such State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred and proceeded with in the proper United States circuit, district, or State court, as the case may be: *Provided, however*, That in all civil actions, causes, and proceedings in which the United States is not a party, transfers shall not be made to the circuit and district courts of the United States except upon written request of one of the parties to such action or proceeding filed in the proper court; and in the absence of such request such cases shall be proceeded with in the proper State courts.

SEC. 19. That the Legislature of the said State may elect two Senators of the United States as is provided by the constitution of said State, and the Senators and Representatives of said State shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 20. That until the State officers are elected and qualified under the provisions of the constitution of said State, the officers of the Territory of Wyoming shall discharge the duties of their respective offices under the constitution of the State, in the manner and form as therein provided.

SEC. 21. That from and after the admission of said State into the Union, in pursuance of this act, the laws of the United States, not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States; and all laws in force made by said Territory, at the time of its admission into the Union, until amended or repealed, shall be in force in said State, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and all acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by a legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I did not hear the order made for the consideration of this bill read, and I desire to know whether the bill is to be considered in the House regularly or in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. In the House.

Mr. ROGERS. By the order?

The SPEAKER. By the order.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask to have the order read again. I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. It will require unanimous consent to have the order again read.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the order, as above.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this bill ought to receive its first consideration in Committee of the Whole, as it carries an appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the country may contemplate with pride and satisfaction the fact that the time is not far distant

when the last of our Territories will cease to exist as such, and the new relation of "State" will be assumed by membership in a Union which has stood the tests of more than a century the most eventful in the world's history.

Wyoming will, if admitted under the pending bill, be the forty-third State to come into the Union, and the thirtieth to enter since the original federation, following which are to come Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma (which give promise of early preparation for statehood), Utah, and perhaps Alaska. There is every assurance that the last of our Territorial dependencies will become a State in the Union ere another decade shall pass, and when the calendar shall mark "A. D. 1900" we shall be a great Republic of half a hundred States, mighty in the achievements of war, to be sure, but far greater in the conquests of peace.

So the second century of our national existence will, in its first decade, give promise of growth in population, success in the pursuits of peace, prosperity to our vast industrial interests, progress in science and art, greater far than that of any preceding century of any nation in the world's history. Before the next half century passes we shall see the annexation, by natural attraction, of our neighbor on the north, with several ready-made States, abundantly equipped in all those elements which combine to insure strength and secure to all men equality and liberty in the highest and best sense.

Instead of a mere "commercial union" will come a political union, the conditions of, and considerations for, which will be mutual. Moreover, the invincible power and aggressiveness of our advanced civilization will extend southward until our "Union" will reach from the North Star to the Southern Cross! Then the Republic of North America will greet her sister Republics of South America across the Nicaragua canal. This may seem like an attempt on my part to assume the rôle of a prophet, but the conditions which have obtained in the great Northwest were all foretold by the founders of the Republic.

Immediately after the close of the Revolution, when several of the States were laying claim to the great outlying territory east of the Mississippi River, and north as well as south of the Ohio River, the patriotic State of Virginia, which seemed to have the stronger claim to the largest portion, yielded her claim for the benefit of all the States, imposing conditions that such territory should not be kept for any considerable time in a colonial condition, but stipulated in the contract under which the region northwest of the Ohio was ceded that when in any portion thereof 60,000 free inhabitants should assemble and become permanent citizens they should have absolute right to form for themselves a constitution and State government republican in form and should be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The further condition was imposed that such territory should, in forming into states, comprise not less than three nor more than five. So we find that, in following the provisions of such contract, the great States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois have come into the Union. Similar conditions have governed in the creation of the territory west of the Mississippi River, which was acquired from France, into States, and so we have the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, and the two Dakotas.

The creation and advent into the Union of the twenty-nine States which have come in since the original federation are but the fulfillment of the predictions, the realization of the prophetic utterances of our fathers when they laid the foundation of this Republic, a Republic which, as I have said, has successfully withstood the tests of more than a century, and grown stronger with each decade and mightier with the admission of each new State.

Our history from the beginning is, in its earliest chapters, replete with the utterances of the framers and defenders of our Constitution showing how clearly they were able to foresee the great future of our growth.

Territorial governments are a necessity, and in this very Congress we are earnestly desired to create such a government for Oklahoma, not because it is a desirable thing, but because the people are too few in number and too scant in resources to maintain a State government. "A Territory," Chief-Justice Taney said, "is required to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority." They are given rules and regulations by Congress in order that the people thereof may be protected in their persons and property and the sooner fit themselves for statehood. Yet it has been said, and all our past experience has demonstrated, that Territorial governments are contrary to the spirit of our American Constitution and are to be tolerated and continued only so long as the necessity exists.

There are now over a hundred thousand intelligent, law-abiding citizens in the Indian Territory and Oklahoma for whom we are going to create a Territorial government as a matter of necessity only. In a very few years they will be prepared for statehood, if encouraged as they deserve, and she will make one of the fairest in the Union.

The Territorial is a preparatory or probationary condition, out of which the people should at the earliest moment emerge into statehood.

Wyoming and Idaho have endured this condition of vassalage, the former since 1868; the latter was organized nearly five years earlier; both have borne a long probation; each has come and is here asking to be clothed with the habiliments of statehood in the Union; each is

fully prepared to assume all the duties and obligations of such and presents the most satisfactory credentials. To me has been delegated the pleasant duty of presenting upon this floor the offering of Wyoming. It would seem almost unnecessary to occupy the attention of the House at any length, because I believe there is no substantial opposition to the immediate admission of the State from any source.

Within her own borders both the great political parties and all interests, public and private, seem to have united in the memorial which has been presented to Congress. Wyoming is here asking for her constitutional right of admission to the Union and for representation upon this floor on an equality with her sister States, and her request has received the unanimous approval of your Committee on the Territories.

I have said there is no substantial opposition to the immediate admission of Wyoming from any source and that her request for admission has received the unanimous approval of your Committee on the Territories. Perhaps such assertions are too strongly stated. It will be conceded, however, that no negative vote was heard upon the proposition to report the bill with favorable recommendation, and I will not contend that individual objection to or criticism of any of the provisions in their constitution should subject a Representative to the charge of making substantial opposition to the admission of the State.

The suffrage article, being the sixth, as will be seen by reference to the report, provides that "the rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex" and "that both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges." It provides further that "no person shall have the right to vote who shall not be able to read the constitution of this State."

These are constitutional provisions not to be found in the fundamental law of any other State. They are novel and not yet new. As a Territory woman suffrage has obtained and existed for twenty years in their government. The people of the new State, men, women, and children, all, irrespective of political affiliations or religious prejudices, so far as we are informed, want the same principle ingrafted into their fundamental law. I honor them for it. He may not be a "bold, bad man" who will deny them statehood or argue against their capacity for self-government because they want to continue in statehood the principles under which, as a Territory, they have prospered and builded for themselves a State, but he does assume to battle against a sentiment which steadily through four decades or more has grown in our land until it has become a mighty power.

It will not be contended that any State now in the Union may not in legal manner amend its constitution by ingrafting thereon the same identical provisions quoted from the Wyoming constitution. Shall it be said, then, that in their organization they shall be denied the right to begin their career as a State by according to women the equal rights before the law granted and enjoyed by them during all their existence as a Territory? Will any man dare to stand up here before the people of this country, talking as we do to sixty millions or more of our equals, and assert that a constitution containing such a principle is unrepugnant in form? If yea, let him so declare, and then go hence and be no more forever, but politically of doubtful sanity.

I shall listen with interest, if not with shame, to the argument of any colleague upon this floor who will contend against the State which has, as a Territory, honored itself in sending as a Representative, term after term, my honored friend, Judge CAREY, to whom I will yield the easy task of answering any objection which may be urged upon that line.

Wyoming comes with the ripe experience of over twenty-one years of Territorial rule; her domain embraces 98,000 square miles—62,000,000 acres; she will be the eighth State in the Union in respect of area, an area equal to New York, New Jersey, Kentucky, and Delaware; her national resources are vast and varied; her actual wealth is not less than \$125,000,000; her railroad property is shown to be not less than \$25,000,000; while she has expended in irrigation works and improvements full ten millions; \$40,000,000 is the estimated value of the live stock grazing upon improved farms and ranches aggregating more than fifteen millions in value. We are convinced that her developed mines represent fully fifteen millions more.

Two and a half millions represent less than the value of the churches, schools, city, county, and Territorial property. She boasts a better capitol building than can be found in fifteen of the older States, erected at a cost of \$275,000. She will doubtless have several Government buildings conveniently located soon after her admission, certainly so if the present Delegate comes back as her representative in the Senate, as is likely to be the case if the fitness of things is to be observed. The present total indebtedness of Wyoming is only \$320,000, which is nearly equalled by the funds in the treasury. Her national banks, nine in number, in 1888 employed an aggregate of \$1,175,000, with a surplus of \$213,000. The mining resources of this new State are wonderful. They embrace gold, silver, lead, tin, asbestos, mica, magnesium, sulphur, graphite, kaolin, fire-clay, marble, salt, and it is shown that coal, petroleum, iron, and soda exist in almost inexhaustible quantities.

The oil-bearing area is said to be 300 miles in length, while its coal area is known to cover 30,000 square miles. Her population is not less than 110,000. The population of each of ten of the great States, which I will name, at the time of admission was much less: Ohio when

admitted had 45,000; Indiana, 63,000; Mississippi, 35,000; Illinois, 35,000; Alabama, 40,000; Missouri, 66,000; Oregon, 45,000; and Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado each had but 100,000.

The vote cast in 1888 at the election for her present Delegate was 18,210. The increase of vote year by year has been marked. A comparison with the votes cast at Presidential elections at various periods in the history of several of the States will prove interesting. I quote from the remarks of Wyoming's Delegate made before the Committee on Territories:

States.	Years after admission.	Votes cast.	Members of Congress.
Tennessee	28	20,725	9
Indiana	8	15,725	3
Illinois	10	8,344	1
Do	14	19,576	3
Missouri	15	5,192	2
Do	19	19,332	2
Mississippi	15	5,007	2
Do	19	19,667	2
Arkansas		3,638	1
Do	4	11,209	1
Do	12	16,888	1
Do	16	19,357	2
Michigan		11,360	1
Louisiana	28	18,914	4
Florida	3	4,963	1
Do	7	7,193	1
Do	15	14,345	1
Texas	3	15,177	2
Do	7	18,647	2
Iowa	3	24,303	2
Wisconsin		39,166	3
Oregon		12,410	1
Do	14	14,649	1
Nebraska	2	15,168	1
Do	6	26,141	1

Wisconsin Territory at election preceding admission cast 20,318 votes, admitted with two Representatives, and she cast first Congressional election 24,600. Iowa admitted with two Representatives, who were elected with total vote of 20,064.

Kansas cast at second Congressional election after admission 15,272. Nebraska cast first Congressional election subsequent to admission 14,710. Colorado cast at election previous to admission 17,100. California at her first State election, after a most bitter political fight when the selection of governor, judiciary, and other State officers, including United States Senators, was dependent upon the result, cast only 12,875 votes.

In the great debate over the admission of Oregon and Kansas it was not claimed that more than 10,121 votes had ever been cast in the former and 13,289 votes in the latter Territory. The votes rejected as well as those counted were included in these totals.

At almost every Presidential election up to and including that of 1872 there were from three to five States that did not have as many male voters as there were in Wyoming in 1888.

The new State also makes a most favorable exhibit in her postal affairs.

I am tempted to quote briefly from the report of Professor Meade, the Territorial engineer, to illustrate the wonderful push and industry of the people in the matter of reclaiming and developing her agricultural resources, resulting, as is shown, in reclaiming fully 2,500,000 acres, making it to bear abundant fruit. Professor Meade says:

Wyoming stands third in extent of irrigated lands and in number and mileage of irrigation canals. More than \$10,000,000 are invested in irrigation ditches and canals, and over \$15,000,000 have been expended in the reclamation of desert lands. The irrigated districts, as to extent, are equal to two-thirds of Italy and are greater than those of France and Spain combined. The lands now reclaimed would, if divided, make 30,000 80-acre farms and, if provided with transportation facilities, would furnish employment and support for more than one-quarter of a million of people. Fully 10,000,000 acres can be reclaimed by irrigation if proper measures are taken for storing and distributing the water. These lands are not only enormously productive, but their agricultural value is enhanced by contiguity of over 30,000,000 acres of valuable grazing lands. The irrigable land of this Territory equals in extent the combined irrigation of Egypt and Italy, the agricultural area of which supports over 10,000,000 people. Taken in connection with the grazing land, its area and productive value are above the States in the Mississippi Valley.

In the volume and distribution of her water supply Wyoming takes the first place among the States and Territories of the arid belt. Within her boundaries are the sources of three of the great rivers of the continent—the Missouri, Colorado, and Columbia—streams crossing the continent in three directions and emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, Gulf of California, and the Pacific Ocean. These three great water courses have their origin within a circle of which the radius is less than 10 miles. Six hundred natural water ways have their water diverted in irrigation. Four great rivers cross her borders: the Platte on the east, the Big Horn on the north, the Snake on the west, and the Greene on the south. Their tributaries penetrate all parts of her vast extent and are fed from the melting snows of a mountain area which covers over 20,000,000 acres. There are over 3,000 irrigation ditches, with a total length, not counting laterals, of nearly 5,000 miles. The record ditches cover 2,105,180 acres of land.

I have hastily referred to these things in passing, not in the belief that any gentleman is in doubt or needs convincing, for I believe that with one voice the people of the United States, through their Representatives on this floor, are ready to say amen to the prayer of Wyoming for admission. They have in an orderly and authoritative manner expressed their desire to be clothed with the power and charged with the duties of statehood. They have proceeded in a justifiable and regular way to place themselves in condition for admission.

Their constitution and State government, duly adopted and organized, are republican in form, and all the conditions as to area, population, production, resources, morals, and lawful and orderly practices assure the existence and continuance of a permanent State government.

Upon such a showing, clothed as she is in all that lies at the foundation of every prosperous State, I am proud to bid Wyoming welcome to the sisterhood of States! We are engaged in a great transaction when we admit a new State to the Union. By our act we tie a knot that, as our experience has illustrated, can never be cut by the sword! We pin a star upon our flag that the torch of war can never obliterate! We are erecting a defense stronger than all the projected coast defenses combined can ever be made, more invincible than armies and navies. France has within a few years expended over \$775,000,000 in fortifying Paris, and yet all engineers confess or claim their fortifications are worthless because of later improvements in engines of destruction. We will expend our millions in internal improvements, in encouraging our own industries, and in enlarging our own commerce, and so command and supply the markets of the world with the products of our own industries.

Germany expends over \$202,000,000 annually on her army, while her Kaisers and Bismarcks, in chorus with Czars and Emperors, for a decade have assured the world that the peace of Europe is secured; yet Germany has for the past eight years increased her army expenses at an average rate of nearly forty-three millions per year. We employ our army in the pursuits of peace, and in two decades have, through our industrial campaigns, increased our aggregate wealth by more than \$40,000,000,000. European nations take three millions of the most robust and capable of their sons from farm and shop, where they would be self-supporting and help to bear the legitimate burdens of state, and place them in barracks, where they become not only non-producers, but where they consume, waste, and destroy the productions of those who toil. We encourage our sons to build for themselves new States, to advancement in education, arts, science, invention, and agriculture, and in all the pursuits of peace.

European powers have manufactured wars at the behest of toppling monarchies, in order that their dynasties might be bolstered up through the sacrifices of blind, patriotic impulse and love for national prestige, while our institutions have, year by year, grown stronger because they are founded upon "right," not power, upon the doctrine that "right makes might" rather than the hateful sentiment that "might makes right." This Administration will be illustrious in history because in its outset four new members were added to the family of States, with promise that two and perhaps four others may soon follow. Under its wise direction will be inaugurated commercial relations with our sister Republics of South America, the re-establishment of our merchant marine, with probable direct railway communication to the very heart of the new Republic of Brazil.

Were ever the conquests of war to be compared with the achievements of peace such as these? The policy of all the foreign powers means wasteful war, while ours means peace and plenty. We need no standing army. The world knows that since we were able to achieve independence for 3,000,000 in the struggle against British tyranny and King George III, a hundred years ago, and to maintain the Union and constitutional liberty against British sympathy and a gigantic civil war, unparalleled in history, seventy years later, coming out from the later struggle, as we did, with a Union and a people stronger and more united than ever before in our own history, we have nothing to fear from foes without or foes within.

It has been well said that "no foreign power, even in its nightmares, dreams of waging war upon our country. On the contrary, every nation on earth is on its knees every morning praying that our Government will not attack it. Our resources in men and money establish this as a fair conclusion that no European nation could float a flag five years if it made war on one of our forts. None but France is brave enough and the French are too friendly. In case of an attack by any, a European war would at once result and millions of American soldiers would swarm over the little territory of any European power like the locusts of Egypt. Our prestige in this comes not from our rank as a military power, but rather from the fact that we have been and are progressive people, engaged in building States rather than maintaining armies and navies.

Let us then encourage the new States to come into the Union as soon and as fast as they may come under proper conditions, for with every new State comes new strength, an aggregate of homes, wherein abide peace and industry, virtue and temperance, in which rests the absolute security of our Republic. [Applause.]

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

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan). The gentleman has twenty-five minutes of his hour remaining.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of the bill reported by the majority of the Committee on Territories in favor of the admission of Wyoming into the Union. I propose to give the reasons which control my judgment. I believe, in the first place, that there have been gross irregularities attending the preliminary proceedings under which this constitution was formed and under which the admission is sought. I believe, secondly, that no evidence has been furnished to the committee, nor can be to the House, that the Territory of Wyoming has the population requisite for admission into the Union. I believe, in the third place, that there have been incorporated into the constitution of Wyoming features relating to the subject of female suffrage and the right of females to hold office under the government which, in my judgment, are antagonistic to republican institutions and were never contem-

plated by the fathers in the formation of this Government. I hope that I may be able reasonably to demonstrate the truth of these propositions. In what I shall say I am actuated by no feeling of opposition to the people of the Territory, nor to their admission into the Union when they are sufficiently qualified for it.

It may be well, Mr. Speaker, at the outset to recur to some of the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States which have been supposed to govern and to some which do govern and control the administration of the affairs of those areas of country which we usually describe under the name of Territories, and at the same time those principles which are to regulate and control our conduct as Representatives of the people in properly admitting them as members of the Federal Union. The Constitution of the United States, Mr. Speaker, is remarkably silent upon this subject. For many years it was supposed that the provision in the Constitution which had reference to the disposal of the territory and other property of the United States and the regulation of its affairs had respect to the "Territories" of the United States. That clause is found in the second paragraph of the third section and fourth article of the Constitution, and is in these words:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

But when we examine that provision in connection with that other provision of the Constitution which gives to the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction in the territory which we know as the District of Columbia and in the forts, dock-yards, and arsenals of the Government, we see that the difference in the language shows that the framers of the Constitution never contemplated that that clause should be regarded as conferring the exercise of governmental authority over the Territories. The provision concerning the District of Columbia and concerning forts and arsenals is found in the seventeenth paragraph of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution. The language is:

Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation over such District, and like authority over such forts, arsenals, etc.

The last clause cited refers to legislation and confers the power of exclusive legislation. The former provision quoted uses language applicable to the territory and other property of the United States as property.

This subject came before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Scott vs. Sanford* (19 How., 393). The court in that case gave a history of this clause and showed in that history that it was intended to refer only to the territory of the United States belonging to the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and to that territory simply under its character of property. In that case the court traced the power of the General Government over the Territories to the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory; and the right to acquire territory, it was held, was conferred by the right given to admit new States.

Chief-Justice Taney in his review of this subject shows that the whole control which we exercise over what are known as the Territories of the United States is merely implied power, implied as a matter of necessity, and derived from the clause in the Constitution which provides that—

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

We have a right, then, to acquire territory—not to be held, to use the language of the Supreme Court, as a colony, and governed by Congress with absolute authority, but to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State, on an equal footing with the other States.

The Chief-Justice in this opinion shows—and with the views therein expressed I am in full accord—that the Constitution intended that these Territories, as long as they remained Territories, should be governed in such a way as ultimately to fit them to become States; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as long as they are in that Territorial condition, however small the number of people who may dwell within the fixed area which we may prescribe for a Territory, those people should be allowed the very largest share of self-government compatible with their subordination to the Constitution of the United States.

But, sir, I believe at the same time that the right of admitting them as States of this Union is a matter of sound discretion on the part of Congress, and inasmuch as the Constitution has been perfectly silent as to the regulations which should precede their admission, I think that when we come to exercise that discretion it should not be exercised in a spirit of caprice, but should be exercised with wisdom, caution, and deliberation.

I have said this much, Mr. Speaker, because we have before us not merely the bill now under consideration for the admission of Wyoming, but we have also upon the Calendar a bill for the admission of Idaho, and there are two or three other similar bills which have been introduced which may or may not receive favorable consideration at the hands of the committee and may or may not come before the House. It is well that when we have to consider the question of the admission of so many States we should understand clearly and carefully the limitations which the Constitution prescribes on that subject, and the regulations which precedent and the experience of the past suggest to us.

When the Union was formed there were but thirteen States entering that Union. Twenty-nine have since been admitted. The great ma-

majority of these States were admitted after Congress had passed enabling acts authorizing the people to assemble in convention to form State constitutions and apply for admission. This is unquestionably the regular method.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman desires to be exactly accurate as to the number, I can assist him in that respect.

Mr. BARNES. I do not desire any assistance whatever; when I need it I will call for it.

Mr. BAKER. The fact is that only ten States came in without enabling acts, and ten in the regular way—

Mr. BARNES. I know—

Mr. BAKER. So do I.

Mr. BARNES. I do not desire any assistance on this subject; when I need it from the gentleman I will call for it.

Mr. BAKER. I think you need it now.

Mr. BARNES. Well, there is a difference of opinion on that subject. As I occupy the floor, I propose to exercise my privilege of expressing my own opinion upon the question.

I say—and I repeat it—I have looked into this question with some degree of care and caution; and if there is one thing about which I am careful it is never to misstate a historical fact. I say that in the majority of cases, so far as my reading goes, enabling acts were passed. In other cases, where the people of the Territories assembled in convention they assembled under Territorial acts, not under enabling acts of Congress; and when they met under Territorial acts they framed their constitutions in accordance with the acts that had been passed by the Territorial Legislature.

There are some few special cases, such as the case, for example, of Maine, which was carved out of Massachusetts, where this was not necessary. There was the special case of Kentucky, which was organized and formed under an act of the Legislature of Virginia. There have been a few cases of that kind; but I say that the general rule has been that Congress has in the first instance passed an act authorizing and enabling the people of the Territory to meet in a convention and form a constitution, and when that has not been done the general rule in the other cases has been that Territorial Legislatures have passed acts providing for constitutional conventions. That is my reading of history.

But where Congress failed to pass enabling acts, why, sir, in every such case, except in a few isolated instances such as I have mentioned, the Territorial Legislature passed an act under which an election was held for delegates to a convention to form a constitution; and when those delegates had assembled in convention they formed a constitution and submitted it usually to a vote of ratification by the people. All such constitutions were formed in accordance with the forms of law.

In my judgment nothing but the most extraordinary circumstances would justify a departure from this rule. In the case before us the governor of Wyoming issued a proclamation under which delegates were selected and assembled in convention and formed a constitution. So far as I have been enabled to study this question, there is but one other instance in American history clearly and distinctly made where this was done, and that was in the case of California. In that case, it must be recollected, however, that the territory had just been acquired by conquest. It was in 1848. We had just terminated the war with Mexico. Gold had been discovered in California. Vast hordes of people were rushing in there. The country there was under the control of a military governor.

Our whole country was disturbed and agitated—rocked from center to circumference, as it were—by the discussion of the slavery question. Under the military proclamation of General Riley a government was formed in California; the people assembled in convention and formed a State government. Mr. Clay, when he came to Washington in 1850, came as the great pacificator of the country. This government in California had been organized for a year. Mr. Clay proposed, in that period of agitation and disturbance, when the country was threatened with civil war, as a measure of peace, as a measure of compromise, with the hope of adjusting the differences between the North and the South, that California be admitted; and under these extraordinary circumstances it was done—as an extraordinary measure, as a peace measure, as a measure of compromise; and the precedent which was set in the case of California can not control until you find a case presenting like circumstances.

Why, Mr. Speaker, necessity may justify anything; but in the case of Wyoming there is no necessity justifying any extraordinary measure. How different the situation of the country now from what it was when California was admitted. There is no turmoil; there is no strife; there is no confusion. Profound peace reigns throughout the land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Yet with this solitary precedent, constituting one case alone out of twenty-nine—a case surrounded by extraordinary circumstances which never before existed and I trust will never exist again—it is sought to admit this State of Wyoming into the Union.

Upon this question, in regard to assemblies of the people held in this informal way, without the sanction of law, for the purpose of establishing governments, I desire to read for a few moments from the argument submitted by Daniel Webster in the celebrated case of *Luther vs. Borden*, the case growing out of the Dorr rebellion. Said Mr. Webster:

It has been said by the opposing counsel that the people can get together, call

themselves so many thousands, and establish whatever government they please; but others must have the same right. We have, then, a stormy South American liberty, supported by arms to-day and crushed by arms to-morrow. Our theory places a beautiful face on liberty and makes it powerful for good, producing no tumults. When it is necessary to ascertain the will of the people the Legislature must provide the means of ascertaining it.

The Constitution of the United States was established in this way: It was recommended to the States to send delegates to a convention. They did so. Then it was recommended that the States should ascertain the will of the people. Nobody suggested any other mode. The opposite counsel have cited the examples of the different States in which constitutions have been altered. Only two provided for conventions, and yet conventions have been held in many of them. But how? Always these conventions were called together by the Legislature, and no single constitution has ever been altered by means of a convention gotten up by mass meetings.

There must be—

Says Mr. Webster, and there is the germ of all he said—there must be an authentic mode of ascertaining the public will somehow and somewhere.

When these conventions are called for the purpose of forming a constitution they must do so under that mode by which the public will is shown somewhere or somehow. That will is expressed by Congress in an enabling act and by the people expressed through the Territorial Legislature. When you do not do it in this mode you violate the Constitution. You call the people together in a tumultuous assemblage. That is the case in Wyoming.

Mr. HILL. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. BARNES. I am reading from 7 Howard, in the case of Luther vs. Borden.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Webster is speaking there of a convention called to set up a constitution where there is another government in the State. Does the gentleman think that is a parallel case?

Mr. BARNES. I do, and I will tell you why. There was a government in Wyoming set up by the United States in accordance with the Constitution of the United States—a government legal and constitutional, just as much so as the government in Rhode Island. The cases are perfectly parallel, and the argument of Mr. Webster applies here in the case of Wyoming just as much as it did in the case of Rhode Island, which he was then arguing. When this governor of Wyoming attempted, under his proclamation, to call the convention together it was without form of law. It was in the absence of the authentic mode which Mr. Webster said was necessary, which was the only mode known to American law and American liberty.

If I had time to cite that brief in full I would show the position taken by Mr. Webster in that argument was a position in accordance with English history by which every change had been made in the British Government.

Now, what was the way in which it was done in Wyoming? I have the proceedings here contained in the memorial in this case. Why, certain commissioners of the several counties, upon whose suggestion I do not know, because it is not disclosed in the memorial, asked the governor to issue a proclamation for a convention of the people. The governor thereupon issued a call for a convention for the purpose of forming a constitution. Upon this bare suggestion he issues his proclamation, and there are some extraordinary features in that proclamation to which I desire to call attention.

He recites in the preamble his authority, and what is his authority? His authority is simply that of the board of commissioners. It is not done under the law. It is not in pursuance of any act of the Legislature or of the Congress of the United States, but merely at the suggestion of these boards of county commissioners. Why, sir, they had no more right to suggest than you or I had. I could have suggested, or Mr. CAREY, the Delegate from Wyoming, could have suggested. He shakes his head, I see, and says, "No." You are too modest, but you were behind the scenes while the governor suggested it. [Laughter.]

But the governor, in his proclamation, says:

I suggest that in organizing a State government preparatory to admission the provision of the Senate bill—

Which had been introduced, but which had never become a law—should be followed, as nearly as may be possible, and in pursuance thereof the following recommendations are hereby made.

Then he proposes and recommends there shall be fifty-five delegates, and they shall be divided among the several districts which he has located by his own act throughout this Territory. When they assemble it is not provided these delegates shall be qualified under any existing law, under any constitution, under any form of government, but the character and fitness of the delegates to be chosen, it is stated in the proclamation, are, in fact, of greater importance than the manner of their selection. I have always understood the manner of election was a question of law, and as to character and fitness the legally qualified electors were to decide.

But here was this governor, with the aid of the chief-justice and the secretary of the Territory, who divided this Territory without law, without authority—no more authority than the Committee on the Territories would have had, nor I would have had, nor any member of this House would have had; not one whit more—assigning the number of delegates to the districts, and providing, they say, for their assembling to form a State government. Such a case is without precedent in American history.

He says in this proclamation:

The character and fitness of the delegates to be chosen are in fact of greater im-

portance than the manner of their selection, and if the citizens of any county generally prefer to elect their delegates by some equitable method other than that hereinbefore prescribed, it is believed that the delegates so chosen will be recognized and admitted to seats in the convention.

It is without any authority of law. It does not even have the form of law. They were not governed by any particular manner; but if they had character and fitness it was believed they would be admitted. Who is to judge of the character and fitness of the delegates? Who is to judge between the mode of selection recommended in the proclamation or some other mode or modes which citizens in different counties may prefer?

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit a question?

Mr. BARNES. Certainly.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he is arguing now on constitutional grounds, by what authority the convention framed the Constitution under which we are now living.

Mr. BARNES. Why, Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster answers that, and if the gentleman had listened to the quotation I have just made he would not have needed to ask the question.

Mr. CAREY. I was unable to hear what the gentleman read.

Mr. BARNES. I refer the gentleman to the argument of Daniel Webster in that case. He answered that question fully in the brief to which I have referred.

Mr. STRUBLE. I would like to interrupt the gentleman from Georgia on another point, and that is as to the division of this Territory into districts, to make a suggestion which my friend will recognize to be true, that these officers to whom he refers were just such as were suggested by a bill reported by the Senate and placed upon its Calendar in the Fiftieth Congress; and, while I do not claim that that is authority of law, yet I think it is only due that that much should be said in explanation of the action to which the gentleman has adverted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me suggest in that connection that the failure to pass that bill would argue that they were not authorized to do what they did.

Mr. BARNES. A sufficient answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa is the objection I am making, that this was done without any authority of law whatever. I do not care for the suggestions which may have been embodied in a bill which did not pass. They do not afford warrant of law for such action. I do not care for suggestions which entered into the minds of men, even if recognized as the ablest in any section of the country. They come without the sanctity of law, and that is the only point I am making, and the gentleman can not deny it. The whole thing, Mr. Speaker, according to the language of Daniel Webster, was nothing more nor less than a "tumultuous assemblage of the people" combined together at the suggestion of the governor, who sees fit to say that it does not matter how the delegates are selected provided that they have the requisite character and fitness.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit me to suggest in this connection, it should be said that some of these delegates were elected at county boards, some by joint action of the two political parties in the counties contesting, and the gentleman from Wyoming can inform the House as to the correctness of the statement.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I must now decline to be interrupted any further. I have yielded as far as the limited time at my disposal will allow, and I have attempted to dispose of the questions which have been suggested in their order. This brief of Mr. Webster, to which I have already referred, contains a good many old things which would be of value to gentlemen if they would consider them in this discussion.

Mr. STRUBLE. Perhaps their age would not improve them when referred to a subject of this kind.

Mr. BARNES. The difficulty with my friend here is that he wants new things, and it does not matter how the new things are brought about, whether they plainly violate the law or not, provided they are new. I prefer to go to a higher source for my authorities. Let me remind the gentleman of an old saying that is very true, and it is well for him and some of my colleagues also to recall that saying, "that change is not always reform;" and when gentlemen are disposed to change from principles of law which were laid down by Daniel Webster in an argument like this which I have cited, they are very apt to go greatly astray.

Now, the difficulty in the case of this Wyoming election and the assembling of this convention is, as Daniel Webster said, that under the American method there must be an authentic mode of ascertaining the popular will somewhere or somehow. But in this case there was no such authentic mode of determining it. It is wanting in all of the elements, in the very foundation of the convention itself, which is without warrant or authority. What followed? What could follow as a natural consequence?

Why, Mr. Speaker, we were told that there were eighteen thousand and odd votes cast at the last election for my friend Mr. CAREY, in November, 1888; we were told also that the population of that country was rapidly increasing; that it was a growing region; population pouring into it from all parts of the country. And yet when this convention, for which these people are represented to be crying like a hungry infant for its mother's milk—when this convention was to be voted for they could turn out but 8,000 votes, of men and women combined, for that bill at that time; and when they did turn out there were over 1,923

votes against it. The people regarded the whole performance as a mere farce at the time.

But let me call your attention for a moment to some of the literature on this subject. Let me direct your attention to an article headed, "The banner town of Crook County," taken from the Sundance Gazette, published in Crook County, Wyoming, immediately after the election:

One of the arguments used before the Legislature in favor of Weston County is that Newcastle is the banner town of Crook County, and the three hundred-odd votes credited to Newcastle at the constitutional election are pointed to with great pride as proof of the assertion. We should think that that particular election would be given a wide berth, especially by Newcastlers. There was no election there on that day, but three persons, each of whom we could name, went into a back room and conducted a cigar-box election. No one else was present, and these men marked the tickets and dropped them into the slot of the cigar-box.

How 7 votes came to be cast against the constitution arose from the fact that one of the parties, after nearly all the tickets had been cast, exclaimed, "I'm d—mn tired of voting for the same man all the time; I'm going to vote for the other fellow." And he accordingly dropped in 7 votes with "Yes" scratched out.* The cigar-box, the ballots, and the tally-sheet giving the result were sent here, the same canvassed at this point, and with the other but bona-fide returns forwarded to Cheyenne, where they were duly recorded. And that is how Newcastle came to be the "banner town" of Crook County. The above particulars were related to us by one of the trio who conducted the cigar-box election, and a gentleman whose word is as good as gold. As there was no color of legality about the election in Crook County, the scheme was devised and carried out more in a spirit of levity than otherwise, and it was not thought the returns would be forwarded to Cheyenne and made a part of the record.

Mr. HILL. Is that the kind of political matter you introduce into a report?

Mr. BARNES. There is a sample of the votes cast at this election. Is it a wonder that any such consequences follow?

Mr. STRUBLE. Let me suggest—

Mr. BARNES. I decline to be interrupted any further. My time is too limited.

Mr. STRUBLE. It is unfortunate that the gentleman should undertake to make that statement in regard to this election, and refuse to allow a single suggestion.

Mr. BARNES. I am at liberty to state my thoughts in my own way, and I have said that I could not, in my limited time, permit further interruption.

Mr. STRUBLE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CAREY. I know the gentleman from Georgia is fair, for I have had many conversations with him; but before he proceeds further I would like to ask him to state to the House where he obtained that evidence.

Mr. BARNES. Why, from this newspaper, of course.

Mr. CAREY. From the newspaper?

Mr. BARNES. Yes.

Mr. CAREY. Newspaper of one town fighting about the relative size of the town as compared with another; and the gentleman puts that in as evidence.

Mr. BARNES. I do. There is the evidence. It could have readily occurred at such an election. I will add what Webster said in his argument already quoted, that there is no chance of punishing anybody at such an election for bribery, for perjury, or for a repetition of his vote. There is no law which could reach a man guilty of such an offense at such an election. And what is cited there is but a fair sample, as I believe, of what took place in other parts of the Territory.

It is a fair sample of what is in evidence as to this election. And what was done at this point could have been done anywhere else in the Territory, at any other precinct in Wyoming. It is pretty strong evidence that the whole thing must have been a fixed-up job, for it so appears on its face.

This convention, it should be remembered, was held, bear in mind, and closed its labors on the 30th day of September, and the pretended constitution under this pretended election was submitted to the people, a great many of whom must have regarded it as a farce, thirty-five days thereafter. Not a soul could be punished for bribery, for perjury, for corruption, or for repetition of votes at the election, and yet in the face of all that, in the face of the fact that here was a rapidly growing Territory, and although they had 18,000 votes at the preceding election for Delegate to Congress, the best that could be done here was 8,000 votes of men and women together, and drawn out under the most extraordinary inducements to vote, of whom 1,923 were opposed to it.

This election had not merely no form of law, but it is an absurd and ridiculous farce, and if it could be subjected to judicial investigation it would never stand the investigation of legal scrutiny or legal trial.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how much time I have.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair). The gentleman has twenty-three minutes, according to the information of the Chair.

Mr. BARNES. There are two other points to which I desire to devote some attention, and I will therefore hasten on. One bears on the subject of population.

Now, I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no fixed rule which has ever been prescribed by law as to the population which a State should have before admission into the Union. There is no provision to be found in the Constitution of the United States as to what is the requisite number of people who shall be found as inhabitants of a Territory preparatory to its admission into the Union. But Mr. Douglas said, in the course of the debate on the Kansas question (and he was probably more familiar with this Territorial subject than any other of our American statesmen), that while we had never adhered to any fixed rule it was a good rule to say that we should require that the people requisite to entitle a Territory to admission into the Union as a State should be the number which would entitle it to one Representative on the floor of this House.

In the ordinance of 1787 there was a compact entered into between Virginia and the Congress of the Confederate States, and under that it was provided that, while Congress might, if it saw fit, admit a State with less than 60,000 inhabitants, if the proposed State carved out of the ceded territory had 60,000 it should be considered as entitled to admission into the Union. Now, the unit of representation at that time was about 30,000, and yet our fathers in 1787, in this compact in the days of their weakness, provided that in the absence of other provisions the requisite number should be 60,000.

Now, my friend from New York [Mr. BAKER] has referred to what were the facts in the different States. I have here a table showing what was the representative ratio prior to the admission of each State into the Union, with the exception of the four last admitted, and what was its population at the time of its admission, from Vermont, admitted 1791, to Colorado, admitted 1876.

State.	Date of admission.	Representative ratio on previous census.	Population by previous census.			Population when admitted.			Population by following census.	Rate per cent. of increase during decade of admission.
			Free.	Slave.	Total.	Free.	Slave.	Total.		
Vermont.....	1791	33,000	85,425		85,425	85,425		85,425	154,446	80
Kentucky.....	1792	33,000	61,247	12,430	73,677	61,247	12,430	73,677	230,955	200
Tennessee.....	1796	33,000	32,274	3,417	35,691	*60,000	*7,000	*67,000	105,602	195
Ohio.....	1802	33,000	45,365		45,365	45,365		45,365	230,760	408
Louisiana.....	1812	35,000	41,896	84,660	76,550	41,896	34,660	76,556	152,923	100
Indiana.....	1816	35,000	24,520		24,520	68,897		68,897	147,178	500
Mississippi.....	1817	35,000							75,448	
Alabama.....	1819	35,000	23,264	17,088	40,352	45,441	30,061	75,512	127,901	403
Illinois.....	1818	35,000	12,282		12,282	34,620		34,620	55,162	350
Maine.....	1820	35,000	228,705		228,705	298,269		298,269	399,445	33
Missouri.....	1821	40,000	56,335	10,222	66,557	56,335	10,222	66,557	140,445	111
Arkansas.....	1836	47,700	25,812	4,576	30,388	*33,000	*9,240	52,240	97,574	221
Michigan.....	1837	47,700	31,639		31,639	*65,000		*65,000	212,267	570
Florida.....	1845	70,680	28,760	25,717	54,477	*34,000	*30,000	*64,000	87,445	60
Texas.....	1845	70,680				*105,000	*38,000	*143,000	212,592	
Iowa.....	1846	70,680	43,112		43,112	78,819		78,819	192,214	345
Wisconsin.....	1848	70,680	30,945		30,945	*180,000		*180,000	305,391	886
California.....	1850	93,423	92,597		92,597	92,597		92,597	379,994	810
Minnesota.....	1858	93,423	6,077		6,077	*120,000		*120,000	172,023	2,730
Oregon.....	1859	93,423	13,294		13,294	*50,000		*50,000	52,465	294
Kansas.....	1861	127,381	107,206		107,206	107,206		107,206	364,899	240
West Virginia.....	1863	127,381						*850,000	442,914	
Nevada.....	1864	127,381	6,837		6,837	*40,000		*40,000	42,491	520
Nebraska.....	1867	127,381	28,841		28,841	*100,000		*100,000	122,993	322
Colorado.....	1876	131,425	39,864		39,864	*100,000		*100,000	194,640	388

* Estimated.

I find on running through a few of these cases that Vermont, which was the first State admitted into the Union, in 1791, when the requisite population at that time under the unit of representation was 33,000, had at the time of admission 85,425 people. I find that Kentucky, which was admitted in 1792, when the unit of representation was still 33,000, had a population of 73,677. I find that Ohio, then a new State just emerging into existence, which was admitted in 1802, when the requisite population was still 33,000, had a population of 45,365. I find that Mississippi, which was admitted in 1817, when the requisite population was 35,000, had a population of 75,512. I find, as I run down the list, that California in 1850, when the requisite population was 93,423, had a population of 120,000.

I find that in all these cases down the list the requisite population always was very near to the unit of representation—frequently it was double; always approximate—and that in these cases it seems to have acquired the force of rule and regulation which accompanies legal enactment. In our own time since 1876 we have still adhered to this rule. Why, the last Congress admitted North and South Dakota, Montana, and Washington. Montana and Washington had a population, as I understand and believe, of 175,000. When we came to North and South Dakota it was claimed by the gentlemen who are now the majority of the Committee on the Territories that all Dakota had a population of 600,000, of which there were about 200,000 in North Dakota and about 400,000 in South Dakota. In admitting those States we required the requisite unit of population. That unit was 151,912 under the census of 1880.

Now, we are told in reference to Wyoming that she is in a fit condition to come into the Union. A fit condition to come into the Union, when at this vote for this convention only 8,000 people could be summoned and dragged to the polls? A fit condition, when that vote, it is to be borne in mind, counted both females and males? A fit condition, when, according to the vote that was cast for General CAREY in November, 1888, when the total was 18,010, we bear in mind that both men and women were counted? If we could estimate the population in proportion of five to one, it would be about 90,000. But both men and women voted, and if one-third were women, leaving 12,000 male voters, according to the usual rate the population would not exceed sixty to seventy thousand people. Now, we have seen that by the last census the unit of representation was fixed at 151,912. Apply the general rule, under the ordinance of 1787, she ought to have at least 300,000 people; but adopting the most favorable rule she ought to have at the time of admission 150,000 inhabitants. This is a small number, considering the present population of the Union, to give reasonable assurance of a State; but we have no reliable information whatever. It is all mere matter of opinion, and there is nothing on which opinion is so loose as concerning the number of a large assemblage of people, even when we look at them face to face; how much worse when scattered over a vast area like Wyoming, containing 98,000 square miles. It is true that Mr. CAREY said, in his opinion, they had a population of 110,000 inhabitants; but this was an extravagant estimate, having existence in a fervid imagination. It is the population which he hopes to expect to see in the future. I have heard these gentlemen, Delegates from the different Territories, before the Territorial Committee.

When I listen to one of them separately describing in glowing terms the vast resources and the wonderful growth of population of his Territory, I have almost felt tempted to emigrate, but when I have heard them all I am left in so much doubt that I conclude after all there is no place like home.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BARNES. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. I notice by the vote given the present Delegate in Congress from Wyoming that the entire vote was 18,010.

Mr. BARNES. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMICK. Has the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Territories, any information he can give to this House as to what proportion of female votes are contained in that 18,000?

Mr. BARNES. No, sir. I must say that is one of the great disadvantages under which the Committee on Territories labored. There never has been any definite information in that regard. There have been estimates submitted and guess-work, but we have not been able by any rule to get at the substantial facts.

In most of these other cases, when these other Territories were admitted, we had something with reference to population which had been ascertained by census and upon which we could rely, but when we come to Wyoming we find it is all guess-work, and, in the absence of information, the Committee on Territories are called upon to make the best guess they can, and as I have been far removed from Yankee-land and have not the faculty of guessing, I find it impossible to obtain the desired information. [Laughter.] We say "reckon" in our country, and therefore we calculate.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. The reckoning was all right in reference to Washington, was it not?

Mr. BARNES. No; I don't think it was altogether right. I think there was some guessing there, too.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. We had 60,000 votes in the last elec-

tion for one member, while you in Georgia get in three members on a far less number of votes.

Mr. BARNES. Well, we get them on the requisite number, and we will not go into an argument of that question now.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. You do not cast the votes at the polls.

Mr. BARNES. There is no use in talking about that now. I have always learned when I have any business before me to go on and attend to that, and not to be drawn off into other matters. As to Georgia votes and Georgia population, I will discuss that when a proper time arrives.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. I do not suppose you will be drawn off on that subject.

Mr. BARNES. No, sir; I will not.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. You did not admit us until, like Paul on his way to Damascus, you were struck by lightning.

Mr. BARNES. Well, I do not expect to be struck by lightning now, and if I am I know it will not come from the gentleman. [Laughter.] Just let me go on with my argument. I have certain business before me and I want to attend to it.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. I will listen to you with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. BARNES. I hope you will. But we do not want any "lightning" in this matter; we do not want to be diverted from the question at issue.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. Well, you had referred to Washington, and I wanted to reply.

Mr. BARNES. Well, I had referred to it in very pleasant terms. Before passing let me say the gentleman and myself misunderstood each other some moments ago. I had given Washington full credit for having more than the requisite unit population at the time of admission.

The gentleman certainly did not hear me or he would not have interrupted me on this point, and I did not understand his inquiry when he asked whether the reckoning was all right concerning Washington. In fact I did not, in the midst of the interruption, understand fully the nature and scope of his inquiry. Had I understood him I would have promptly answered, what I had previously stated and what I again repeat, that I believe Washington had more than the requisite population at the time of her admission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another feature, aside from the question of population, to which I object. I object to that provision in the constitution of Wyoming which bears on the subject of female suffrage. My time is getting short and it is cut especially short by these interruptions.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. I will move to extend it.

Mr. BARNES. You are not the House.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington. Well, I can make the motion.

Mr. BARNES. I do not know that it would be carried. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of suffrage, sections 1 and 2, article 6, of this constitution provide as follows:

The rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges. Every citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years and upwards who has resided in the State or Territory one year and in the county wherein such residence is located sixty days next preceding any election shall be entitled to vote at such election, except as herein otherwise provided.

In a previous part of the constitution we are furnished with two clauses which I suppose are intended to form the logical precedent of the conclusions which are embodied in the two provisions I have read. In the declaration of rights, section 2, article 1, we are told that—

In their inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness all members of the human race are equal. Since equality in the enjoyment of natural and civil rights is made sure only through political equality, the laws of this State affecting the political rights or privileges of its citizens shall be without distinction of race, color, sex, or any circumstance or condition whatsoever other than individual incompetency or unworthiness, duly ascertained by a court of competent jurisdiction.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the right of suffrage is an inherent right. I believe that the inherent rights are those which are set forth in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and wherever a right is an inherent right I am entitled, and everybody else is entitled, to an equal share in that right. But when it comes to the exercise of suffrage, suffrage is a method, a means, by which we exercise political power, by which we confer political power; and, as a means and a method of exercising political power, it is conferred by the State upon those individuals (at least in theory) who are presumed to be best fitted for the general welfare of the State to exercise it.

But to say that suffrage is an inherent right, like life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, would be to say that all political powers, like those inherent rights, belong equally to each individual, to man and woman equally without regard to sex, to men and children equally without regard to age except where infancy imposes a natural disability for the time being. So far as inherent rights are concerned, we are entitled to share them equally, but when it comes to political rights it is impossible that we can share them equally.

The Speaker must necessarily exercise more political power than the

individual member upon the floor. The governor of a State must necessarily exercise more political power than the citizen who merely casts his vote. Each exercises a share of political power, but if the right were inherent each would be entitled to share it equally. That is the law of nature. That is the law which the God of nature has imposed upon us.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this time to go at any length into this subject of female suffrage. I have no time to draw fancy pictures about the beauty of home and about "woman's sphere" and "man's sphere." Suffice it to say that I believe God has made the two sexes each the complement of the other, and that each in acting as the complement of the other performs the highest duties which God intended it should perform.

But I have this to say further, in a political point of view, upon this question: In the convention which framed the Constitution which gave to Congress the power to admit new States they did not define what States were. It is not necessary to go to the authority of a dictionary or to a publicist to ascertain what a State is. States were in political existence before that Constitution was framed, and the framers of the Constitution understood what States were.

Now, what were those States which they must have had in mind? They were bodies of people united together politically under a form of government which was free, where the rulers were held responsible to the ruled through the exercise of the suffrage of adult males. That was the universal law of the country, and that was what the framers of the Constitution understood by States. And when the Constitution provided for the admission of new States into the Union it provided for the admission of those States under the same form as the States which already existed.

The new States which Congress was to have the power to admit were to be States as Connecticut was, the same as Massachusetts was, the same as Pennsylvania was, the same as Virginia was, the same as South Carolina was. That was the character and kind of State which was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution in that clause which provided that Congress might admit new States, which should become part and parcel and members of the Federal Union of which the old thirteen States was composed. They never contemplated for a moment the idea of a State in which women would share equally in political power with men. Suppose Wyoming had come here to-day with a constitution excluding men from the right of holding office, from the right of voting, confining the right of suffrage and the privilege of holding office to women entirely, would you say a State organized in that way was such a State as was contemplated by the Constitution?

Again, suppose—for it is possible and it would not be violative of the letter of the Constitution, though it would be of its spirit—suppose Wyoming had adopted a constitution providing that the right of suffrage should be vested in all persons from the age of twelve years up to forty-five, would you say that a State with such a constitution was such a State as Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison, and John Adams, and Alexander Hamilton had contemplated? No, Mr. Speaker, such a thing never was intended.

It is a very easy matter to say you will confer female suffrage in the selection of boards of school trustees or in the administration of public charities; but to say that women shall elect members of Congress and United States Senators, may be elected as Representatives in Congress or as United States Senators—that they shall join in shaping the national legislation which is to affect the rights and interests of the whole people throughout our vast domain—I say that a constitution and such a form of government was never contemplated. I recognize the right of each State to the fullest extent to prescribe the qualifications for the exercise of the right of suffrage, subject only to the changes in the recent amendments to the Constitution; but while I recognize this right I claim still that in the exercise of a sound discretion I have a right to vote against the admission of any new State which prescribes qualifications of suffrage which I believe to be injurious to the best interest of the country. I believe suffrage to be a great political right, not to be conferred indiscriminately on all alike, without regard to sex, age, or condition. Upon its proper exercise depends, in my judgment, the preservation of free constitutional government. It is an organism which lies at its very base.

Upon this point I would like to read a few words from Mr. Calhoun's essay on government, a work worthy of the study of every student of politics and which will be more and more esteemed in the future than it has been in the past:

How government, then, must be constructed, in order to counteract, through its organism, this tendency on the part of those who make and execute the laws to oppress those subject to their operation, is the next question which claims attention.

There is but one way in which this can possibly be done; and that is, by such an organism as will furnish the ruled with the means of resisting successfully this tendency on the part of the rulers to oppression and abuse. Power can only be resisted by power, and tendency by tendency. Those who exercise power and those subject to its exercise—the rulers and the ruled—stand in antagonistic relations to each other.

The same constitution of our nature which leads rulers to oppress the ruled—regardless of the object for which government is ordained—will, with equal

strength, lead the ruled to resist when possessed of the means of making peaceable and effective resistance. Such an organism, then, as will furnish the means by which resistance may be systematically and peaceably made on the part of the ruled to oppression and abuse of power on the part of the rulers, is the first and indispensable step towards forming a constitutional government. And as this can only be effected by or through the right of suffrage (the right on the part of the ruled to choose their rulers at proper intervals and to hold them thereby responsible for their conduct)—the responsibility of the rulers to the ruled through the right of suffrage is the indispensable and primary principle in the foundation of a constitutional government.

That is what the right of suffrage meant. It was an organism lying at the basis of constitutional government; and it was not intended for females and children, but men.

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

Mr. BARNES. No, sir; I can not.

Mr. HILL. Just a short question.

Mr. BARNES. Well, sir, if I may be allowed the time I will do so.

Mr. HILL. Thus far you have not discussed this question upon principle—

Mr. BARNES. No, sir; and I have not time to do it. Please take your seat, sir. If I had unlimited time to argue this question I might go into an abstract discussion with the gentleman about the right of home, of solitude, of exile, and a thousand other things [laughter], but, sir, I am arguing this question on high political principles. I say that the right of suffrage is an organism, the means by which the State has provided for lodging a certain share of political power in the hands of electors.

When we come to exercise political power we enact it in the form of law. Law is worthless without the exercise of force to carry it into effect; it is only by the aid of that portion of the community intrusted with suffrage that the force of law can be accomplished and carried into practical execution. It is on the force which resides alone in the male sex that the State must rely for the execution of law, whether she executes it through her officers, her *posse comitatus*, or her armies or fleets, and it is to that sex, representing that force, which should be committed the political power for enacting opinion into law.

Whatever may be the views of gentlemen on the abstract question in regard to the right of women to vote, I think I have demonstrated at least that it was never contemplated by the fathers of the Republic; it was never part and parcel of the principles ingrained in the American constitutions from New Hampshire to Georgia when the thirteen States entered the Union. And when the convention which formed the Constitution of the United States gave to Congress power to admit new States into the Union they meant to admit such States as were then formed, as were then in existence, of which they had practical knowledge and practical experience.

I could argue this question at much greater length; but the hands of the clock warn me that my time has nearly expired. Suffice it to say now that there were three propositions with which I set out. First, that there have been gross irregularities in the formation of this constitution sent here by Wyoming; that the convention which framed the Constitution was held without authority of law; that the election for delegates to that convention was in fact void; that there was no mode of punishment prescribed, and none could possibly have been prescribed, for fraudulent voting at that election; that there is no evidence that the people themselves gave this constitution their approval. Next, I have held that the population proper to entitle a Territory to admission as a State is here wanting—wanting according to all precedents, according to all forms, according to all our history in reference to the admission of States. Thirdly, I have held that this question of female suffrage, which is introduced as a most extraordinary feature in this constitution, has never been fairly submitted to a vote of the people of that Territory, and we have no knowledge whether they favor it or not. I repeat that this is a new feature in American constitutions, is contrary to the experience and history of the country, not conformable to the constitutions of the different States, and in my judgment it is fraught with great danger to the free institutions under which we live, and to the harmony, welfare, and good order of society. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen may extend their remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that members may extend their remarks on this subject in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. CAREY obtained the floor and said: I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VANDEVER.)

Mr. VANDEVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] made a reference in the course of his speech to the act for the admission of California as a State. He remarked that that act was a compromise measure; and so it was. But what was the nature of the compromise? California came to the Congress of the United States with a constitution framed without the preliminary of an enabling act by Congress. In that constitution was incorporated a clause from the ordinance of 1787, providing that slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a penalty for crime, should be forever prohibited within that State.

Almost without exception, every Democratic member of the two branches of Congress rose in hostility to the incorporation of that provision into the constitution of California. They forced a compromise. What was it? What were the so-called compromise measures of 1850 that the friends of California were compelled to consent to to procure the admission of the State into the Union?

In the first place they were compelled to consent to the passage of an odious fugitive-slave law. In the second place, that in the passage of the Territorial laws for New Mexico and Utah we should forego the insertion of an anti-slavery clause similar to that contained in the ordinance of 1787. There was no possibility at that time of obtaining the admission of California into the Union except by agreeing to those terms dictated by the Democratic members of both Houses of Congress; and we had also to consent to payment of a bonus of \$10,000,000 from the public Treasury to the State of Texas.

There was no Republican party in existence at that time, but the foundation of the Republican party was laid upon this issue. It dug the grave of the Democratic party and led to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. [Applause.] It led to the total extinction of slavery in this country by the war of the rebellion. [Renewed applause.]

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] refers to it as the compromise measure of 1850. They held to that compromise principle until 1854, when the question came up in regard to the formation of a State government in Kansas.

The Democratic party forced the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act through Congress in 1854 as their pet measure in the hope and with the purpose of organizing one or both of these Territories into slave States. They claimed that the so-called compromise legislation of 1850, by which California gained admission to the Union as a free State, was inconsistent with the anti-slavery provisions of the ordinance of 1787 and with a similar provision in the Missouri compromise act of 1820; in other words, it was claimed by the Democratic party in 1854 that they had consented to the admission of California with her free State constitution upon condition that the policy of excluding slavery from Territories as inaugurated by the ordinance of 1787 should be abandoned by Congress in its future action. This is the kind of compromise the gentleman from Georgia refers to, approvingly, in his objections to the suffrage features of the Wyoming constitution.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] says that he has respect for precedents of the past. He has called up memories connected with the compromise measures of 1850 which secured the admission of California as a State. She did not come into the Union with the consent of the Democratic party. The friends of California had to pay for her admission by a reluctant consent to the passage of the fugitive-slave law. The friends of suffrage and freedom were compelled at that time at the dictation of the Democratic party to consent to this compromise. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, since my first entrance into the Hall of the House of Representatives as a Delegate of the people of Wyoming Territory it has been my first thought to do that which seemed best to be done to promote the measures which to them were of the greatest concern. During the five sessions of Congress that I have had the privileges of this floor, whether here or performing the duties incumbent upon me elsewhere in this Capital, I have not for a moment forgotten that I am not a Representative of a State, and that I am here not because my people had any constitutional right to send me, and that whatever of privileges are accorded me are derived solely through the suffrage of the legislative branch of the Government.

The treatment received at your hands has been most cordial. If my rights had been measured by your high standard of welcome I should have been more than convinced ere now that the privileges of a Delegate were in all respects equal to those of a Representative of a State. For the reason that I have been a Delegate only, I have occupied the time of the House always with reluctance. If to-day I should be more generous in the use of your time than has been my custom my excuse shall be that the question under consideration is of importance beyond measure to my people. If your decision should be favorable it will mean to them those rights of citizenship not heretofore enjoyed. It will give them all the political rights of American freemen. It will elevate them from the condition of a province to the enjoyment of the privileges of the grandest of all political divisions, those afforded by an American State. You will therefore to-day pardon my boldness. Who would not be courageous under the same circumstances? Two thousand miles away I can see the outlines of a new star that is about to take its place in the constellation of States. You will forgive my enthusiasm, for I behold in your countenance, which is but the index of the soul, a warm welcome to the new State. I know that you, the Representatives of the greatest people that live, are ready to extend the hand of fellowship and admit a young, a proud, and noble people, the offspring of your own homes, with their new Commonwealth, into the very heart of the Union of States.

In 1850, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Winthrop, of Massachusetts said:

I see in the Territorial possessions of this Union the seats of new States,

the cradles of new Commonwealths, the nurseries, it may be, of new Republics, I see in them the future abodes of our brethren, our children, and our children's children, for a thousand generations.

Seventeen States had then been admitted into the original Union. Since the utterance of the prophecy twelve great States have been admitted, eleven of which were organized from the then territory of the United States and are inhabited by millions of progressive and patriotic people. To-day five more Territories have the requisite number of people and the necessary wealth to be admitted as States and to enter upon careers of growth and prosperity not excelled by any of the States heretofore admitted into the Union.

The Territory of Wyoming, except a small area on the western part of its southern boundary, obtained under the treaty of peace with Mexico in 1848, was included in the Louisiana purchase.

Though the Territory, with the exception named, had belonged to France and was then ceded to Spain, and by Spain back to France, and had, from the organization of Missouri in 1812, in part been included within the boundaries of several organized Territories, it was virtually without government until the organization of the Territory of Wyoming in May, 1869, under the provisions of the act of Congress of July 25, 1868, entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Wyoming."

Note the word "temporary." The act could have been as properly entitled "An act to govern the child Wyoming until she is of age to enter the sisterhood of States." Not unlike many Territories that have preceded her; not unlike many of her sisters who have not yet formed a Union, she has been required to serve a full term of pupilage. Before Wyoming, under the provisions of this bill, can consummate her union she will have turned the twenty-first milestone in her history.

THE ORDINANCE OF 1787.

In the twelfth year of the Independence of the United States, and whilst the Constitutional Convention was in session in Philadelphia, and nearly two years before the Constitution of the United States went into full operation, "The ordinance for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio River" was ordained by the Confederate Congress.

Few laws have been enacted that have exerted a greater influence for the happiness of mankind, for its disenfranchisement, for the cause of republican government. Under the provisions of this ordinance Territories have been organized and great States builded. Read by the light of a subsequent century, it must be pronounced second to none of those remarkable instruments produced during the infant days of the Republic. To go back to the time of its enactment and look over the important events that followed it, it must be admitted that the lawgivers who made it were gifted with a power most extraordinary to look into the future and open the way for great States whose foundations should be freedom, equality before the law, freedom of conscience, education of the masses, and an indestructible union of States.

All Territorial governments since created and organized have been founded on this historic document. Every new State admitted has been upon the plan proposed by its wise provisions. Its sentiment and its most important principles were incorporated in the Constitution itself. It has afforded the framework for the bills of right and State constitution that have since been adopted. It guaranteed to the people of the Northwestern Territory those principles of government which have ever been dear to the American people.

It provided that the people at the earliest possible moment should be permitted, through their representatives, to frame their own laws.

To the people were insured the benefits of the writs of habeas corpus and the trial by jury.

It declared all persons shall be bailable, unless for capital offenses, when the proof shall be evident or the presumption great. It forbade unusual punishments.

It provided that no man should be deprived of his liberty or property but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land, and should the public exigencies make it necessary for the common preservation to take any person's property or to demand his particular services full compensation should be made for the same.

It provided that no law should be made to affect private contracts or engagements made in good faith. It declared that religion, morality, and knowledge—being necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind—schools and the means of education should be forever encouraged.

It is not necessary to ask the question why was this government instituted. The reason of the ordinance is best answered by its own provisions:

And for extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws, and constitution are erected. To fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments which forever hereafter shall be formed in the said Territory. To provide also for the establishment of State and permanent governments therein, and for their admission to a share in the Federal councils on an equal footing with the original States at as early periods as may be consistent with the general interests.

The purpose, then, of the ordinance was to prepare the people to be-

come States. Article V defines when the people of any one of the States formed may be admitted into the Confederacy:

And whenever any of the said States shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and State government: *Provided*, The constitution and government so formed shall be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles, and, so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000.

I particularly desire to call your attention to the part of the proviso where it says "And so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000."

The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin were formed out of the Northwest Territory, and each in turn was admitted into the Union. With the exception of Wisconsin, it is not probable that any one of the States named had a population of 60,000 free inhabitants at the date of admission. It was estimated that Ohio had 45,000 of population, Illinois 35,000, Indiana 63,000, and Michigan 65,000. It may be safely asserted, however, that it was found consistent with the interests of the older States to admit four out of five States created in the Northwest Territory with a less number than 60,000 free inhabitants.

This ordinance, either by direct act, by implication, or by inheritance, if I may be permitted to use the word, was from time to time extended to every Territory since organized. The Louisiana purchase of 1803 was the following year divided into two great Territories, the northern portion being known as the Territory of Louisiana. The ordinance of 1787 was made applicable by act of Congress to that great Territory. Subsequently the Territory of Missouri was organized. This Territory included nearly all the area now constituting the Territory of Wyoming. The rights of this ordinance were retained for Missouri.

Time will not permit me to follow all the changes that occurred in the creation of Territories and States from the organization of the Territory of Missouri, which the maps show extended from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, to the date of the organization of Wyoming. The changes have been many. It is sufficient for my present purpose to state that all of the Territory except a small strip on the western southern border purchased from the Republic of Mexico was included in the Territory of Missouri, all except a strip on the western border has since formed a part of the Territory of Nebraska, while at a subsequent period the major portion of Wyoming became a part of the Territory of Dakota.

It was shown in the discussion that took place over the admission of the Dakotas that by implication the people of Dakota were entitled to the rights, privileges, and immunities that were granted to the inhabitants of the Northwestern Territory. It is safe to say that the people of Wyoming through the Territories from which their Territory was organized are now entitled to admission under the provisions of the ordinance of 1787.

Perhaps no questions have been more thoroughly discussed than those that affect the acquisition of new territory, the organization of temporary government therein, and the admission of new States. These great discussions have been participated in by the ablest men of the Republic.

I believe an investigation of the whole subject will convince any impartial mind that this Government has acquired new territory for but one purpose, to admit the people thereof at the earliest possible moment as a State or States; that all the legislation of Congress in the establishment of temporary governments and the admission of new States, while often tardy in the exercise of its power, has been to afford to the people of a new country at the earliest possible moment "all the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States," which can only be secured under the provisions of the constitution of a State admitted "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

Though the right to acquire territory is not expressly given by the Constitution, it is no longer denied that the United States as a nation possesses this power. The practice of nearly a century establishes the further fact that until the people of such territory are prepared to be incorporated into the Union Congress may establish temporary governments over such acquired territory. The highest court of the land has also decided that territory can be acquired, but not to be held permanently in a provincial condition. The Supreme Court in 19 Howard, 446, said:

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish and maintain colonies bordering on the United States, or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given, and if a new State is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State, and the citizens of the State, and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be acquired and held permanently in that character.

We do not mean, however, to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory, not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion.

The Constitution framed in 1787 had been in actual operation for a period of fourteen years when, under Mr. Jefferson's administration, the Louisiana purchase was effected. This great territory was acquired for one purpose only, to be admitted as States into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. The parties to the treaty were then, as they are now, the two greatest living republics. The third article of this treaty says:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States.

The States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, a part of Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota, the Indian Territory, and all but a small portion of Wyoming have been carved from the country obtained by the cession. In this treaty, though the same language is not used, the same guaranty is made to the inhabitants in the territory acquired as was given to the people of the Northwestern Territory. The same privileges and rights, namely, to become States of the Republic, have been guaranteed by solemn treaties to the people of each and every Territory acquired.

Note the language of article 6 of the treaty with Spain by which we acquired the Floridas:

The inhabitants of the territories which His Catholic Majesty cedes the United States by this treaty shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution and admitted to the enjoyment of all privileges, rights, and immunities of the citizens of the United States.

The United States next acquired the territory of the Lone Star Republic. In this case it was found consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution to admit Texas immediately as a State and her people to the enjoyment of all the privileges, rights, and immunities of citizens of the United States.

But let us proceed further.

By the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 we acquired a very large territory from the Republic of Mexico. The ninth article of this treaty provides that—

Mexicans who in the territories aforesaid shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic * * * shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of the citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution.—*United States Statutes at Large*, volume 9.

Before this treaty was ratified the words "to be judged by the Congress of the United States" were inserted by the Senate. The Mexican Government then refused to ratify lest the words inserted might preclude the people of the ceded territory of the rights of American citizens.

To a communication received from the Mexican Government, Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, replied as follows, which secured the ratification of the treaty by the Mexican Government:

Congress, under all the circumstances and under the treaties, are the sole judges of this proper time, because they, and they only, under the Federal Constitution, have power to admit new States into the Union. That they will always exercise this power as soon as the condition of the inhabitants of any acquired territory may render it proper, can not be doubted. By this means the Federal Treasury can alone be relieved from the expense of supporting Territorial governments. Besides, Congress will never turn a deaf ear to a people anxious to enjoy the privilege of self-government. Their desire to become one of the States of this Union will be granted the moment it can be done with safety.

It will be seen that Mr. Buchanan's interpretation of the treaty leaves the principle under discussion in exactly the same condition as the treaties with other powers antecedent to it.

We think, therefore, it is plain that the people of Wyoming may rightfully now ask to be measured by the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, as well as by the articles of the treaties under which their Territory and the jurisdiction over the same were acquired for incorporation into the Union.

No question arising under the Constitution of the United States has created wider discussion in both branches of Congress than the section which provides that "Congress may admit new States into the Union." The more deeply we investigate the principles which have governed Congress acting under this provision of the Constitution the more firmly are we convinced that no inflexible rule, no plan, no mode has ever been prescribed, much less followed, for the admission of new States. In all ways have people come and asked to be taken into the Union. In some instances compliance with the request has for the time being been delayed, but the past proves that no people properly equipped and presenting themselves in the right spirit will ever appeal in vain for admission as a State.

The question when or how new States should be admitted was dis-

cussed very fully in the convention which formed the Constitution. The acquiring of the territory out of which so many States have been carved does not appear to have been contemplated; yet there was even then a fear expressed at the power that might be wielded by the new States of the West. Some of the members of that great and illustrious body, though noted for their broad and liberal views, contended that restrictions and limitations should be placed upon the powers of Congress to extend the number of new States, and that if new States were admitted they should not be admitted on an equal footing with the original States.

Fortunately, such men as Mr. Madison took the ground that no such restrictions should be imposed, he insisting that the Western States neither would nor ought to submit to a union which degraded them from an equal rank with the other States. The provision incorporated in the Constitution has proven to be a wise and a far-reaching one. It has depth; it has breadth; it has length. The Constitution provides:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Under this provision of the Constitution there are but two restrictions on the discretion of Congress in the exercise of its power in the admission of new States:

First, no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of another State "without the consent of the Legislature of the State concerned as well as of the Congress;" and, second, "Nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

State pride, similarity of interest, the same history, the worshiping of the same heroes, form an all-powerful protection to a State. For these reasons no State willingly surrenders its territory or a part of its people. Congress has only been called upon once in seventy years to consent to the creation of a State within the jurisdiction of another State. This exception would not have taken place in a time of peace. It was one of the results of the civil war.

Territory has been acquired by purchase and by discovery. The United States have erected in some instances Territorial governments; in other cases the acquired territory has been admitted directly as a State. The discretion vested in Congress has been wisely exercised. In what other line of legislation have so few mistakes been made? But little in this direction would Congress recall were it in its power to do so. As the people in a given area have presented themselves, their case has been considered and generally the decision has been in the affirmative. Each has adopted its own plan and the questions affecting the admission of the new State have been discussed with reference to that particular case.

Since the Constitution requires that the United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government Congress has always required the community that asks to be intrusted with the powers of a State, before admission to present itself with a constitution republican in form. This, with a people confident of their strength, with a territory of adequate area sufficiently developed to indicate resources to make an important State, affirmatively shown, has been the only test required. The policy pursued has resulted in increasing the number of the thirteen original States, whose people by their courage and love of self-government and whose patriotic and unselfish statesmen made the confederacy possible, to the forty-two States now composing the Republic.

We now come to the other questions involved: "Is the applicant prepared to be a State? Are the boundaries defined and is the Territory of suitable area? Do the number of inhabitants, the conduct of the people during the probationary period of twenty-one years, the accumulated wealth, the developed and undeveloped resources, justify Congress in the exercise of its discretion in an affirmative manner in admitting Wyoming now as a State?" If so, the only remaining question will be, Do the people present themselves with a constitution republican in form? I believe, following all the precedents of the past, every unbiased mind will, after an examination of these questions, answer each and every proposition contained therein in the affirmative.

Fortunately for Wyoming, and unlike in this respect several of the Territories that have preceded her, there are no questions of boundaries or divisions to be determined antecedent to admission.

The boundaries defined for the temporary government in 1868 have remained unchanged. They have been surveyed and marked. None of the people within these boundaries ask for a division and attachment to an adjoining State or Territory, nor do any wish to encroach upon a neighbor to the extent of one foot of territory.

The country you gave them as a Territory they now desire as a State. From the beginning they have labored to this end. The law made them one people. In their association in overcoming the same obstacles, enduring the same hardships, and managing the same affairs they have become the same people in sentiment and feeling, and are bound together more strongly than any law could ever make them.

Wyoming and Colorado are the only political divisions of the United

States that are inclosed by four straight lines. The boundaries form a rectangle approaching a square, and scarcely could a State containing an area of nearly 100 square miles be made more compact. The State of Wyoming will be the eighth in point of size; more than one-third as large as Texas, two-thirds as large as California or Montana, approximating in area Colorado, nearly as large as New York and Pennsylvania combined, more than twelve times as large as New Jersey, twenty times as large as Connecticut, and nearly eighty times as large as Rhode Island.

These comparisons do not show that the State of Wyoming will be too large; nor can it be claimed that Wyoming will be too small to make a great State.

Summary of areas of States, Territories, etc., in square miles.

	Gross areas.	Coast waters (bays, gulfs, sounds, etc.).	Rivers and smaller streams.	Lakes and ponds.	Total water surface.	Total land surface.
Alaska	577,390					
Alabama	52,250	440	250	10	710	51,540
Arizona	113,020		80	20	100	112,920
Arkansas	53,850		540	265	805	53,045
California	158,360	540	240	1,600	2,380	155,980
Colorado	103,925		270	10	280	103,645
Connecticut	4,990	25	80	40	145	4,845
Dakota	149,100		610	790	1,400	147,700
Delaware	2,050	30	60		90	1,960
Dist of Columbia	70		10		10	60
Florida	58,680	1,800	390	2,250	4,440	54,240
Georgia	59,475	150	300	45	495	58,980
Idaho	84,800		200	310	510	84,290
Illinois	56,650		515	135	650	56,000
Indiana	36,350		330	110	440	35,910
Indian Territory	64,690		600		600	64,090
Iowa	56,025		450	100	550	55,475
Kansas	82,080		380		380	81,700
Kentucky	40,400		375	25	400	40,000
Louisiana	48,720	1,060	540	1,700	3,300	45,420
Maine	33,040	545	300	2,300	3,145	29,895
Maryland	12,210	1,850	500		2,350	9,860
Massachusetts	8,315	125	60	90	275	8,040
Michigan	58,915		260	1,225	1,485	57,430
Minnesota	83,365		360	3,800	4,160	79,205
Mississippi	46,810	30	340	100	470	46,340
Missouri	69,415		630	50	680	68,735
Montana	146,080		410	360	770	145,310
Nebraska	76,855		630	40	670	76,185
Nevada	110,700		35	925	960	109,740
New Hampshire	9,305		80	220	300	9,005
New Jersey	7,815	205	120	35	380	7,435
New Mexico	122,580		115	5	120	122,460
New York	49,170		350	900	1,550	47,620
North Carolina	52,250	3,200	250	160	3,670	48,580
North Dakota						
Ohio	41,060		140	160	300	40,760
Oregon	96,030	50	500	920	1,470	94,560
Pennsylvania	45,215		200	30	230	44,985
Rhode Island	1,250	135	10	20	165	1,085
South Carolina	30,570	215	180	5	400	30,170
South Dakota						
Tennessee	42,050		200	100	300	41,750
Texas	265,780	2,510	800	180	3,490	262,290
Utah	81,970		80	2,700	2,780	82,090
Vermont	9,655		50	380	430	9,125
Virginia	42,450	1,780	520	25	2,325	40,125
Washington	69,180	1,380	560	360	2,300	66,880
West Virginia	24,780		135		135	24,645
Wisconsin	56,040		420	1,170	1,590	54,450
Wyoming	97,890		85	230	315	97,575

It is doubtful whether any State has been admitted unless the question of population has been raised. From the admission of Kentucky in 1792 to the present time, it has been urged by those opposed to new States that the applicant was not entitled to admission because of the insufficiency of population. As a fact, however, whether a new State should be taken into the Union has been determined by other questions. The number of the population has had but little effect in the matter. Before the civil war the real question was that of the extension or restriction of slavery, which resolved itself into a question of political or party expediency. An examination of this question becomes most interesting.

Three States (Illinois, Arkansas, and Florida) were admitted, each with less than 33,000 free inhabitants, while the people of Dakota were deprived of the blessings of State government until the population of their Territory had reached quite a half a million of people.

If we omit Maine and West Virginia, which had shared the governments of mother States, and the States admitted under the omnibus bill of 1890, which States should have been recognized from five to ten years before they were, of the twenty-three remaining legislative States only five can it be claimed (Texas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado) had at the respective dates of admission as much as 100,000 inhabitants. Of the remaining seventeen, only five as much as 75,000 people, while the remaining thirteen States had from 33,000 to 70,000 population. The average population of the twenty-three States will scarcely exceed 70,000 inhabitants.

The following ten great States had an average of about 60,000 popu-

lation at date of admission, the population being determined in each instance by estimates of the people themselves or by an imperfect census.

State.	Population when admitted.	State.	Population when admitted.
Ohio.....	45,000	Missouri.....	66,000
Indiana.....	63,000	Oregon.....	45,000
Mississippi.....	35,000	Kansas.....	100,000
Illinois.....	35,000	Nebraska.....	100,000
Alabama.....	40,000	Colorado.....	100,000

The growth of the population of Wyoming has been steady. There have been no booms or immigration societies to create an ephemeral growth or bring together a heterogeneous mass of people. Consequently there has been no retrogression in population since the Territory was organized. By the time the State government is fully in operation, under the provisions of this bill, I have no doubt that the population will approximate that required for a member of Congress under the present ratio of apportionment. There is nothing in a Territory to call out a full vote. There is but little party feeling, and every election may be said to occur in an off year.

The settlements are widely separated. The distances are great. The polling-places are far removed from each other. In Wyoming the population is scattered over a territory of nearly 100,000 square miles, an area nearly equal to that of the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Connecticut combined. The increase of the vote each two years since the Territory was organized can leave but little doubt that if the same percentage of the total vote should go to the polls at the next election as were gotten out at the Delegate election in 1888, when the vote was 18,210, there will be polled about 23,000 votes. With State government the vote will be several thousand larger.

To secure as full a vote as can be obtained in a well settled country is an impossibility. A governor who was much opposed to State government estimated the population of the Territory in 1887 at 85,000. The vote in 1888 showed an increase of 23 per cent. in two years. A larger increase will be shown this year. Very few States have been admitted with a larger population than Wyoming now has.

The following table of figures, compiled from official sources, of the votes cast at Presidential elections in the States named best illustrate my statement:

States.	Years after admission.	Votes cast.	Members of Congress.
Tennessee.....	28	20,725	3
Indiana.....	8	15,725	3
Illinois.....	10	8,344	1
Do.....	14	19,576	3
Missouri.....	15	5,192	2
Do.....	19	19,332	2
Mississippi.....	15	5,007	2
Do.....	19	19,667	2
Arkansas.....		3,638	1
Do.....	4	11,209	1
Do.....	12	16,888	1
Do.....	16	19,357	2
Michigan.....		11,360	1
Louisiana.....	28	18,914	4
Florida.....	3	4,963	1
Do.....	7	7,193	1
Do.....	15	14,345	1
Texas.....	3	15,177	2
Do.....	7	18,647	2
Iowa.....	3	24,303	2
Wisconsin.....		39,166	3
Oregon.....	2	12,410	1
Do.....	14	14,649	1
Nebraska.....	2	15,168	1
Do.....	6	26,141	1

I might continue to fortify the case of Wyoming by calling attention to the vote in many of the States subsequent to their admission into the Union, but I shall only instance four or five other cases, which I believe will be sufficient to convince the most skeptical. Wisconsin at the election next preceding her admission as a State cast 20,318 votes. This State was admitted and accorded three members of Congress. At the first Congressional election in the State there were 24,600 voters.

Louisiana, admitted in 1812, at an election for governor in 1822, with four candidates, polled 4,748 votes. Illinois was admitted in 1818. At an election held in 1822 for the election of a governor and a Representative in Congress 8,075 votes were cast. Arkansas and Michigan were admitted in 1836. The former cast at the Presidential election that year 3,638 and the latter 11,360 votes.

Florida, admitted in 1845, cast at one of her first Congressional elections 5,301; Iowa, admitted in 1846, cast at her first election 13,271 and was given two members of Congress. At the time of the admission of California as a State the population consisted almost exclusively of men, and one of the chief objections to California becoming a State

was that a very large portion of the voters were aliens. Yet the whole vote at the first State election, when the governor, judiciary, and other State officers and Legislature to choose United States Senators were selected, was only 14,232; Oregon, under the same circumstances, cast 10,121 votes.

In the great debate arising over the admission of Kansas it was not claimed that over 13,289 votes had ever been cast, and this State, at the second Congressional election after admission, showed a vote of 15,272. Colorado, at the election next preceding admission, cast 17,100 votes. The State increased this vote nearly 50 per cent. at the first State election.

The case of Nebraska, though one of the young States, is perhaps the most marked. In the discussion that took place at the time of its admission it was disclosed that at the election immediately preceding that which had given a doubtful majority for the constitution of scarcely 100, and which had resulted in the election of State officers, a member of Congress, and the selection of two United States Senators, the total vote cast was 9,120. Nebraska, at the first Congressional election thereafter, cast 14,170 votes, a gain of more than 50 per cent.

I will not continue these comparisons, but let each draw his own conclusions. If California, Nebraska, and Kansas with the votes cast had 100,000 people at the dates of their admission, is it not safe to conclude that the vote that Wyoming will cast at her first State election will more than justify Congress in admitting her as a State?

Mr. Speaker, no particular number of inhabitants is prescribed by the Constitution, nor have the precedents fixed any number necessary for a State. The Constitution says the Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, and that each State shall have at least one Representative. Any law which might be enacted would not necessarily govern or control Congress in the exercise of its discretion. Each case as a people presents itself must be left to the wisdom of the legislative department of the Government.

Congress has passed no general law on the subject and never will. The policy of the Government has been to admit the new States as soon as the people of such States had confidence in themselves to maintain a State government. Representation under our system of government has always been unequal, and it could not be otherwise. The want of equality is usually most felt in the Western growing States. To make the matter clear I will repeat what I said on the subject before the Committee on Territories:

As I have said on another occasion, equal representation as a theory is good enough; in practice it is an impossibility. There are Congressional districts represented in the House by one member that under the present basis of apportionment are entitled to three and perhaps four Representatives. Men are sent to Congress to represent ideas and questions of public policy. The influence of a State in the national legislature depends not so much upon the number of its delegation as upon the character, integrity, and ability of its Representatives. As a rule the new States are the ones that do not have their full representation. Whatever deficiency there may be in population at the date of admission of a State is more than compensated for before the second decade in the State's history has passed.

The admission of Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado, each in turn, was opposed for the want of sufficient population to entitle them to a Representative. Note the fact that a Congressional district of Nebraska bordering on the eastern boundary of Wyoming, represented by a worthy member of this committee [Mr. DORSEY], cast in 1888 nearly 78,000 votes, more votes than Nebraska had population at the date of her admission. Judge PETERS, of Kansas, represents probably as many voters as Kansas had population when admitted. But the most marked case is Wyoming's neighbor on the south, Colorado. Loud protests were made against her admission for the want of sufficient population, yet there were 92,000 votes cast for her one Representative at the last election. Unless an apportionment is made before the next Congressional election, I have no doubt the smallest of these three districts will cast at least 100,000 votes.

Population of certain States at the time of admission into the Union.

States.	Date of admission.	Representative ratio on previous census.	Estimated population when admitted.	Population by following census.
Vermont.....	1791	33,000	85,425	154,446
Kentucky.....	1792	33,000	78,677	220,955
Tennessee.....	1796	33,000	67,000	105,602
Ohio.....	1802	33,000	45,365	230,760
Louisiana.....	1812	35,000	76,556	152,923
Indiana.....	1816	35,000	63,897	147,178
Mississippi.....	1817	35,000	35,512	75,448
Illinois.....	1818	35,000	34,620	55,162
Alabama.....	1819	35,000	40,000	127,901
Missouri.....	1821	40,000	66,557	140,444
Arkansas.....	1836	47,700	52,240	97,574
Michigan.....	1837	47,700	65,000	212,267
Florida.....	1845	70,680	64,000	87,445
Iowa.....	1846	70,680	78,819	192,214
Wisconsin.....	1848	70,680	180,000	305,391
California.....	1850	93,423	92,597	379,994
Minnesota.....	1858	93,423	120,000	172,023
Oregon.....	1859	93,423	50,000	62,405
Kansas.....	1861	127,381	107,206	364,399
Nevada.....	1864	127,381	40,000	42,491
Nebraska.....	1867	127,381	100,000	122,993
Colorado.....	1876	131,425	100,000	194,640

Again, quoting Mr. Winthrop's California speech:

It is said she has not population enough. The best accounts that we can obtain estimate her population at more than 100,000 souls. * * * And what, after all, are any estimates of population worth in such a case? The British orator, Burke, said of the American colonies in 1773, "Such is the strength with which population shoots in that part of the world, that, state the numbers as high as we will, whilst the dispute continues the exaggeration ends." While we are discussing any given magnitude they are grown to it.

RESOURCES OF WYOMING.

The resources of Wyoming are varied and of that character that are in constant demand to supply the wants of the civilized world. These resources developed are sure to make Wyoming a wealthy and prosperous State.

General Powell, the Chief of the United States Geological Survey, and Mr. Elwood Mead, the hydraulic engineer of Wyoming, estimate that there are from ten to twelve millions of acres of lands in the Territory so situated with reference to the water supply that they may be successfully cultivated by irrigation. The moisture precipitated on the mountains and plains gathered in the great water arteries is sufficient to permanently reclaim such an acreage as will make Wyoming an important agricultural State.

To the ten to twelve million acres that may be irrigated, there should be added from four to five millions of acres that will ultimately be brought into bearing without the aid of irrigation. But no agriculturist who has tried both systems will ever abandon the former, where water is accessible, to conduct what is known on the plains as dry farming. Farming with the aid of artificial irrigation while the oldest is also the best.

It is the only system under which the crops may be improved by a drought. Where it is necessarily resorted to, the rains do not come in any season in such quantities as to discourage the farmer or to destroy the husbandman's well deserved harvest.

Wyoming is rich in agricultural possibilities. In the valleys and on the benches and plateaus the soil is very productive. Before it is touched by the hand of man it is in appearance barren and unsightly. With water and the skill of the farmer it becomes, in many cases, of twice the productive capacity of lands in the most favored of the agricultural States. Irrigation does not impoverish, but the distribution of the mountain sediment becomes a perennial fertilizer to the soil.

The tame grasses, timothy, alfalfa, and clover, and wheat, oats, barley, rye, potatoes, melons, garden vegetables, berries, and other small fruits and hardy varieties of apples are being successfully and generally grown. For the want of transportation facilities there is a large surplus of agricultural products in the farming districts; especially is this the case in the northern part of the Territory. In the districts devoted exclusively to the mining and grazing industries, with the necessary transportation this surplus would find a good and ready market. One of the most profitable of the agricultural crops is that of the cultivated grasses. This is fed to live stock, and the cattle and sheep are driven to the railroads for transportation. The large herds furnish a certain demand for the entire product.

East of the Big Horn Mountains, north of the center of the Territory, extending over an area of 5,000 square miles, are sufficient lands of rich soil with an abundance of available water to supply agricultural products for a large population.

I can not better show the present condition of the agricultural interests of Wyoming, and what may be expected of this great Territory in this direction, than by calling attention to the following facts, gleaned from the official reports of Elwood Mead, the hydraulic engineer of Wyoming:

First. In the volume and distribution of her water supply Wyoming takes first place among the States and the Territories of the arid belt.

Second. Within her boundaries and in a circle of which the radius is less than 10 miles are the sources of three of the great rivers of North America, the Missouri, Colorado, and Columbia, crossing the continent in three directions, and emptying respectively into the Gulf of Mexico, the Gulf of California, and the Pacific Ocean.

Third. Four great rivers cross the border of Wyoming: the Big Horn on the north, the Platte in the east, the Green on the south, and the Snake on the west. The tributaries of these streams penetrate all parts of her vast extent, and are fed by the rains and melting snows of a mountain area of Wyoming and Colorado of over 20,000,000 of acres.

Fourth. Wyoming's situation is such that before these waters are diverted elsewhere her farmers will always have the first opportunity to be supplied.

Fifth. Six hundred natural water ways have their waters diverted wholly or in part by irrigation in Wyoming.

Sixth. Wyoming stands third in extent of irrigated lands, which amounts to an area of nearly 2,500,000 acres, equal to two-thirds of the irrigated district of Italy, and equal to the irrigated districts of France and Spain combined. This great irrigation area can be more than doubled without the aid of storage basins.

Seventh. Wyoming has 3,000 irrigation ditches and canals, with a total length of nearly 5,000 miles, exclusive of the laterals.

Eighth. That more than \$10,000,000 are invested in irrigation canals and works, and over \$15,000,000 have been expended in the reclamation of desert lands.

Ninth. That the lands now reclaimed, if divided into small farms, with the means of transportation which would furnish markets, would employ and support more than a quarter of a million of people.

Tenth. That the great area of irrigable lands in Wyoming, which become enormously productive, is equal in extent to the combined irrigated area of Egypt and Italy, which support 10,000,000 of people.

Before leaving this branch of my remarks I wish to call the attention of the committee to the amount of improved lands in several of the States. The census of 1880 shows the area of improved farms in the following States to be:

	Acres.
Colorado.....	616,169
Connecticut.....	1,642,000
Delaware.....	746,000
Florida.....	947,640
Louisiana.....	2,739,000
Massachusetts.....	2,128,000
New Hampshire.....	2,308,000
New Jersey.....	2,996,000
Rhode Island.....	298,486
Vermont.....	3,286,000
West Virginia.....	3,792,327

Closely allied to the farming industry are the grazing or pastoral interests. Contiguous to the valleys and plateaus susceptible of irrigation are lands aggregating 30,000,000 acres well adapted for grazing purposes. Indeed, there are no finer grazing fields in the world than are found in this Territory. The soil each year returns its crop of grass upon which all kinds of domestic farm animals may be kept each month in the year. Such is the quality of the grass that if these ranges are not overstocked the percentage of loss is not greater than on a well conducted farm.

In the last five years the manner of conducting this business has been greatly changed. The herds have been improved; great crops of cultivated grasses are harvested. In this wise the capacity of a given section to carry stock is increased and the liability of the business to losses during the winter months greatly lessened. In Wyoming there are at least 3,000 Angora goats (a new business), 175,000 horses, 1,250,000 sheep, and 1,500,000 neat cattle. These great herds of domestic animals of civilized man have entirely supplanted the buffalo, which furnished to the Indian his choicest meat, a roof for his wigwam, and coverlet and mattress for his bed.

There are from eight to ten million of acres of forests in Wyoming. Probably two-thirds of this area is covered with a good quality of pine and spruce. These lands, with the exception of small areas included in the grant to the Union Pacific Railroad Company, are still owned by the General Government. With the proper protection these forests will build up an important commerce and always afford to the inhabitants of Wyoming an abundant supply of lumber to meet the demands of the city and the agricultural and mining interests, besides being the means of regulating and holding up the annual water supply derived from the melting snows of the mountains until required by the farmer in the irrigation of his crops.

These forests have scarcely been disturbed. Indeed those acquainted with the forest area say that the value of these forests has greatly increased since the organization of the Territory, through the protection given by the laws, not of the United States, but of the Territory, enacted to prevent the spread of fires.

Mr. Speaker, in a most cursory manner I have referred to three of the great resources of Wyoming, the agricultural, pastoral, and lumber interests. These within themselves are sufficient to make a populous and wealthy State. They pertain to the soil—those vegetable products grown solely by nature's laws, controlled and directed in part by the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of the skilled husbandman.

In passing to those resources which have already been formed, which lie embedded wholly or in part under the surface of the ground, known as mineral resources, I believe I may say without fear of successful contradiction that nowhere else in this broad land where nature has been so beneficent have the great upheavals of the past ages disclosed and brought to light minerals more diversified, in greater abundance, and by their peculiar characteristics better adapted to satisfy the wants and skill of man than have been discovered in this Territory. In minerals Wyoming is one of nature's great store-houses. It would take the learning of the skilled mineralogist to enumerate and classify all these discoveries. They include gold, silver, lead, tin, asbestos, mica, graphite, kaolin, fire-clay, salt, and inexhaustible quantities of marble, petroleum, iron, soda, and coal. In the last-named products lies untold wealth for Wyoming.

The oil-bearing area extends over a country more than 300 miles long and averaging from 50 to 75 miles wide, but little developed. There are great flowing wells that have not yet been reached by the transportation companies.

The country has been examined by experts. Actual tests and discovery confirm the statement that as soon as the product can be utilized

Wyoming will become one of the great oil-producing sections of the globe.

The deposits and lakes of sulphate and carbonate of sodium are the most extensive yet discovered on the continent. The iron does not have to be discovered. The ore is found in great quantities of superior quality in many different portions of the Territory. Coal is found in every county of good quality for generating steam and for domestic purposes. In the northeastern portion of the Territory within the past few months great veins of excellent coking coal have been developed. The coal area is known to underlie not less than 30,000 of square miles.

These great resources have scarcely been touched, yet the production of coal last year amounted to 2,000,000 of tons, which, at the doors of the consumers, brought to the miners and transportation companies \$13,000,000.

This production is certain; it is not the result of speculation; it is not affected by drought or flood.

The production at the dump is equal in value to 20,000,000 of bushels of grain in the neighboring State of Nebraska. It requires as much labor, as many engines and cars to distribute it as it requires to transport 70,000,000 bushels of grain.

The production has only been limited by the facilities for its transportation.

The demand is double the present output. Should the production increase in the same ratio for the next five years that it has in the past, it will reach 5,000,000 tons. This coal has a widespread reputation from the Missouri to the Pacific Ocean. It furnishes the greater portion of the State of Nebraska with fuel. It provides the power for the engines over thousands of miles of railroads. Without it the Union and Central Pacific Railroads could scarcely be operated. It is the chief fuel of many of the smelters in Montana. It finds a ready market in seven States and Territories.

Unlike in the prairie States, is found in Wyoming in abundance almost every kind of material required to supply the wants of man. Here are marbles of every hue and variety, granite of various colors and qualities, and lime and sand rocks. These, with the lumber procured from the forests, afford the material for the building of towns and cities, the construction of irrigation works, the improvement of farms, for the opening of mines.

The material is at hand for inexpensive structures or for monuments and buildings of the most costly character. These products have already made a considerable commerce between Wyoming and the States east of her that nature has not so abundantly supplied with such material. This commerce, with increased means of transportation, must become very important.

Manufacturing establishments come with capital and a considerable population. Yet Wyoming has already made progress in this direction. In the Territory there is a rolling-mill, large machine and railway repair shops, flouring mills, a glass factory, tanneries, planing-mills, foundries, harness and saddle factories. No country offers better facilities for manufacturing. The raw materials are in abundance for the creation of trade and industrial establishments. Within 10 miles of a large glass factory at Laramie City are all the products that enter into the manufacture of glass, of the best quality and in abundance.

The greatest nations are those that have a great variety of resources. The same is true of States. The rolling-mill, the furnace, and factory give employment for the masses.

If for any reason there is a loss in one branch of industry this year it is compensated by the profits of some other industrial establishment; consequently the depression and suffering incident to the failure of crops in a State strictly agricultural are scarcely ever heard of in a country with numerous developed industries.

Mines of precious minerals become exhausted. The iron and coal of Wyoming will not be exhausted in thousands of years. These base materials are of more value to make a wealthy and populous State than all the precious materials yet discovered on the continent. They enter into the wants and comforts of every-day life. They provide the basis of power and the strength to control it. They furnish the important factor for the road-bed and the steam to propel the carriages and vehicles for the transportation of man in comfort and safety and the articles of trade with celerity. They overcome distance and make us one people, one nation, in sentiment and feeling. Their combined power could not be supplied by all the animal life of the globe.

Wyoming early in her history took an exalted stand in educational matters. The people have willingly taxed themselves for the maintenance of public schools. With a compulsory system the opportunity has been offered and enforced for the education of all the children that have been accessible.

Notwithstanding the immigration, it is believed that the illiterate class over ten years of age has not increased the 2.6 per cent. of the population as shown by the census of 1880.

I do not know of a man or woman who lived a portion of his or her childhood in Wyoming that is unable to read and write. Good public schools are supported in every settlement where enough children can be gotten together to justify the employment of a teacher. The teachers

are carefully examined. In all the towns of any size, good graded schools are maintained. A university is supported at public expense, offering a higher education for all children of the Territory that desire to avail themselves of its advantages.

In addition to the public schools well patronized private schools and educational institutions are established. The Territory has not derived a cent from donations of public lands.

The Territory has not asked nor has it received one dollar of aid for the purposes stated from the General Government.

The people last year expended for educational purposes nearly \$250,000. They have raised and expended during the past ten years for this purpose over \$1,000,000.

INSTITUTIONS.

The public buildings erected and the institutions maintained characterize an intelligent and progressive people. To accomplish what they have done, they have provided the necessary money largely by taxation.

They adopted the plan to meet the greater part of the principal of their obligations as soon as the liability occurred, and thereby avoid an ever-increasing debt. You have not been generous enough to give them one public building. What they have done has been without your aid or encouragement. Few new countries have done better, and in comparison with her accumulated wealth few States can make a better showing.

Of the Territorial institutions maintained I will call your attention to the following:

A water department, at the head of which is a skilled hydraulic engineer, for the purpose of investigating the questions pertaining to the reclamation and irrigation of the arid lands and the distribution and division of the waters of the Territory.

A department of mineralogy, at the head of which is an experienced geologist, to investigate and give free information as to the mining resources of the Territory.

A veterinary department, to prevent the introduction and spread of disease among the live-stock of the Territory.

A fish hatchery, for the propagation of fish and the stocking of the streams of the Territory.

A university, the building and grounds of which have cost \$100,000.

A deaf and dumb and blind asylum, erected at a cost of \$10,000.

An insane asylum, erected at a cost of \$75,000.

A poor-farm for a home for those who, by reason of age and misfortune, are unable to labor, the cost of which when completed will be \$25,000.

A capitol building has been erected at a cost of \$275,000, a better building than that possessed by fifteen of the States.

A penitentiary is in course of construction which will cost \$100,000.

The counties of the Territory almost without exception are well provided with substantial court-houses and jails, and in some instances with good hospitals.

Public sentiment has been in favor of making but few new counties, believing that the benefit to be derived is more than offset by the expenses of extra sets of county officers. The cities, towns, and villages of the Territory are well built and are well provided with good business blocks and are full of comfortable homes. The cities and towns are well governed. There are eight of the incorporated cities that are provided with water-works and five are lighted with electricity. The cities and towns are well provided with elegant churches and good school-houses.

The banking interests, which represent in a measure the integrity of a people, also speak well for our business affairs. Permit me to call your attention to the following data. It is a better showing than has heretofore been made by any new State except those admitted under the omnibus bill in 1889.

BANKING INTEREST.

There are nine national and eleven private banks in Wyoming.

A recent report of the Comptroller of the Currency shows:

That no national bank has ever suspended or gone into liquidation in that Territory. Four private banks have failed only.

That the first institution under the national-banking law was organized in 1871.

That there was not in banking capital in the Territory at that time \$150,000.

That the total of the items of resources of the nine national banks of that Territory is now nearly \$4,000,000.

Add to this total the items of resources of the private banks, and the aggregate is over \$5,000,000. This is as much or in excess of the banking resources of either of four States, all of which have been in the Union for twenty-five years or more.

These States have, respectively, one, two, five, and seven Representatives in Congress.

This table shows the steady increase each year in the banking resources and business of the Territory. It will be noted that at no time has there been any retrogression:

Summary of national banks, the important items of resources and liabilities, and the totals, etc., Wyoming Territory.

Date.	No. of banks.	Loans and discounts.	U. S. bonds.	Cash and cash items.	Capital.	Surplus.	Undivided profits.	Outstanding circulation.	Individual deposits.	Totals.
1871	1	\$77,000	\$30,000	\$15,000	\$75,000		\$3,000	\$27,000	\$55,000	\$161,000
1872	1	99,000	30,000	26,000	75,000		5,000	27,000	81,000	188,000
1873	2	203,000	60,000	34,000	125,000		23,000	51,000	162,000	363,000
1874	2	199,000	60,000	58,000	125,000	\$10,000	25,000	54,000	190,000	412,000
1875	2	246,000	60,000	62,000	125,000		16,000	49,000	297,000	539,000
1876	2	198,000	60,000	96,000	125,000	21,000	29,000	50,000	265,000	498,000
1877	2	303,000	60,000	89,000	125,000	25,000	62,000	52,000	311,000	580,000
1878	2	285,000	60,000	129,000	125,000	25,000	89,000	42,000	369,000	657,000
1879	2	385,000	60,000	79,000	125,000	50,000	58,000	53,000	444,000	753,000
1880	2	492,000	64,000	109,000	150,000	50,000	39,000	52,000	535,000	841,000
1881	3	730,000	94,000	201,000	225,000	50,000	48,000	83,000	856,000	1,306,000
1882	4	991,000	194,000	219,000	425,000	78,000	71,000	127,000	1,185,000	1,928,000
1883	4	1,313,000	219,000	242,000	425,000	103,000	103,000	123,000	1,604,000	2,486,000
1884	4	1,604,000	235,000	209,000	525,000	78,000	107,000	138,000	1,418,000	2,509,000
1885	5	1,861,000	155,000	309,000	800,000	140,000	152,000	140,000	1,744,000	3,067,000
1886	6	2,335,000	180,000	401,000	900,000	167,000	193,000	160,000	1,768,000	3,398,000
1887	8	2,527,000	224,000	305,000	1,075,000	210,000	180,000	201,000	1,697,000	3,568,000
1888	9	2,419,000	249,000	298,000	1,175,000	213,000	115,000	221,000	1,731,000	3,614,000
1889										3,726,000

I desire to make some comparisons, as follows:

State.	Date.	National banks.	Total revenues.	Average.
Mississippi.....	Sept. 30, 1889	12	\$4,200,000	\$350,000
Florida.....	do.	13	4,278,000	328,000
West Virginia.....	do.	20	7,588,000	379,000
Arkansas.....	do.	8	4,764,000	599,500
Wyoming.....	do.	9	3,272,600	414,000

I should add that two more national banks are in process of organization.

FINANCIAL MATTERS.

The people have managed their affairs well.

They have the best credit at home and abroad. They have guarded their credit at every stage with jealous care. Neither the Territory nor any county, city, or school district has ever defaulted in the payment of any obligation or any accruing interest thereon at maturity. The Territory has not at any time had a floating indebtedness. An auditor's warrant only floats the time it takes it to go to the office of the treasurer. The total indebtedness of the Territory is \$320,000. No bonds of the Territory bear over 6 per cent. interest.

No bonds have ever been sold by the Territory for less than 5 per cent. above par and some as high as 12 per cent. premium.

These bonds can not be bought for less than 18 per cent. premium in New England, where they are held.

On January 10, 1890, after every obligation had been paid, there was in the treasury \$230,000.

The result of a levy of 8 mills on the actual wealth of the Territory on the 1st day of January, 1890, would, with the cash on hand, have paid every obligation of the Territory, and of the counties, cities, towns, and school districts therein, and have left public property of the value of more than \$2,000,000.

During the entire history of the Territory, not one defalcation of a Territorial officer has occurred.

During the past five years the Territory has expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in the erection of her public buildings and not a whisper or scandal has been heard with reference to those who have had control of these matters.

Open the books of some of the States and make a better showing.

WEALTH.

Wyoming is well prepared to take care of a State government. Commencing with an assessable wealth of \$6,924,000 in 1870, an increase of \$4,333,000 was made by 1880. The property of the Territory was assessed at \$31,500,000 in 1889, and this after a reduction was made on the live-stock of the Territory, owing to a depreciation of values, to the amount of \$5,000,000. The actual wealth of the Territory is four times greater than the amount returned as the assessable wealth, as shown by the following table:

Items.	Actual value.	Assessed value.
Railroad property.....	\$35,000,000	\$6,163,000
Live-stock.....	40,000,000	9,000,000
Improved farms and ranches.....	15,000,000	3,000,000
Developed mines.....	15,000,000	Not assessed.
Churches and schools, county, city, and Territorial property.....	2,500,000	Do.
Irrigation works and improvements.....	10,000,000	Do.

For the purposes of the argument I desire to call your attention to the following facts by way of comparison. To be absolutely within bounds let us call the actual wealth of Wyoming \$100,000,000. Since

no effort was made before the census of 1860 to collect data of the assessable wealth of the several States, I have assumed that the assessable wealth of the several States was 60 per cent. of the actual wealth.

The following table shows the amount of assessable and true wealth of several of the States at the date of admission or at periods subsequent thereto:

	Years after admission.	Actual wealth.	Assessable wealth.
Wisconsin.....	2	\$42,000,000	\$31,200,000
Arkansas.....	14	39,000,000	23,400,000
Florida.....	5	23,000,000	13,800,000
Iowa.....	5	24,000,000	13,200,000
Oregon.....	2	19,000,000	11,400,000
Minnesota.....	2	52,294,000	32,087,730
California.....		22,161,000	13,296,000
Kansas.....		31,327,000	22,500,000
Wyoming, in 1889.....		100,000,000	31,500,000

POSTAL STATISTICS.

One of the surest indications of the prosperity in a community is found in the statistics of the postal service. The receipts in Wyoming during 1888 were as follows:

Total postal receipts in Wyoming during the last year amounted to.....	\$70,235.12
Receipts from the sale of postage-stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards were.....	63,978.18
From box-rents.....	6,253.05
Paid to postmasters for compensation.....	33,027.24
For clerks in post-offices, fuel, and rent.....	4,836.37
Clerks.....	477.25

There are nearly two hundred post-offices in the Territory, of which six are Presidential offices.

WYOMING MAKING RAPID STRIDES IN RAILROAD BUILDING.

There are about 900 miles of operated railroads in the Territory.

The principal railroad companies of the central west are locating lines and securing rights of way in Wyoming.

The Chicago and Burlington Railway Company operates a through line from Cheyenne, the capital of the Territory, to Chicago.

The Northwestern Railroad Company has built and is operating a line of road in the central portion of the Territory, connecting with its eastern system. This company has located from its present terminus a road to Ogden, Utah, which will make another through line to the Pacific.

The Cheyenne and Northern Railroad has completed 125 miles of road north from the capital of the Territory.

The Union Pacific Railroad traverses the Territory through its entire length from east to west.

The Union Pacific Railway Company built, during the year 1889, a road to the newly opened coal-mines in Carbon County.

The Burlington system constructed last year a road from Central Nebraska to the fields of coking coal in Northeastern Wyoming. Additional railroad mileage is now under contract that will cost over \$1,000,000. Even in the dead of winter engineers are in the field surveying and locating new lines. No less than four transcontinental lines are located across her borders. That Wyoming will soon double her railroad mileage there can be no doubt.

The best constitutions made are those that emanate directly from the people.

The inhabitants of a new State should always be left untrammelled by law or precedents when making the fundamental law.

A constitution should be the result of deliberation and thought.

I do not believe under any conditions the people of Wyoming, not even if granted half a hundred of constitutional conventions, could obtain a better result for themselves than the constitution with which they ask to be incorporated into the Union.

It will bear a critical examination, and an honest comparison of its provisions with those of any one of the State constitutions will not result to its discredit.

The time will not permit me to review it in detail, and sufficient for the present will be to call attention to a few of its provisions.

The people selected from their best men to make it. These were selected without much regard to their party affiliations. They had the best guide to govern them, the experience of the people for a period of twenty years. A young people, without the prejudice of old communities to influence them, they incorporated in the constitution the results of the best thought of those who in this progressive age have made constitutional law life's study.

The constitution is progressive, yet conservative enough to keep the managers of public affairs in the beaten paths which will afford to the people the best form of republican government.

The constitution presented is republican in form and makes no distinction in civil and political rights on account of sex, race, or color, and it is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The constitution will give an economical government; indeed, less expensive to the people than that under the Territorial system. It creates no unnecessary or ornamental officers.

The Legislature, in the first instance, is small, the two houses being comprised of 16 and 33 members, respectively. The first session may be extended to sixty days only; subsequent sessions, to forty days only.

Special legislation of every character is prohibited. Every safeguard is thrown around a bill from its introduction in either house to its final passage or defeat.

The constitution, in addition to the usual veto power, authorizes the governor to withhold his approval to individual items in appropriation bills. The constitution limits the indebtedness of the State and all political divisions of the State and the expenditures of any one year to the amount of the annual revenues, unless expressly authorized by a vote of the people.

It inhibits the voting of aid or loaning of credit to any railroad company or corporation by the State or any subdivision thereof.

It abolishes the fee system except in a few limited cases.

The constitution protects the rights of the people against trusts and corporations and combinations.

It makes ample provision for public schools. It places every protection around the school funds of the State.

It throws every safeguard around the land donated by the Government to aid in the support of public schools and the building up of State institutions.

The provision most to be commended is that clause that makes no discrimination on account of sex, so far as political rights are concerned. The people of Wyoming after a practice and experience during their entire Territorial life hesitated not one moment on this subject. They were substantially of one mind. The manner in which woman has exercised her right of elective franchise has left few men indeed who would deprive her of the privilege if it were in their power to do so.

The entire article relating to suffrage and elections is worthy of consideration. If a pure ballot and an honest election are obtainable by law, it is provided for in the constitution adopted by the people of Wyoming.

All criticisms of this constitution by the press and people have been in words of commendation.

The Senate Committee on Territories says of the constitution:

Your committee find much to praise and nothing to condemn in the constitution which has been adopted, and believe that the highest and best interests of its people, as well as the strength and glory of the Republic, will be subserved by its immediate admission as a State. The bill referred to the committee conforms to the bill recommended at the last session of Congress for an enabling act, except as to the method of admission; and with some verbal and unimportant amendments in the text the committee recommend that it do pass.

The people of Wyoming had a high precedent for their action. An act was passed by the Confederate Congress—or the Congress of the thirteen original States—providing for a convention, not to frame a constitution, but a convention to submit amendments to the Articles of Confederation. When that convention met they disregarded the instructions that they had received from Congress, and proceeded to form a constitution for the States, not as an amendment to the Articles of Confederation, but as an original document.

This action of the convention was urged as a reason why the Constitution should not be accepted by the States. The Constitution was a good one, and you are here to-day because of its adoption and wise provisions. The convention that framed it was composed of fifty-five members, and thirty-nine of its members signed it. The Wyoming constitutional convention was composed of fifty-five members, of which forty signed the constitution.

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

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. General leave has already been granted to gentlemen who desire to extend their remarks.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the request of the gentleman from New York

is that the gentleman from Wyoming may have the privilege of concluding his remarks. There is no objection, of course, if the time is taken out of the time allotted to that side.

Mr. BAKER. I move that the gentleman be permitted to finish his remarks.

Mr. SPRINGER. To be taken out of the time on that side?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I may not have been present when the gentleman referred to it, but from his large familiarity with that Territory I should be glad to have his judgment as to the population.

Mr. CAREY. I think our population will run anywhere from 110,000 to 125,000.

The constitution in the case of Wyoming was framed by a convention which emanated directly from the people; and as my time is limited I shall briefly call the attention of the House, especially of gentlemen on the opposite side of it, to the case of Oregon.

Forty years ago Oregon applied for admission to the Union with a constitution which was formed by that people without any authority of Congress. The people of Oregon live under that constitution to-day. In the discussion that took place in the Senate and the House of Representatives, it was declared to be among the best constitutions that had been presented by any people up to that time asking for admission as a State.

I wish also to call your attention to the fact that Oregon stood with two Senators and a Representative ready to be admitted the very moment the bill for the admission of the State was passed. They had elected State officers. Mr. William H. Seward, who was then one of the ablest of those composing the Senate of the United States, stood up and declared in favor of the people of Oregon, notwithstanding that they were here with two Senators and a Representative directly opposed to him politically, championed the cause of the people of Oregon, and Oregon was admitted as a State.

I would like to call the attention of the gentleman of Georgia to the case of Michigan. The people of Michigan were not admitted under an act of Congress, but on a constitution framed by a convention having its origin in a Democratic county convention of Wayne County, in that State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman from Wyoming allow me a moment in that connection?

Mr. CAREY. With pleasure.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman will refer to part 2 of the Charters and Constitutions of the United States, under the head of Oregon, page 1492, he will find that the constitution of Oregon when admitted to the Union was framed by a convention chosen under the act of the Territorial Legislature of Oregon, no enabling act having been passed by Congress.

Mr. CAREY. I shall refer to that presently. Now, will the gentleman be kind enough to read what were the preliminaries in the Michigan case?

Mr. SPRINGER. I was not referring to Michigan, but to Oregon. The gentleman said that Oregon was admitted to the Union under a constitution framed without authority of law.

Mr. CAREY. What I referred to was that there was no previous act of Congress. I am glad to hear the gentleman now admit, since he made such a strong fight against South Dakota, that the Territorial Legislature has such power as he states was exercised in the case of Oregon.

Mr. SPRINGER. I never denied it.

Mr. CAREY. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. SPRINGER. In the case of Oregon a convention was held under the act of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. CAREY. Then you claim that they have a right to pass such an act?

Mr. SPRINGER. They have not done that in this case.

Mr. CAREY. The inhabitants of the new States should always be left untrammelled by law or precedents when they are making their fundamental law. The constitution should be the result of deliberation. The only questions for Congress to determine are whether it represents the wishes of the people and is in form republican.

I want to say to my Democratic friends that from the very commencement of the State movement in Wyoming there has been no written agreement, but an implied agreement, that no political questions in a partisan sense should be discussed in the organization of the State government; and for that reason they did not elect State officers and did not send Senators and a member of Congress here with the constitution. The convention was composed of able men.

No better body of men ever assembled in the Western country than the men who composed the convention; and I want to say to my Democratic friends that from the organization of the convention until its close it never divided on a political question.

I want to say further to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that the convention was composed of fifty-five delegates. Fifty-one delegates, I think, qualified by taking the oath; forty delegates signed the constitution; nearly all the other delegates requested that their

names be signed to the constitution. Some of the delegates had to leave before the final revision was agreed to in the constitutional convention. I do not know of a man of the fifty-five members elected who was opposed to the constitution. I believe every man would have signed it if he could have remained until the final revision.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman allow me in that connection to call attention to the fact that only thirty-nine signed the original Constitution of the United States?

Mr. CAREY. Well, forty signed the Wyoming constitution.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Would another election change the result of that particularly?

Mr. CAREY. No, sir. The people have presented the constitution under which they desire to live.

Mr. STRUBLE. You say that that was a unanimous report of the Senate committee?

Mr. CAREY. It was a unanimous report of the Senate committee. Senator PLATT has been over the bill time and again, and this is the result: That is the bill upon which the members of this House will be asked to vote without regard to the three amendments. The bill fits the constitution and the constitution will be put in full operation by the bill under consideration.

The minority report says:

There is no State in the Union which contains such provisions in its constitution; nor is there a State or nation in the civilized world where women are permitted to hold office and vote, except in a few instances relating to school offices.

Woman suffrage is not a new question. It is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. It is not un-republican.

In New Jersey, under the Articles of Confederation, women had the right of suffrage. New Jersey became a State of the Union with woman suffrage. Women were not deprived of the right until 1807. The other States of the Union did not object to her exercising the elective franchise in the State of New Jersey. In England she votes in municipal matters; in Scotland and Wales and in the Isle of Wight; and in Ontario, on the northern portion of our boundary, a province which is as large as the States of New York and Michigan combined, she votes for everything except member of Parliament.

In British Columbia she votes in all matters except for members of Parliament. A law has been passed in Australia giving her suffrage; the same also in New Zealand. I should say that suffrage in some of these instances is limited to unmarried women. But it is not even new in our own country. Women exercise the right to vote and to hold office in the State of Kansas; in municipal affairs, I think in all cases in cities of a certain class.

Mr. KELLEY. In all cities.

Mr. CAREY. In all cities; I thank you.

I want to say further to the gentleman from Illinois that women to-day have the right in seventeen States to vote on school matters.

This minority report is a most remarkable production; notwithstanding my friend had nearly six weeks after the bill was reported to this House, after it had been considered in this House, on almost the very last day he filed the minority report. He gave as his excuse that he had not the time in which to prepare it.

This minority report consists in a magazine article by Goldwin Smith, an extreme conservative educated in England, a man who resides, I believe, in a British province. It consists also in an article of Mrs. Leonard, a most estimable woman, a woman who, I think, has been successful in a political way in Massachusetts. She has been prominent as a member of the board having in charge certain reform institutions in that State. It is said that she is one of the best officers they have in the State of Massachusetts. She has been the peer of the ablest men in this regard. She is a living example that woman has the ability to vote and hold office.

Then comes an article on which the gentleman from Illinois depends, written by Miss Whitney, which is full of beautiful sentiment and full of poetry. He has used woman's argument against woman. If his theory is correct woman's argument should have no weight one way or the other. If she has not the capacity to vote, has she the ability to discuss the question? I desire to call attention to a Supreme Court decision bearing upon this question (*Minor vs. Hoppersett*, 21 Wall., 162):

The court said:

The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation. The elective officers of the United States are all elected, directly or indirectly, by State votes. * * * It is not necessary to inquire whether this power of supervision thus given Congress is sufficient to authorize any interference with the State laws prescribing the qualifications of voters, for no such interference has ever been attempted. The power of the State in this particular is certainly supreme until Congress acts.

On the adoption of the Constitution, in no State were all citizens permitted to vote, but various and sometimes stringent restrictions were imposed upon the suffrage in the State constitutions:

The right of suffrage when granted will be protected. He who has it can only be deprived of it by due process of law, but in order to claim protection he must first show that he has the right.

No new State has ever been admitted to the Union which has conferred the right of suffrage upon women, and this has never been considered a valid objection to her admission.

After stating in many ways that the right of suffrage is not conferred by the Constitution of the United States and in every way giving the

idea, not expressed directly in words, that the question of suffrage is one for each State to settle for itself, subject to certain enumerated restrictions, in which, however, the question of sex does not enter, the court says:

If the law is wrong it ought to be changed; but the power for that is not with us. The arguments addressed to us bearing upon such a view of the subject may perhaps be sufficient to induce those having the power to make the alteration, but they ought not to be permitted to influence our judgment in determining the present rights of the parties now litigating before us.

Being unanimously of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one and that the constitutions and laws of the several States which commit that important trust to men alone are not necessarily void, we affirm the judgment.

United States vs. Crushack, 92 United States, page 555, it was cited from *Minor vs. Hoppersett* with approval:

The Constitution of the United States has not conferred the right of suffrage upon any one, and that the United States have no voters of their own creation in the States.

It was also cited from *United States vs. Reese et al.*, 92 United States, page 214, with approval:

The right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship. * * * The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted by the Constitution of the United States, but the last has been.

The minority report lays stress on the fact that the vote was small on the adoption of the constitution. Those who vote control those who do not vote. There was no contention about the constitution; no effort was made to get out the vote. The universal exclamation in Wyoming was that day, "Everybody favors the constitution, and what is the use of voting." I have seen important measures pass this House by one vote, and the Speaker would strain his ear to catch that one vote.

Why? Because there was no objection to the proposition. Voters are gotten out to vote for men; rarely will they turn out to vote except in small numbers for or against a constitution or for an amendment to a constitution.

There was no election for officers on the day the constitution was submitted to the people of Wyoming. The Democrats and Republicans in the start said, "Let us have a constitution under which we will be willing to live. We will not elect State officers until Congress says we may."

I have hastily looked up some figures. They are interesting. In 1835 the question was submitted to the people of Pennsylvania to vote for or against a constitutional convention. On the same day, at the same election, a governor was elected. The total vote for governor was within a few votes of 200,000; the total vote on the other question was 86,570. A constitution was submitted in 1838. On the same day a governor was elected. The total vote on the constitution was less than half that cast for the candidate for governor. The question was submitted to the people of New York in 1867 whether there should be a constitutional convention. The total vote cast on this question was 287,947; for secretary of state, same election, 698,128.

Same year, question of prohibition or no prohibition submitted to the people of Maine. Total vote on question, 24,893; same election, vote cast for governor, 103,684.

In Wisconsin in 1871 people voted on certain constitutional amendments. The total vote was 57,750; total on State officers, 147,000. Again, in 1882 certain constitutional amendments were voted upon. The total vote on these questions was less than one-fourth of that cast for State officers at the same time.

These are not exceptional cases. The people do not turn out to vote for or against constitutions. In Illinois a new constitution was submitted to the people in 1870. The constitution made radical changes in the stereotyped State constitution. It was widely discussed, yet at the election the total vote for and against the constitution was about 50 per cent. only of that cast for State treasurer and a Congressman at large.

I think the gentleman from Illinois was the secretary of the convention that made the constitution which was submitted to the people in 1870. Is that true?

Mr. SPRINGER nodded assent.

Mr. CAREY. I am sorry that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] has left. I merely call attention to his own case to fortify my theory "that unless there is opposition the vote is always small."

The gentleman from Georgia came to Congress in the Forty-ninth the first time. His district gave 9,166 votes; 1,277; 161 votes—altogether 10,604 votes. He came back to the Fiftieth Congress. It is noted in the record at that time that there were for BARNES 1,944. He has written out against that, "no opposition." [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNES. I did not write it, but it was so.

Mr. CAREY. In the Fifty-first Congress he must have had some opposition. There were 6,577 for Mr. BARNES; for Lyon 797. I merely call attention to this to show that where there is no opposition the vote will always be small.

The minority report calls attention to the vote given at the election for Delegate of 1888 and then to the vote cast for and against the constitution. I was elected to the Forty-ninth Congress, and I had a good deal of opposition. In the Fiftieth Congress the Democratic party announced in their papers that they would not nominate anybody against me. The result was that only about half of the vote of the Territory

was polled. In other words, I only received about half of the vote of the Territory. There was no opposition.

I desire further to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois in the last Congress reported a bill which included the Territory of Wyoming.

When did my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] have the change of heart? In the last Congress he reported a bill for the admission of Wyoming, Idaho, and Arizona. Permit me to read some extracts from section 2 of that bill (H. R. 12411):

SEC. 2. That all persons who shall have resided within the limits of said proposed States for sixty days, and are otherwise qualified by the laws of said Territories to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assemblies thereof, are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form conventions in said Territories; and the qualifications for delegates to such conventions shall be such as by the laws of said Territories, respectively, persons are required to possess to be eligible to the Legislative Assemblies thereof. * * * And all persons resident in said proposed States who are qualified voters of said Territories, and as herein provided, shall be entitled to vote upon the election of delegates, and upon the ratification or rejection of the constitutions, under such rules and regulations as said conventions may prescribe, not in conflict with this act.

If the bill had become a law the women would have voted for delegates to the constitutional convention and for or against any constitution that might have been submitted.

He can not claim that he was ignorant of the fact that women enjoyed full political rights, for I was called upon to give my views on the matter in the Forty-ninth Congress before the Committee on Territories, at a meeting at which Mr. SPRINGER was present. I think he presided over this particular meeting, owing to the absence of Mr. HITT, the chairman.

Every county was represented in the convention. There was no contested seat; no complications; everybody was entirely satisfied. The result that was obtained by this action has not only been ratified by the people and fully accepted by the people, but it has another indorsement. It has been acknowledged by the gentleman from Illinois that the Legislative Assembly has some authority in these matters. The Legislature adjourned on the 14th of this month, the upper branch of which was Democratic and the lower branch Republican. They have presented a memorial to this House, and that, too, by a unanimous vote, asking that the Territory may be admitted under the constitution that has been adopted and presented by the people.

If there ever was unanimity in the presentation of a case by a people it is in the case of Wyoming Territory. The Democratic central committee met at the capitol and by a unanimous vote asked Congress for admission. Of the thirty-three newspapers, Democratic and Republican, published in the Territory, all except one weekly paper have indorsed admission under this constitution. If there has been any protest I have not heard of it. Indeed, the great protest is a clipping from a newspaper in Crook County where the rival towns, Sundance and Newcastle, were making a fight on the division of the county. That is quoted as evidence to defeat the admission of the people of Wyoming under this constitution which they have presented.

The early statesmen of our country, actuated by their power of forecast and ambition for the Union which had been cemented by the trials, hardships, and blood of the soldiers of the Revolution, saw the necessity of adding new territory and preparing the same at the earliest possible time to become States of the Union. Their action, as well as that of those who have followed them in the management of the public affairs, has resulted in the making of precedents to guide a people when taking the initial steps to become a State of the Union. Forms have been discarded, and each case has been decided on its merits.

Some States have been admitted under enabling acts; and others with constitutions framed and ratified by the people previous to the passage of any act of Congress on the subject. In all ways have the new States offered themselves. They have been received, and whatever defect of form has appeared in their application has been cured by the acts of admission.

Of the States admitted, Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maine, Michigan, Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, California, and Oregon were not authorized to form the constitution presented by previous acts of Congress. The same was true of Wisconsin and Nebraska, as these failed to follow the acts provided by Congress. Kentucky became a State with a constitution that was not ratified by the people; Florida, with a constitution that was stored away with the dusty and moldy papers that accumulate at the capitol and was almost forgotten for a period of seven years; California, with a constitution made by a convention called into existence by an unauthorized order of a military governor; and Nebraska, with a constitution framed by the Territorial Legislature.

I defy any one to find a precedent among the twenty-nine legislative States where a people have presented themselves in a form more regular than do now the good people of Wyoming. This people had not a written law, yet they followed that unwritten law which the American only can follow, and obtained better results than could have been possible had they been governed by a solemn legislative act.

Place the true American anywhere, and amid the confusion he will anticipate the statutes that will follow his acts, and will evolve law and government not inconsistent with the republican form instituted by his fathers. The manner in which the people of Wyoming present themselves is to them a high compliment.

HISTORY OF THE STATE MOVEMENT.

The plan followed by the people is best told by the report of the committee. In 1888 the Legislative Assembly of Wyoming memorialized Congress for an enabling act. Bills were introduced in both branches of the last Congress to enable the people of Wyoming to form a State constitution and for the admission of the State. During the last days of that Congress a bill was unanimously reported to the Senate, and an omnibus bill including Wyoming was unanimously reported to the House. There was no further action on these bills.

After the adjournment of Congress the board of county commissioners of nearly all of the counties in the Territory by resolutions asked the governor, chief justice, and secretary to apportion the Territory into delegate districts, and the governor to call an election for a constitutional convention in the manner provided by the bill unanimously reported to the Senate. The action was taken and the provisions of the bill were followed, the result being the constitution framed and adopted under which the people now ask to be admitted as a State.

The Legislative Assembly of the Territory which adjourned *sine die* on the 14th of March instant, by a memorial to Congress praying for the admission of Wyoming as a State with the constitution framed, unanimously approved the action of the people in the making and ratification of the constitution. All the people are agreed; there are no contending factions growing out of the proposed admission of the State.

Can we do better than to take the opinions of some of the ablest men that the nation has produced? We may go back to the builders of the Union. Mr. Madison said in the case of Tennessee:

The inhabitants of that district of country were at present in a degraded situation; they were deprived of a right essential to freemen, the right of being represented in Congress. Laws were made without their consent or by their consent in part only. An exterior power had authority over their laws; an exterior power appointed their executive, which was not analogous to the other parts of the United States, and not justified by anything but an obvious and imperious necessity. He did not mean by this to censure the regulations of this provisional government, but he thought where there was doubt Congress ought to lean towards a decision which should give equal rights to every part of the American people.

To Mr. Madison a Territorial government was unsatisfactory. It did not give the people residing therein equal right with those living in the States. His opinion was concurred in by his contemporaries, and Tennessee was admitted with the constitution which had originated with the people and without a previous enabling act by Congress.

The debate over the admission of Missouri was a protracted one. In that debate Mr. Hardin, of Kentucky, said:

The Constitution, when it says "New States may be admitted by Congress into the Union," is silent upon the subject of numbers or boundary, but leaves that subject to the sound discretion of Congress. The manner in which that discretion has been exercised has been so uniform and invariable that it amounts to a law. It is, Mr. Chairman, a proclamation to the inhabitants of all the Territories that whenever their numbers approach to fifty or sixty thousand they shall be at liberty to burst from around them the bonds and chains of Territorial servitude and vassalage and assume and exercise the rights of self-government as the inalienable rights of mankind.

Mr. Barbour, a United States Representative from Virginia, afterwards one of the judges of the Supreme Court, said:

On my part it is contended that the power of Congress is limited to the simple alternative of admitting or not admitting; that even this power is subject to modifications; that they have not a moral right to refuse admission to a Territory whose situation and circumstances suit it for admission.

Mr. Holmes, a Representative from Massachusetts, in this great debate said:

The authority is to admit or not to admit, but not to prescribe conditions. What would be a fair construction of this? Surely not that Congress might hold a Territory in a colonial condition as long as they choose; nor that they might admit a new State with less political rights than another, but that the admission should be as soon as the people needed and were capable of supporting a State government.

In Michigan's case the rule laid down was not less explicit. Mr. Benton declared:

Conventions were ordinary acts of the people. They depended upon the inherent and inalienable rights. The people in any State may at any time meet in convention without a law of their Legislature and without any provision of Congress, any provision in their constitution, and may alter or abolish the whole frame of government as they please. The sovereign power to govern themselves was in the majority, and they could not be divested of it.

Mr. Buchanan, on the same question, said:

The precedent in the case of Tennessee has completely silenced all opposition in regard to the necessity of the previous acts of Congress to enable the people of Michigan to form a State constitution. It now seems to be conceded that our subsequent approbation is equivalent to our protest. This can no longer be doubted. They have the unquestionable power of waiving any irregularities in the mode of forming the constitution, had any such existed.

California presented herself for admission as a State without having lived a day under a Territorial system. The debate that took place was prolonged. The discussion that grew out of this question and Mr. Clay's compromise resolutions was participated in by the intellectual giants of that period. Mr. Calhoun, South Carolina's greatest son; Mr. Clay, Kentucky's greatest orator and the country's greatest commoner; Mr. Benton, the most illustrious man yet produced by Missouri; Mr. Cass, the great soldier, diplomat, and statesman of the northwest, and Mr. Webster, the greatest of all American constitutional lawyers, were just about to close their public careers. But one of them was living ten years later, at the breaking out of the civil war.

These great men had in their youth and during their early public

life received inspiration from the actual participants of the Revolutionary struggle. They had been prominent in public affairs for more than a quarter of a century. They were of that generation who had received the infant Republic from its father as a glorious heritage, to be protected and transmitted to posterity. This great debate is memorable also for the reason that Seward, Hamlin, Douglas, and Chase, men destined within a few years to play most exalted parts in the history of their country, had but just entered upon their illustrious careers in the Senate of the United States.

The result of this debate was significant. It settled two questions: first, that there was no fixed number of people required for a new State and, second, that it was the right of the inhabitants living in a Territory of the United States, without previous authority by Congress, to form a constitution and present themselves for admission as a State of the Union.

Mr. Calhoun, in a speech delivered in the Senate in February, 1849, used these words:

I hold it to be a fundamental principle of our political system that the people have a right to establish what government they may think proper for themselves; that every State about to become a member of this Union has a right to form its own government as it pleases, and that in order to be admitted there is but one qualification, and that is that the government shall be republican. There is no express provision to that effect, but it results from that important section which guarantees to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

In the course of a report made by Mr. Clay, from the compromise committee of thirteen, we take the following extract in relation to the admission of California:

There are various instances prior to the case of California of the admission of new States into the Union without any previous authorization by Congress. The sole condition required by the Constitution of the United States in respect to the admission of a new State is that its constitution shall be republican in form.

Mr. Cass, in the great debate on the subject of Territorial government (see Appendix to volume 22, Globe, page 59, 1850), said:

Are not the people of the Territories competent to manage their own internal affairs? Are they not of us and with us? bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh? the same people, with the same views, habits, and intelligence: all, indeed, which constitutes national identity? Ay, sir, and exhibiting by the very act of emigration a spirit of enterprise which commends them the more to our respect. Can not such a people administer their own government safely and wisely? Experience says they can. They have in every instance proved their capacity for self-government, and life, liberty, and property have been as well protected by their laws as by the laws of the States.

And the late proceedings in California to organize a government and the constitution which has been the result, are the best proofs that could be offered of the capacity of the people to lay the foundations of their political institutions wisely and justly. I know of no constitution in this broad Union where the principles of rational and progressive liberty are better secured than in this first great political offering from the shores of the Pacific.

Mr. Benton, in the Senate of the United States, in reference to the objections urged against the admission of California for the reason that Congress had not authorized the people to form a constitution, said:

The fact is admitted, but its consequence is denied. Congress has full power over the admission of new States, and may dispense with all preliminary forms when it pleases and come direct to the question of admission. It has admitted more new States without than with the previous authority of an act of Congress to form a constitution. Eight have been so admitted: Vermont, in 1791; Kentucky, 1792; Tennessee, 1796; Maine, 1820; Arkansas, 1835; Michigan, 1837; Florida, 1845; and Iowa, 1846—eight in all, a majority of the whole number ever admitted, and stretching over a period of sixty years and reaching back to the venerable times of our early history when Washington was President and the fathers of our political church were still at the altar.

Speaking of the constitution, a fair American republican constitution, and one of the best, if not the very best, that has been made * * * and being thus good in itself, it is not to be met by the question, Who made you? It is well made, and that is all the business that anybody has with it. It is a republican constitution, and that is the only test to which all can subject it.

Of the population he said:

Insufficient numbers, not people enough, is another of the objections. And how many are enough? I speak of men who exercise political rights and constitute the States. How many are enough according to the practice of Congress in admitting new States? About ten or twelve thousand, for that is the number of men which the usually required population of a new State would give.

One man to six souls is the usual proportion in civilized communities, and sixty thousand souls would give ten thousand men, and upon that number or thereabouts have most of our States been admitted. * * * We look to the population which sustains a State, which constitutes political power, which pays taxes, gives votes, and fights battles. * * * Let us vote her in. * * * The people who have gone there have done honor to the American name. Starting from a thousand points and meeting as strangers far removed from law and government, they have conducted themselves with the order, decorum, and justice which would have done honor to the oldest established and best regulated community.

The principles involved in the admission of a new State were also fully discussed in the case of Oregon and the case of Kansas, now famous in our history. The Representatives of the great States were very explicit in their declarations on this subject. The committee have called attention to several of these declarations in their report. Mr. Seward, it must be admitted, was one of the greatest of the statesmen of the last generation. In the Oregon debate he said:

I can conceive of a State with a million of people that I would not consent to admit into the Union; and I can conceive of a State that I would admit with a population of forty, fifty, or sixty thousand. She—alluding to Oregon—is to be admitted some time, and inasmuch as she is to be admitted, it is only a question of time whether you will admit her to-day or admit her in six months hence or seven years. Now, what objection is there to her being admitted

now? You say she has not 100,000 people. What of that? She will have 100,000 in a very short time.

Now, what earthly difference can it make to this Republic collectively, these States collectively, or to one State in the Union, whether Oregon is admitted now or admitted next December? The State of Oregon is here of her own free will—is here ready to be admitted. I think there is nobody who doubts that the people are ready, desirous, and willing to come in. They have made a constitution which is acceptable to themselves; a constitution which, however it may be criticised here, after all complies substantially with every requirement which the Congress of the United States or any considerable portion of either House of Congress has ever insisted on in regard to any State. For one, sir, I think that the sooner a Territory emerges from its "provincial condition" the better; the sooner the people are left to manage their own affairs and are admitted to participation in the responsibilities of this Government the stronger and more vigorous the States which those people form will be.

The Constitution of the United States does, in a great many cases, adopt that principle of generalization; that is, fixing certain rules and measurements, all of which must be conformed to before a great public transaction can be achieved; but it has always struck me that it was certainly a mark of wisdom in the framers of the Constitution that, in regard to the admission of new States into the Union, new members of the Confederacy, the Constitution avoided altogether everything like form, everything like particularity, and submitted the transaction always to the uncircumscribed discretion of the Congress of the United States.

Congress may admit a new State which has been organized by a compliance on the part of the people with certain prescribed forms set for them by the Congress of the United States or on the compliance with certain customs which the other Territories seeking admission in the Union may have adopted; so, on the other hand, Congress may admit a new State, as it has on more than one occasion admitted a new State, which had complied with no forms, but which had proceeded at once to the matter of organizing itself without any preliminary application to Congress or any preliminary investigation of it by the people themselves. I think it is important that this should be kept up, that the question should always come before Congress in the case of every new State which is embarrassed by form, embarrassed by measurement, and embarrassed by precedents.

Mr. Douglas and Mr. DAWES were not less explicit in their declarations as to the rights of a people seeking admission as a State. Mr. SHERMAN, in the Nebraska case, said:

It is sometimes said that these new States have too much preponderance in the legislative power of the Government. It is thought that if they have not sufficient population for one member it gives them an undue advantage in the House of Representatives, and that with a small population they ought not to be admitted into this Senate on an equal footing with the great States of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other States. Perhaps that is so, but in the practice of our Government there never has been any difference of interest between the small and the larger States. These Western States will be governed by the same impulses and the same feelings that govern us.

I never yet have seen the line of distinction drawn between the small and the large States. There has been no question presented since I have been a member of this body which divided the large from the small States. There is no danger therefore of an undue representation. These small States are increasing rapidly in population. I have no doubt that in a very short time Nebraska will contain more population than several of the existing States. By the time the next census is taken this young State, admitted I hope by your action, will have passed in the race of population and great progress many of the old States of the Union. It requires but very little time for the American people to fill up one of these new Territories. We must not treat them as if their rights were any different from ours.

We might proceed indefinitely to read extracts of the opinions of the men who have left their stamp upon this country's history from the time of Washington until the present, and we will find that they are nearly all of one opinion with reference to this important question.

I will call attention to the opinion of one more of the great men whose names are familiar to every household of this great land, that of Mr. Sumner, one celebrated for his learning, for his ability as a great international and constitutional lawyer.

Mr. Sumner, in the Kansas debate, said:

Kansas may be admitted by Congress into the Union without regard to population or preliminary forms.

To the objection that Kansas had not a sufficient population he said:

In the absence of any recent census, it is impossible to do more than approximate to the actual population, but from careful inquiry of the best sources I am led to place it now at 50,000.

In speaking of it being urged by some that a population sufficient for one member of Congress should be required before a new State was admitted, he said:

But in making this number the condition of the admission of Kansas you set up an extraordinary standard. There is nothing out of which it can be derived from the beginning to the end of the precedents. Going back to the days of the Continental Congress you find in 1784 it was declared that 20,000 free inhabitants in a Territory might establish a permanent constitution and government for themselves. Though this number was afterward, in an ordinance of 1787, North western Territory, raised to 60,000, yet the power was left in Congress and subsequently exercised in more than one instance to constitute a State with a similar number.

He took the ground that Kansas should not be required to have 93,420 people, that required for a Representative, before being admitted. He said:

Out of all the new States only Maine, Wisconsin, and Texas contained so large a population as is proposed to be required for Kansas.

He said that—

Fifteen new States have been admitted with a similar population. * * * But this is not all; at the adoption of the national Constitution there were three of the old thirteen whose respective populations had not reached the amount now required of Kansas.

That the practice of Congress had not been on the basis of requiring the existing ratio of representation for a member of the House of Representatives in the proposed new State.

He said:

The rule might be a reasonable one and might not be a question in ordinary cases, but that it can not be drawn or implied from the Constitution.

He also said:

This ratio is in itself a sliding scale. At first it was 30,000; it increased in 1793 to 33,000, and thus continued until 1813, when it was put up to 35,000. * * * Now it is 93,420.

If any ratio is to be made the foundation, the binding rule, it should be that which prevailed at the adoption of the Constitution, or at least that which prevailed when Kansas as a part of Louisiana was acquired from France in a solemn stipulation that it should be incorporated into the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible according to the principles of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Sumner proceeded to show that in the case of Florida the rule that had governed in her admission was the treaty stipulation under which the Territory contained in her boundaries was acquired.

The admission of new States detracts not from the dignity of the older States, while it magnifies the importance of the Union of States. In the performance of this duty Congress has increased the strength and glory of the Republic. The growth of the nation's power has not been by the sword or through the conquests of battle, but by the building of new States.

There have been victories which have done more for the human race than all that have been accomplished during the same period by the military powers of the world. Without standing armies this nation, through the courage and labor of her men and women in the broad and great West, has reared monuments more lasting than any erected to perpetuate the victories of battle-fields. The American youth are skilled and cultivated in the arts of peace, which prepares them to be invincible in war.

You ask why are the people of the Territories so anxious to become States? If you had ever lived in a Territory it would not require a reply. Your every-day experiences would have answered it a hundred times. Population and wealth avoid a Territory until forced across its borders. The world believes a Territory is without law and order; the term is treated as if synonymous with being the home of refugees from justice and the abode of desperate characters; and more, a true American when living in America wants to enjoy all the privileges of American citizens. These things amount to a constant restraint to immigration and the investment of capital, consequently retarding growth and development.

You who are so fortunate as to live in a great and worthy State, ask yourselves this question: How would you like to have your State become a province of the Union of States, with your governor, secretary, and judges appointed and controlled by influences entirely outside of the Territory, and these appointees often being wholly disqualified by experience and habits of life to perform the duties intrusted to them, yet clothed with power to approve or disapprove your laws, administer your justice, disburse the moneys raised by the taxation of your people?

I will note here, however, that President Harrison has followed the letter and the spirit of the platform on which he became President, and has appointed the officers of the Territory from actual residents, and has in this respect endeared himself to the people of the Territories as no President who ever preceded him. He has said no to the Eastern aspiring politicians, which his predecessor had not the manhood to do.

How would you like always to see your wants the last heeded and attended to, and laws enacted to which you were not accorded the right in their passage to say ay or nay; your demands not complied with, because you are without representation, consequently without power?

Aided in nothing, pushed aside until the last, consequently your time never arriving; your people in the mean time meeting their share of the public burdens, and paying millions of dollars into an overflowing treasury for lands made valuable only by the industry and settlement of your people; restrictive and inapplicable laws enforced against cutting of lumber to improve the farms, mine, and build the town, while the law made free gift to corporations building railroads of timber and other material, and to your people wrongs irreparable being done for a period of years in destroying their only evidences of title to their homes derived from the Government.

Would you be happy? If you were not restless, full of discontent under such circumstances, would you be worthy of the name of American? I now ask you, do you approve of colonial government under the jurisdiction of the United States, except in cases of extreme necessity?

Will you now say to a people, your own sons and daughters, men and women conscious of their strength and ability, you shall longer remain in a colonial condition? What have you done for the people of Wyoming? You have permitted them to breathe the air. You vote an average of \$26,000 per annum for the support of a government not of their making, while they expend ten times as much in the maintenance of public schools.

The people of Wyoming are prepared for admission. Of their Territorial childhood they render you to-day an account. What they have accomplished is the best evidence of their true worth. They have made an exhibit of their mines, of their agricultural development, of the growth of their industrial establishments, of their flocks and herds, of their educational and financial institutions. All these are the best and highest pledge that they are prepared to be a State of the Union.

I have said her people are entitled to admission under the beneficent provisions of the ordinance of 1787. They are entitled to admission

now under the provisions of the treaties with France and Mexico, which provide that the people shall be incorporated and admitted into the Union of the United States as soon as possible, according to the principle of the Federal Constitution. They are entitled to admission because of the implied pledge you gave them when you organized a temporary government over them. The people, irrespective of party, have presented a constitution republican in form, alike creditable to themselves and the Union of States they seek to enter.

No stories of dissatisfaction with that constitution have followed them in their petition. The question of boundaries, the serving of strange gods, the restriction of rights belonging to American freemen, the upholding of institutions repugnant to our system of government, and inhabitants within her borders who refuse to assimilate and to accept our institutions, do not stand in her way. Neither political party can make a point by now obstructing her admission.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason, stronger than any written law could be, more overwhelming in its influence, all powerful in their behalf.

The people, from the very foundation of the Government, have been opposed to the provincial system; it is obnoxious to their sense of justice and fair play. They believe in "home rule," local self-government. The wrongs of omission and commission to the Northwest have intensified public sentiment against it. No true American ever defended it a day beyond its absolute necessity; he has only apologized for its existence. It is not a part of our Federal system. It has nothing to do with our Union of States. The American people are overwhelmingly against it and stand ever ready to destroy it.

May not the people of Wyoming to-day turn with confidence to the Representatives of the thirteen original States who emerged from the provincial condition and made the American Union possible—may they not look also to the Representatives of the twenty-nine legislative States and feel assured that you will deal with them as a great and generous Republic dealt with your people when they were seeking admission as States?

Many of yours are old and powerful States. Wyoming, young and enterprising, rich in resources, with Western ambition and strength, will hasten to overtake you, and at your side bear a State's share of the burdens and responsibilities of the Republic. Wyoming, full of energy, full of hope, patient until well prepared with the constitution of her own making, now asks of you, the Representatives of the American people, the choicest gift and blessing in your power to bestow, to be forever incorporated into the Union of States. [Loud applause.]

[Mr. DOCKERY withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, in the very able presentation of the case of his Territory by the Delegate from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] he stated one great truth which, if fully recognized and understood, as that gentleman understands it, by members generally on the other side of this Chamber, would probably cause them to have less difficulty in arriving at correct conclusions in the matter of elections in many of the districts in Southern States. It would deprive them of the major part of their capital for bloody-shirt arguments in contested-election cases from the South.

It is a fact, known of all men who have ever given any study or attention to the subject, that wherever the people in a State, Territory, or district are practically unanimous in favor of a proposition the vote will be small, whether the question be the election of an officer or the adoption of a constitution; and the fact that the vote was small in the case in hand is, to my mind, an argument in favor of the popularity of this constitution with the people of Wyoming.

It is now the chief argument of certain gentlemen in both branches of Congress and the radical Republican newspapers that the small vote polled in many of the Congressional districts of the Southern States is due to the intimidation of colored voters or to throwing out and fraudulently refusing to count those cast for the Republican candidate.

In many districts in the South a competent and suitable candidate of honest character and of Republican faith can not be found, and a majority of the colored people have sense enough to know it; they have not forgotten the conduct of the gang of thieves and incapables who led them in reconstruction times, and hence do not care to vote.

When the Republicans have no candidate or one who does not command their respect and confidence, they do not vote; and when such a state of things in a district is apparent less than half the Democrats (mostly white men) do not care to leave their business to go to the polling places to vote. And in such districts there is no disturbance and perhaps not a single challenge of the vote of any man offering to vote anywhere within the district.

It is frequently the case that large numbers of voters of both races remain at home busy at honest toil upon their farms and do not know when election day for members of Congress arrives. When the election of State and county officers is held on a different day, as in my State, the election of a member of Congress is an exceedingly quiet and tame affair; yet it is a regular stock argument with many Republicans that intimidation has stalked forth on stilts through these districts and done this work. Nothing is more absurd. Such arguments are attributable either to ignorance or malice.

In the district I have the honor to represent there are about 30,000 voters, as shown by the last census, nearly equally divided between the two races, the colored having, by actual count at the Census Office, in round numbers 1,100 majority. The two races stand politically divided about as follows: Of the whites, 1 per cent. is Republican; of the colored, about 15 per cent. is Democratic. At the election to the Fiftieth Congress I received 6,666 votes and had no opposition; yet it was charged by some of the Republican newspapers that my election was secured by intimidation. Why, sir, the Republicans had no candidate. Were they prevented from making a nomination? Where is the evidence of it? I will pay a reward of \$1,000 to any one who will produce proof of a single instance where any voter within the Third district of Alabama was intimidated and prevented from voting as he pleased at any Congressional election during the nine years I have had the honor to be a Representative here. And I have no doubt that the same may truly be said of a large majority, if not of all, of the districts throughout the Southern States.

I have not investigated the elections in Wyoming as to the convention or ratification of their constitution. I am loath to believe that the Democrats of the Territory approve this constitution. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] presented, by clear and unmistakable statements of fact, the irregularity with which the convention was elected or claimed to be elected and this constitution framed, but the fact, if it be a fact, of the unanimity of the people in indorsing the constitution is, to a great extent, a waiver so far as they are concerned of any such irregularity.

I find that the constitutional provisions for the admission of new States are quite limited and practically leave the whole matter to the discretion of Congress. Section 3, Article IV, provides that—

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

And the next paragraph provides that—

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

And the fourth section provides that—

The United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, etc.

These are all the provisions which can be construed as bearing upon the question of the powers of Congress or the limitations imposed by the Constitution in respect to the admission of new States. It is therefore left to the sound discretion of Congress to determine when and in what cases new States shall be admitted.

The principle of allowing the people within a State to determine the question of the elective franchise is one that has always been recognized in the United States, with one notable exception. When eleven States which had tried to get out of the Union never were out according to the Supreme Court, and yet were not in according to the Congress of the United States, their suffrage was regulated for them by Congress and the Army. Their people, though among the most intelligent in the world, were not allowed to determine who should exercise the suffrage within their respective jurisdictions, and I believe that is the only exception.

It does not follow, however, that where the people of a Territory have exercised this right in framing a constitution they should be admitted as a State of this Union. Other questions are to be considered.

The constitution which Wyoming presents did not originate in the usual or regular way. The convention which framed it was not elected and did not convene in pursuance of an enabling act passed by Congress. There was no law to regulate that election, and hence no means of preventing fraud or bribery, and hence good men who may have been opposed to the convention and to the constitution may have regarded the whole thing as a farce and thought that Congress would so regard it.

The suffrage clause in the constitution presented for our action is an innovation—a new departure—as no State has ever been admitted into the Union with woman suffrage provided for in its constitution. The Delegate from Wyoming cited New Jersey as an instance. I do not know whether it was by statute or constitutional provision, nor does it matter. If not unfortunate for the gentleman's cause, it is, to say the least, not a very strong argument in favor of the proposition, for he says that that State abandoned it less than twenty years thereafter.

Now, this clause goes further than the mere securing to women of the right to vote in this Territory. The first clause relating to suffrage is as follows:

The right of the citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

I am opposed to that. I am opposed to the admission of this Territory as a State, first, on account of this provision in its constitution. If this were not in the constitution, then so far as that question is concerned, if the State when admitted thought proper to regulate the suffrage by statute and allow women to vote and hold office, it would be no concern of Congress, as the people would then have the right to regulate their internal affairs to suit themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

But this is a new departure. No new State, so far as I have been able to learn, has ever come into this Union with such a provision in

its constitution, insuring the right to vote and hold office to its female population above the age of twenty-one years, the same as the males.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a very erroneous idea prevails in the minds of many people of this country in respect to suffrage. It seems to be to some a startling proposition that all people have not the right to vote. Some claim that this is a natural right. No claim that ever was presented is more absurd. The right to vote in all countries where it has ever been exercised is a matter of mere municipal regulation. It is not a natural right in any sense. It is a right bestowed or conferred by law.

Some claim that citizenship and the right to vote should be identical, and that the denial of the right to vote is a denial of citizenship. That is not true. The fourteenth amendment of the Constitution defines very clearly who are citizens of the United States. All who are born within the United States and all aliens who become naturalized are citizens of the United States. The child but one year old is as much a citizen of the United States as the man of ninety, both being born here. A woman is as much a citizen of the United States as the President himself. Citizenship therefore has never been recognized as bestowing upon any person or class of persons the right of suffrage.

I believe that a people's government—a constitutional, representative democracy—is the best government on earth. But, sir, it is a delicate and difficult task to maintain such a government. It will not do to make suffrage coextensive with citizenship. The idiot and the child of tender years are citizens, and yet no one, I presume, will contend that either should exercise to any extent the governing power. No republican government worthy of the name can long subsist unless a decided majority of those in whom is lodged the voice or sovereignty of the state are endowed by nature with governing power and prepared by culture to exercise it.

The acquiescence of nations for thousands of years in the assertion of the divine right of kings to rule over them, and ever since that dogma has been exploded a base submission to the rule of one man assisted only by a select aristocracy, show how limited are the capacities of peoples for self-government. A people's government in France, which has cost an ocean of blood and a mountain of treasure, is but a half-way republic, still at the experimental stage, as are those of Mexico and the South American republics.

Our own is the grandest success of any thus far, and yet the United States are but one century old, which is not of sufficient duration in the lives of nations to put us entirely beyond the experimental stage; nevertheless we are so assured of undoubted success that we extend the right of suffrage to a million and a half of newly emancipated slaves of the African race, totally ignorant of the matters of government and never distinguished in the history of the world for capacity to govern themselves in a single instance, and newly arrived foreigners, totally ignorant of both our language and our laws. Under these circumstances, ought any one to be surprised at the corrupt practices prevalent in our elections throughout the country? The wonder is that there is so little corruption. The tree which is tainted with unsoundness and infested by insects in its roots can not bear sound fruit.

Education expels superstition and stupidity; it makes men and women shrewder, more inventive, cautious, and wary, but it does not make them honest, nor of itself make them safe custodians of governing power. It quickens thought and gives subtlety to the reasoning powers; it civilizes and humanizes individuals, but it does not and never can bestow upon any race or nation the capacity to govern. That depends more upon natural gifts than culture. An inborn love of liberty, integrity, superior courage, steadiness and fixedness of purpose, and a high sense of honor are the characteristics which must exist in those or at least a majority of those members of the community, states, or nation in which the governing power should be vested, in order to secure wise, steady, and beneficent republican government. These qualities may be heightened, sharpened, and made more active in the school-room, but they are not acquired there; they are god-given. All of these qualities are found in women only in rare instances. All of these qualities are not at all essential to woman to enable her to fill the sphere assigned to her by a wise Creator.

The high courage and masculine qualities of Joan of Arc, Elizabeth of England, and Catherine of Russia command the applause of men, but it is the timid, affectionate, effeminate, and confiding womanhood which commands our love, makes our hearts and homes happy, produces and matures the best and wisest of men. I like a woman who is a woman and appreciates the sphere to which God and the Bible have assigned her. I do not like a man-woman. She may be intelligent and full of learning, but when she assumes the performance of the rough duties and functions assigned by nature to man she becomes rough and tough and can no longer be the object of affection.

The assertion by the advocates of woman suffrage that giving her the right to vote will purify elections and make them more honest than if men alone exercised the franchise, is but a bald assertion, without any facts to support it. My information, derived from private sources, is that in this very Territory of Wyoming elections are quite as corrupt as in any other place or section of country in the United States. I am told that the buying and selling of votes among the women who vote is a common practice.

That women are better than men in some respects I am proud to

concede and assert, but when thrown into the arena of business, its conflicting interests and contentions, and matters of government, they are no more honest than men; and I do not believe that they could ever bring themselves to regard the full measure and gravity of responsibility which the right of suffrage should impose.

In my judgment, woman has a higher sphere, and by nature is not adapted to the business of government. This is no denial to her of the rights of citizenship. Are not all of her rights as well protected by courts and juries, by the law of the land everywhere, as though she had the elective franchise? However intelligent women may be, however virtuous and good, they are not, in my judgment, proper custodians of political sovereignty. In the few cases where a limited franchise has been bestowed upon them it has been simply an experiment. Throughout all the ages it has never been considered a safe step to take in the affairs of government to make women the repositories of the governing power.

In a neighboring Territory to Wyoming, now the State of Washington, woman suffrage was given a fair trial for many years; yet when the people of that Territory formed their State constitution they wisely rejected it, thereby lifting their women out of the slough of politics and restoring them to their own god-given arena.

The Delegate from Wyoming in his enthusiastic advocacy of woman suffrage was not very happy in his citation of her right of suffrage in Great Britain. It is quite true that she votes in all elections except for members of Parliament, but, sir, it is only when she owns the requisite amount of property in England. In other than Parliamentary elections neither manhood nor womanhood votes. It is property that votes; there suffrage and property are yoked together, which is not the rule in any of the States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment the franchise has been too liberally extended, too liberally, inconsiderately, and hastily extended. Should we ever reach universal suffrage this Government will become practically a pure democracy, and then the days of its existence are numbered.

Under this clause of the Wyoming constitution making women eligible to all offices in this proposed State, how long may it be before a woman may be sent here to sit in this body or in the Senate? And then you would have the State of Wyoming performing the unparalleled act of sending here a representative on this floor who is not a gentleman. [Laughter.] And you will have to change your code or change the language to be employed by the Speaker; otherwise he would very erroneously recognize "the gentleman from Wyoming." Her presence here would at once suggest the inconvenience of pairing as announced in the RECORD.

Mr. CAREY. I will ask the gentleman whether anybody ever sat on this floor who was not a gentleman?

Mr. OATES. I did not assume that. I hope that it is not the case. But in the case I have supposed, if you should send a woman here from Wyoming, you would have at least one member here who was not a gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama a question? His line of remark suggests possibly a difference of opinion upon a constitutional question. Can the constitution or statute of Wyoming determine the qualifications for membership in this House? In other words, can any provision in the constitution of Wyoming confer upon a woman the right to sit as a member of this House if she has not already that right under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. OATES. If the Constitution of the United States—I do not remember the exact language—if the Constitution, in prescribing the qualifications for membership here, uses the term "male citizen," then, indeed, no clause in the constitution of Wyoming could confer upon a woman the right to sit as a Representative in this House. The language of the Constitution, if I recollect it, is that a Representative must be a person eligible to the most numerous branch of the General Assembly, be twenty-five years old and seven years a citizen.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. No; the gentleman is mistaken; the language which he cites is the qualification prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the electors of Representatives; but the Representatives themselves must have certain constitutional qualifications, and those qualifications are prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. If it were otherwise, if the qualification of Representatives were within the control of any State, then there might be as many different rules of qualification as there are States.

Mr. OATES. I will read the clause of the Constitution. It is as follows:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I was familiar with the provision, but what I want to do is to call attention of the gentleman from Alabama to this question. The Constitution of the United States prescribes the qualification of the Representatives in Congress, and no provision of the constitution of Wyoming and no statute of Wyoming

can add to or subtract from those qualifications. And if under the constitution of Wyoming a woman would be qualified to become a Representative in Congress she is qualified to become a Representative under the Constitution of the United States now.

Mr. OATES. There is no provision of the Constitution of the United States which prevents a woman, on account of her sex, from becoming a member of Congress.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Wyoming can not confer it upon her if she does not have it under the Constitution of the United States. All Wyoming can do is to elect a Representative who at the time of the election has the prescribed qualification.

Mr. OATES. I admit that, and am fully aware that there is nothing in the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to prohibit a woman, if she is eligible under the constitution of Wyoming. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States to exclude her.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I hope my friend from Alabama will not commit himself to that doctrine, because if Wyoming is admitted that exact state of the case may arise. My friend may choose to leave the matter open for him to decide hereafter whether the Constitution of the United States admits ladies or not as Representatives in Congress. He should not commit himself on that question.

Mr. OATES. I will tell the gentleman from Kentucky that I am not hedging against the future. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAREY. Is there anything in the constitution of Alabama which prevents conferring upon women the right of suffrage?

Mr. OATES. There is. The State constitution limits suffrage to certain of its male citizens over twenty-one years of age, but the State has the right to change her constitution and enfranchise the women, but that will never be done.

Mr. CAREY. Your State, then, is left to decide the matter for itself.

Mr. OATES. I have already stated that.

Mr. Speaker, my line of argument is that women have not been regarded as safe depositaries of the governing power, and, notwithstanding the respect I have for the ladies, in my judgment they ought not to be invested with it. This Territory should not be admitted as a State with such a provision in its fundamental law.

Furthermore, we find in the second paragraph of this section of the constitution the following:

Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges.

This not only secures to women the right to vote and hold office, but the right to sit on juries, and unless these rights are equally enjoyed the proceeding, whatever it may be, will be unconstitutional.

It seems to me that this clause will bring trouble in their administration of the government. Lord Coke said: "These three things the law favoeth: life, liberty, and dower." The right of dower in the deceased husband's lands will be stricken down by this provision. It completely destroys the marital rights of husband and wife in and to each other's property, and the right to contract in respect thereto is completely severed. For all business it completely divorces husband and wife. It is a most radical innovation upon both English and American common law. The wife can contract debts, sell and convey her goods and lands without the husband's sanction, and *vice versa*.

What is there in the society of Wyoming to require such a wide departure from rules which have prevailed for centuries in other States and communities more populous and quite as intelligent? I believe, sir, that it had its origin with certain strong-minded women who overcame a lot of weak-minded men.

But this is a matter for the people of the Territory to settle for themselves. It does not matter to Congress how they do it. It pertains to their domestic affairs.

My next objection to the admission of this Territory is on account of an unusual provision in its constitution in respect to education. It is also a new departure. I do not think any State has ever been admitted into the Union with such a provision in its constitution. The ninth section of it provides:

The Legislature shall make such further provision, by taxation or otherwise, as with the income arising from the general school fund will create and maintain a thorough and efficient system of public schools adequate to the proper instruction of all the youth of the State between the ages of six and twenty-one years free of charge; and in view of such provision so made, the Legislature shall require that every child of sufficient physical and mental ability shall attend a public school during the period between six and eighteen years for a time equivalent to three years, unless educated by other means.

This is the first instance in this country of compulsory education. That does not accord with the spirit of free institutions, and I am opposed to this constitution for that reason. I am in favor of offering fair educational facilities to the people of every section of this country. I believe it to be the duty and the interest of the State to educate the mind of the State to the extent of the primary branches, but I do not believe in the principle of compulsory education. It seems to answer very well for the Empire of Germany, but I do not wish to see it planted in free America.

Sir, I am not an iconoclast. I believe in conservatism. I would offer to the parents of children the inducement of free education for

their children, and leave the responsibility on them for a failure to give their children the advantages afforded by this great benefaction; but I would never present to the son or the daughter the spectacle of the father or mother, one or both, arraigned before a court to be tried for the offense of failing to send their children to school and to have the children dragged into court and sworn as witnesses against their parents.

Such a thing is revolting, harsh, and unnatural, and utterly un-American in principle. It is a long stride in the direction of paternal government. The truly democratic and American principle of government is, as applied to both State and nation, to govern the people no further by law than is essential to the maintenance of good order and the administration of justice.

Let American institutions remain as free as the air we breathe. The State should never invade the household and undertake to regulate its domestic affairs. But there is no counting for the radical invention and innovations of the people who compose the Republican party. Compulsory education is an importation from the Empire of Germany or China. Our protective-tariff advocates should long ago have put a duty on it which would totally exclude it from our shores.

Section 29 of the bill of rights of the Wyoming constitution declares that—

No distinction shall ever be made by law between resident aliens and citizens as to the possession, taxation, enjoyment, and descent of property.

This is in direct contravention of the public policy of the United States. It is an invitation to the lords and capitalists of Europe to buy large tracts of land in Wyoming, as they have done in some other of the States and Territories. Such persons now own more than 25,000,000 of acres in large bodies of lands in the United States.

But a few years ago Congress passed a law prohibiting any alien from acquiring title to any land in any of the Territories or the District of Columbia, and did not extend the act to the States because some of the members of the House doubted the constitutional power of Congress to extend the provisions of the bill so far. I had the honor to introduce into this House the first bill of this character, and have introduced one at the present session, which I intend to press to consideration if possible, because I believe in the necessity for it and that Congress has full constitutional power to pass an act prohibiting aliens from acquiring title to lands in any of the States of the Union. But Wyoming declares against such policy in her fundamental law.

All the provisions in this constitution I have read with great care, many of which I commend, but these three are the most objectionable, and are of themselves sufficient to require me to vote against the bill to admit this Territory into the Union of States.

Now, I ask the attention of the House to another point. This bill makes exceedingly liberal grants of the public lands to the State, to be selected by the State. I was not surprised when I heard the Delegate from that Territory say that the people under this constitution could run their State government much more cheaply than almost any other State in the Union, or certainly with less expense than any other of the new States. One reason of that is manifestly the exceedingly liberal provisions made in the bill, which exempt the people from any taxation whatever for the erection of the public buildings, or for the erection of any of the buildings for public institutions of the State, or for the maintenance of a magnificent system of schools.

The fourth section of the bill grants sections numbered 16 and 36 in every township of the State for public schools, which is the usual grant in the new States and is entirely free from objection. The seventh section of the bill, in concord with the other and in accord with the precedents heretofore established, grants 5 per cent. of the sales of the public lands to the State for educational purposes. The sixth section of the bill grants fifty sections of the public lands within the State for the purpose of the erection of public buildings at the capital of the State. There is another grant further on in the bill for the same purpose, to which I shall presently refer. Section 8 grants seventy-two sections of land for a State university and one section for a fish hatchery. The ninth section of the bill reads as follows:

SEC. 9. That the penitentiary at Laramie City, Wyo., and all lands connected therewith and set apart and reserved therefor, and the personal property of the United States now being in the Territory of Wyoming and which has been in use in the said Territory in the administration of the Territorial government, including books and records, and the property used at the constitutional convention which convened at Cheyenne in the month of September, 1889, are hereby granted and donated and unexpended appropriations of money therefor are hereby granted and donated to the State of Wyoming.

That is comparatively free from objection, but I cite it to show the extent of the grant. As to the number of acres covered by the words "all lands connected therewith" we are not informed. Section 10 donates 90,000 acres of the public land for an agricultural college. The first paragraph of section 11 grants 30,000 acres in lieu of swamp and overflowed lands. I do not suppose that there is an acre of swamp or overflowed land, properly belonging to that classification, in that Territory.

Mr. MCADOO. Will the gentleman allow me a question just here?

Mr. OATES. Let me get through with the land-grant question first, unless it pertains to this part of the subject.

Mr. MCADOO. It does. I wish to inquire if there is any limit fixed

in the bill as to the purchase of these lands—the quantity that may be purchased by any one person.

Mr. OATES. There is a limit as to the price. None of it is to be sold for less than \$10 per acre.

Mr. MCADOO. But can the purchaser buy a thousand acres or more if he sees fit?

Mr. OATES. One purchaser can buy the whole of it under this bill. It may be bought by a syndicate of foreign capitalists.

Mr. MCADOO. That is it. There is no limit, then?

Mr. OATES. No, sir; only in price.

Then by the same section there is a further grant for the insane asylum, 30,000 acres; for penal, reform, or educational institutions in course of construction in Carbon County, 30,000 acres; for the penitentiary in Albany County, 30,000 acres; for the fish-hatchery in Albany County, 5,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum in Laramie County, 30,000 acres; for the poor-farm in Fremont County, 10,000 acres; for a hospital for miners who shall become disabled or incapacitated to labor while working in the mines of the State, 30,000.

I never knew before that miners were to receive any kind of pension from the State. That is a new departure. They are to be provided with a home out of the bounty of the United States. Why should they be thus provided for while hundreds of thousands of old, tired, worn-out farmers, broken down by honest toil on the surface instead of under the ground, are not provided for? For public buildings at the capital of the State, in addition to those hereinbefore granted for that purpose, 75,000 acres; for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions, 260,000 acres, making a total of 500,000 acres; provided that none of the lands granted by this act shall be sold for less than \$10 per acre.

These grants under this bill aggregate a total, according to my calculation, of 663,080 acres. None of this is to be sold for less than \$10 per acre, making a contribution to this new State of \$6,630,800 in land. All of it may be sold to a single individual, even though a foreigner; there is no restriction as to the quantity that may be purchased or as to the purchaser, but only as to the price. I think that is a very objectionable feature of the bill. The grant is enormous in extent and without restriction except as to price.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit me a question just there?

Mr. OATES. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. Do I understand the gentleman to mean six hundred and odd thousand acres in addition to the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections granted for school purposes?

Mr. OATES. Yes.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is in addition to that?

Mr. OATES. Yes, sir, and in addition to the 5 per cent. to be paid the State on sales of lands made by the United States.

Mr. STOCKDALE. What is to become of the remainder of the land, if there is any left?

Mr. OATES. I suppose the remainder, if there is any left fit for cultivation, will be bought by the Grangers and Alliance people.

According to the report of the committee the Territory contains about 62,000,000 acres. Of this about 4,000,000 are arable and sufficiently watered to be capable of cultivation.

The State, having the selection, of course would take the lands granted by this bill from these, the choicest and best, and, while the grant restricts the State to sell for not less than \$10 per acre, the bill does not fix any maximum, and the State may sell for \$50 or \$100 per acre these valuable agricultural lands, which would give her an enormous, a princely amount for her schools, penitentiaries, state-house, poor-farm, miners' home, and fish hatcheries.

Of the remaining 58,000,000 acres, about ten or twelve million more are susceptible of cultivation when provision is made for their proper irrigation, but this will require a vast expenditure of money, which, no doubt, the United States will be called upon to make from their Treasury. And it may be that this object has had a potential influence in silencing within the Territory opposition to statehood under this constitution, bad as it is.

Forty-six millions of acres within this Territory are arid and unfit for cultivation, adapted only to grazing and stock-raising. I do not know whether the Yellowstone National Park is included or excluded from the computation.

Now, one other point, Mr. Speaker, and I am done—I do not intend to elaborate this argument—and that is, in respect to the political aspect of this measure. I find on an examination of the report of the committee no information as to the population, and I am utterly unable to learn what the present population of the Territory is. There is no official data upon which to determine positively. It is only set forth as a matter of opinion based on the number of votes polled, which is a very uncertain, indefinite, and unreliable method of determining the population. I find in all of the nine Territories at the date of the last census the population of this was the smallest. It amounted in the total to 20,789 souls, and was divided as follows, namely: Males, 14,152; females, 6,637; natives, 14,939; foreign, 5,850; white, 19,437; colored, 298, and about 140 Indians. And just here I will remark in passing that this grant of land under the constitution for the university and for pub-

lic schools is to be used equally for students of both sexes, irrespective of race or color.

Now, while I do not object to offering equal facilities for people of the colored race with those granted to the white people, I do not know how it is in Wyoming, but down in my country both races would prefer having the benefits of public education in separate schools. But that is a matter of taste, and it is for the people out there to determine. Mixing promiscuously seems to please them. If they so prefer and desire mixed schools, I have no objection. And I presume, in view of the provision of the constitution conferring suffrage on women, that they have also stricken down any restriction or difference on account of race, color, previous or present condition.

In this same connection, in respect to the population, I find that the next bill to be considered for the admission of a Territory as a State is that of the next smallest, Idaho, which, according to the census of 1880, contained but 32,610 of population.

I find at the same time that the Territory of Utah contained 143,963, and New Mexico 119,565, and Arizona 40,440. To my mind it is passing strange (but we all know how much party politics creeps into these things) that a Territory with the smallest population should be presented for admission first. The policy of our friends on the other side of this Chamber evidently is to admit the Territories which are surely Republican first, and then, as to the admission of the others, which are probably Democratic, why they will just go and sit down and think about it, and see whether they will let them in or not. This is a most unfair political advantage, which gentlemen may think it is right to take, but I can not see the justice of it. Patriotism requires the true interests of the country at large to be considered rather than mere party ascendancy.

I believe in the principle of admitting Territories whenever they present themselves for admission with a proper constitution and have a sufficient population. I do not believe in keeping people in a Territorial condition after they have a sufficient population to entitle them to a Representative upon the basis of representation adopted by the Congress.

Now, our past experience does not guaranty such a basis as present in this Territory. We have no official information that they have any such number. In fact, it is not claimed by the Delegate in his able presentation of the case of his Territory that they have a sufficient population now to entitle them to a member of this House. I believe the gentleman claimed that they have only about 100,000, and 155,000 is the present basis for representation. It is quite certain that Wyoming has less than the requisite number, on which it is proposed, merely for partisan advantages, to give her one member of this House and two Senators.

The census is now being taken. If that Territory has sufficient population to give it representation in Congress, why is it any hardship to postpone action upon it for a short time only, until the census shall be taken, which will be an official ascertainment of its population? It seems to me it is not. It has occurred to me that the haste which is now being made for its admission is suspicious and perhaps fraudulent; and the same remark would apply to other Territories which are striving for statehood and are not shown by the last census to have sufficient population. Nor is it any guaranty that this Territory will have sufficient population induced and encouraged to immigrate to it from the fact of admission; such has not been the history of States admitted with a small population heretofore in all cases.

I refer to the State of Nevada, which I believe to-day has a smaller population than it had when admitted into the Union. The census shows that there are but 62,260 persons within that State. This Territory is in close proximity to Nevada. Its lands are similar to those of Nevada, and we all know are mountainous and arid plains and incapable of occupancy to any great extent. Had we not better have the satisfaction which the census now being taken would afford?

Ah! but the friends of the measure fear the revelation which that census will make. The Republicans might lose their opportunity of further packing the Senate. They are now hedging against tariff revision and other necessary and reformatory legislation which the people of this country will demand and have at an early day.

The new census would give us certain, unerring, and unmistakable proof of the sufficiency of the population of this Territory if they have it. Why, then, urge its admission to-day? Why not postpone it until next session of this Congress, if you want it admitted only on its merits? The same voting power will be here, with perhaps a slight increase over what it is now. There is no likelihood of the Committee on Elections breaking down, judging from the work they have done in the past two months.

I am in favor, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, of the admission of every Territory, when it comes with a proper constitution and a sufficient population, without regard to its political complexion. I am not in favor of that policy which on account of the politics of their voting population leaves out of the Union and refuses admission to Territories that have a sufficient population to entitle them to a Representative here. It is not only unwise, but absolutely unjust to deny admission to Territories which have sufficient population, because they are Democratic, and to make haste to admit those containing the very smallest population, because they are surely Republican.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. OATES. I yield that to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. DUNNELL. Before the gentleman takes his seat I would be glad to ask him a single question, if his time can be extended.

Mr. OATES. If you do not take up too much time, I will answer a question.

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with the argument made by the gentleman from Alabama. I do not like the suffrage clause of this constitution.

Mr. OATES. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. DUNNELL. I would not vote for it in a constitution of my own or any other State. I do not know how I shall vote to-morrow, but my inclination is to vote against the bill.

Mr. McADOO. Good.

Mr. DUNNELL. But the gentleman let drop one remark that I did not quite understand. He said in regard to suffrage that "when we became a pure democracy the days of the Republic were ended." What did the gentleman mean?

Mr. OATES. I meant to say that, if the time comes, as I fear it may, in the course of events, that universal suffrage, unlimited suffrage, shall be given to all people inhabitants of this country, our Government will break to pieces of its own weight, will become corrupt and go to pieces. I have as deep an interest in the preservation of the Government of the United States as any man and for the perpetuation of the blessings it has bestowed upon our people, and I hope for it, above everything else in political life, perpetuation in its purity as the fathers made it, for the dissemination of blessings to the people.

Mr. DUNNELL. The gentleman gave no reason why he entertained the opinion that the days of the Republic were ended when we had a pure democracy. In the universality of democracy I confess for myself I have no fears of the Republic because of universal suffrage. I have more fear of it in the line of corruption than of universal suffrage.

Mr. OATES. The two are inseparable.

Mr. DUNNELL. Not necessarily.

Mr. OATES. In my opinion they are. We have more trouble from a too extended suffrage now than from any other cause. There is complaint of corruption in elections from one end of our country to the other, and the more the suffrage is extended the more corruption will there be in our elections. I do not believe that every inhabitant of the country ought to be enfranchised and allowed to vote.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume the time of the House in discussing the propriety of the admission of Wyoming as a State on the basis of its population or on the amount of the wealth which it may be able to show by statistics which have been prepared with the greatest care by those who are interested in making the best showing possible for that Territory.

At the outset I will grant that heretofore there has not been, either by statutory provision or by precedent, any rule established which governs or fixes the number of people that must be in a Territory before it can properly apply for admission into the Union or which fixes the resources and the wealth of such a Territory beyond the presumed and implied ability of the people to bear the expense and burden of a State government. In support of this statement I publish the following table, showing the population of several of the States at the date of admission, to wit:

State.	Population when admitted.	State.	Population when admitted.
Ohio.....	45,000	Missouri.....	66,000
Indiana.....	63,000	Oregon.....	45,000
Mississippi.....	35,000	Kansas.....	100,000
Illinois.....	33,000	Nebraska.....	100,000
Alabama.....	40,000	Colorado.....	100,000

This will show in each an average population of about 60,000. The Delegate from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and others who appeared before the Committee on Territories state that they believe the population of Wyoming to be about 125,000 at this time. From other sources considered reliable, I am told that the population will not exceed 75,000, less than half the number required to elect a member of Congress under the present apportionment.

There has been a great fluctuation in the votes cast at different times. In 1888 there were cast 18,210 votes, in 1886 only 9,377, while in 1884 the returns showed 12,820. I am unable to explain these facts unless the population is constantly shifting.

In the matter of actual and assessable wealth I will quote the table and showing of the Delegate, who says:

The assessable property of the Territory increased from \$9,924,337 in 1870 to \$11,257,344 in 1880 and to \$31,500,000 in 1889, and this, too, with a reduction in the live-stock assessment of \$5,000,000 in 1889-'89. The actual wealth of the Territory is not less than four times the assessable wealth.

By way of illustration I need but call attention to the difference between the assessed and actual value of three or four kinds of property in the Territory:

	Actual value.	Assessed value.
The railroad property	\$35,000,000	\$6,163,000
Irrigation works and improvements	10,000,000	Not assessed.
Live-stock	40,000,000	9,000,000
Improved farms and ranches	15,000,000	3,000,000
Developed mines	15,000,000	Not assessed.
Churches and schools, county, city, and Territorial property	2,500,000	Do.

But to be certain let us call the actual wealth of Wyoming \$100,000,000. From this it will be seen, if the estimates are correct, how tenderly they treat the great land grant railroad corporations, whose property of \$35,000,000 is only assessed at \$6,163,000, and how exceedingly liberal they are with the millionaire mine-owners, many of whom no doubt are the rich and titled nabobs of Europe, whose mines, estimated at \$15,000,000, are not assessed at all. But, sir, this is a Republican Territory! It is to be hoped that if it shall be admitted as a State the people will inaugurate a new system and transfer some of the burdens of taxation from the backs of the farmers and laborers to railroads and mines.

I do not believe in holding rich and populous Territories in a state of tutelage or dependence. I believe firmly in the right of local self-government. I believe, as was announced by Chief-Justice Taney (in 19 Howard, 446) that all territory acquired by the United States was "acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress by absolute authority;" that "Territorial governments are organized as matters of necessity, because the people are too few in number and scant in resources to maintain a State government," "are contrary to the spirit of our American Constitution," and "are to be tolerated and continued only so long as that necessity exists."

When a Territory reaches this point it should be admitted to all the rights of statehood in the Union of States without regard to the politics or party affiliation of its people. Any other view than this is narrow, partisan, and unpatriotic. I am ready now to vote for the admission of all the remaining Territories, including Utah, provided such constitutional and legal provisions are made as will forever settle the questions arising out of Mormonism and the practice of bigamy and polygamy in conformity with the laws of the United States.

The majority comprising the Republican members of the Committee on Territories appear to be acting on a different theory. Of the four Territories, Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona, asking admission, they have taken up and are pressing Wyoming, which in point of population and resources is least worthy of them all. They have favorably reported and placed on the Calendar a bill for the admission of Idaho. Both of these are considered by them to be safely Republican. New Mexico, with far greater wealth and nearly four times the population, and Arizona, equally worthy with Wyoming and Idaho, appeal in vain for recognition. They have each a Democratic Delegate representing them on this floor. Further comment is unnecessary.

With a population of from 70,000 to 125,000; with estimated tax values of \$100,000,000; with a good showing for schools and colleges; with railroad, banking, and other business facilities, the people of Wyoming believe they are able to assume statehood, and I, for one, am unwilling to deny it to them on the ground that they vote the Republican ticket. The chief requirement is that they come with a constitution guarantying a government republican in form and one which has been framed, promulgated, and adopted in a regular manner.

Sir, the convention which framed the constitution on which it is proposed to admit this Territory was not called in accordance with any law of Congress or the Territorial Legislature and had no legal sanction whatever. As the memorial which I hold in my hand states, the boards of county commissioners of seven-tenths of the counties in the Territory of Wyoming adopted resolutions requesting the governor, chief-justice, and secretary to divide the Territory into delegate districts and call an election for delegates to a constitutional convention. Only seven out of the ten counties took this action. The governor issued his proclamation on the 3d day of June. The election was held on the second Monday of July, and the convention assembled at Cheyenne, the capital of the Territory, on the first Monday in September. The convention should have consisted of 55 delegates. Several counties were never represented at all. Many of those who attended the opening afterward absented themselves, and on the 30th of September the convention adjourned *sine die*. Only 39 of the delegates out of 55 signed and promulgated this abortive constitution.

On the 5th day of November, just thirty-five days after it was promulgated, the people were called upon to vote for the adoption of this constitution. The Territory of Wyoming is equal in area to the States of Delaware, New Jersey, Kentucky, and New York combined. In many parts the settlements are widely scattered and communication exceedingly difficult.

Several days must have elapsed after the convention adjourned before any authenticated copy of the proposed constitution could be put in circulation. In the limited time, therefore, between the submission

and the vote it was impossible for the people to obtain any correct idea of its provisions. No wonder the voters failed to materialize on the day of the election.

The whole number of votes cast on the question of ratifying the constitution was 8,195, of which 6,272 were cast in favor of the constitution and 1,923 were cast against it. At the election for Delegate in Congress, November, 1888, just one year prior to this election, there were cast in the aggregate for Delegate in Congress 18,010 votes. This was the largest vote ever cast in the Territory. In 1886 the total vote for Delegate was only 9,377; but in 1884 a larger vote was polled, namely, 12,820. The increase in the vote between 1884 and 1888 was 5,190. This increase shows about 1,297 votes each year on the average. Assuming a like gain between 1888 and 1889, there should have been 19,307 votes cast if all the voters in the Territory had voted at the time the constitution was submitted. Thus it will be seen that less than one-third of the voters of the State went to the polls November last and voted for this constitution.

There is nothing here or elsewhere to show how many of these votes were cast by women. It is said there are a large number of Mormons in Wyoming; that the women largely outnumber the men. If that be so, no doubt more women than men voted for my friend Mr. CAREY, when he was elected. [Laughter.]

Just here I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side, why they do not put into this constitution the clause disfranchising every Mormon voter who can not take an oath that he neither believes in nor practices polygamy. They have put it in the constitution of Idaho and are trying to force it into the constitution for New Mexico. Why not treat all Mormons alike? For the very evident reason that the Mormons in Wyoming are supposed to vote the Republican ticket. His politics will determine the amount of toleration which the other side will extend to the religion and practices of the Mormon. But to return to the subject.

This election was irregular. It was not called in compliance with, nor held by, authority of law. No person who voted illegally could have been prosecuted and no election officer was liable in case of making fraudulent returns. It has been reported to us that in many places the election was looked upon as a farce. I have information that in one town in Crook County 300 votes were cast for the constitution in the back room of a saloon and were put into a cigar-box by three men, and that one of them, after casting nearly 300 ballots marked "Yes," for the constitution, said, "Boys, I am d—d tired of voting for the same man all the time. I am going to vote for the other fellow," and accordingly dropped in 7 votes "No."

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAREY. I wish the gentleman would tell us what evidence he has to sustain his statements. I should think his side of the House would be the last to talk about cigar-boxes and ballot-boxes; but I desire to say that I think the election with reference to the adoption of this constitution was absolutely pure. Now, if the gentleman has any evidence to the contrary he ought to produce it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I make the assertion on a newspaper article, which, I presume, is entitled to as much credibility and conveys fully as much truth and justice as do those newspaper articles that are quoted on this floor from the partisan press from time to time concerning affairs in certain portions of this Union, especially in relation to occurrences in the section whence I come. I will read the article to which I referred. It appeared in the editorial columns of the *Sundance Gazette*, published in Crook County, Wyoming, immediately after the election:

THE "BANNER TOWN" OF CROOK COUNTY.

One of the arguments used before the Legislature in favor of Weston County is that Newcastle is the banner town of Crook County, and the three hundred-odd votes credited to Newcastle at the constitutional election are pointed to with great pride as proof of the assertion. We should think that that particular election would be given a wide berth, especially by Newcastle. There was no election there on that day, but three persons, each of whom we could name, went into a back room and conducted a cigar-box election. No one else was present, and these men marked the tickets and dropped them into the slot of the cigar-box. How 7 votes came to be cast against the constitution arose from the fact that one of the parties, after nearly all the tickets had been cast, exclaimed, "I'm d—d tired of voting for the same man all the time; I'm going to vote for the other fellow." And he accordingly dropped in 7 votes with "Yes" scratched out.

The cigar-box, the ballots, and a tally-sheet giving the result were sent here, the same canvassed at this point, and with the other, but bona-fide returns forwarded to Cheyenne, where they were duly recorded. And that is how Newcastle came to be the "banner town" of Crook County. The above particulars were related to us by one of the trio who conducted the cigar-box election, and a gentleman whose word is as good as gold. As there was no color of legality about the election in Crook County, the scheme was devised and carried out more in a spirit of levity than otherwise, and it was not thought the returns would be forwarded to Cheyenne and made a part of the record.

I consider that pretty good reading, coming from a Wyoming paper.

But to return; the Delegate from Wyoming in his statement before the committee claimed that the vote at the election next November (1890) would be at least 23,000. Assuming that to be true, knowing that 18,272 votes were cast in 1888, it seems manifestly unjust that a minority of 6,272 votes should force a constitution containing so many objectionable features on this people.

The reason assigned for the light vote is that the day preceding the

election a blinding snow-storm raged and the next day was exceedingly cold. To what vain subterfuges, alas, will men resort when in desperate straits! The Signal Service weather reports show that on the 4th and 5th of November, 1889, the day preceding and the day of the election, the mercury ranged from 1° or 2° to 25° or 30° above zero and the rain and snow fall amounted to a fraction of an inch. Such was the inclemency of the weather which kept 12,000 voters, male and female, from the polls when the very charter and guaranty of their rights, privileges, and immunities was being voted upon. Why, sir, not even the danger and rigor of a Dakota blizzard would have kept these people from the polls had they known and understood the provisions of this constitution or had they looked upon it as other than a farce and a fraud? I can not make myself believe that they ever dreamed that the schemers after statehood could induce even the reckless Republican majority in this House to breathe the breath of life into this bastard instrument.

What the Democratic minority of the Committee on Territories ask is that the bill under consideration be amended so as to send this constitution back to the people of Wyoming with certain amendments proposed and submit the constitution with these amendments to a vote of the qualified male voters of the Territory at the regular election next November. This will do no injustice to the people; it will not delay the admission beyond the assembling of Congress next December. It will give an opportunity for a full and free discussion and for intelligent action, and will enable the people of Wyoming to say whether they wish to come into the Union with the right guaranteed to women to vote and to hold office.

My chief objection to the hasty admission of Wyoming at this time and under this bill is based on my opposition to Article VI, sections 1 and 2, of the proposed constitution, which are as follows:

ARTICLE NO. VI.
SUFFRAGE.

SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges.

SEC. 2. Every citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, who has resided in the State or Territory one year and in the county wherein such residence is located sixty days next preceding any election, shall be entitled to vote at such election, except as herein otherwise provided.

These sections grant and confirm to women the right to vote at all elections and to be eligible to and to hold any office within the gift of the people of that Territory or State, as it may be. In no State in the Union to-day does woman have the unrestricted right to vote and hold office. Several States have conferred the right to hold offices up to a certain grade and to vote in certain elections. I shall not discuss the advisability of such a course further than to say that I am unalterably opposed to female suffrage in any form. It can only result in the end in unsexing and degrading the womanhood of America. It is emphatically a reform against nature.

In the case of Wyoming, I maintain that the Legislature of that Territory never had the constitutional right or authority to confer suffrage on women. The law granting it was passed by the Territorial Legislature several years ago and has never been tested in the courts, but, being in conflict with the law of Congress creating the Territory, it is, in my judgment, to-day clearly unconstitutional. The act passed by Congress creating a Territory and establishing over it a Territorial form of government is to that Territory what the constitution is to the State, and the Territorial Legislature in its enactments can not transcend the power granted by Congress in the organic act.

The act passed July 25, 1863, entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Wyoming," reads as follows:

SEC. 5. And be it further enacted, That every male citizen of the United States above the age of twenty-one years and [including] persons who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, who shall have been a resident of the said Territory at the time of the passage of this act, shall be entitled to vote at the first and all subsequent elections in the Territory, and shall be eligible to hold any office in said Territory; and the Legislative Assembly shall not at any time abridge the right of suffrage or to hold office on account of the race, color, or previous condition of servitude of any resident of the Territory: *Provided*, That the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States and those who shall have declared on oath before a competent court of record their intention to become such and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution and Government of the United States.

From this section it will be seen that Congress limited suffrage to "every male citizen," as it had a right to do.

By turning to the Statutes at Large for 1853, we find that section 5 of the act passed March 2, 1853, entitled "An act to establish the Territorial government of Washington," reads as follows:

SEC. 5. That every white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one years who shall have been a resident of said Territory at the time of the passage of this act and shall possess the qualifications hereinafter prescribed shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said Territory; but the qualifications of voters and of holding office at all subsequent elections shall be such as shall be prescribed by the Legislative Assembly: *Provided*, That the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States above the age of twenty-one years and those above that age who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act, etc.

This section is almost identical, word for word, with section 5 of the act organizing the Territory of Wyoming, except that in the latter the

word "white" male citizen was omitted, owing to the adoption in the mean time of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments.

Mr. MOREY. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would rather not be interrupted just now, as my time is limited.

Mr. MOREY. I only wished to call the gentleman's attention to a section of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Territory of Washington enacted a law similar to that of Wyoming, authorizing female suffrage. That law was finally submitted to the adjudication of the supreme court of the Territory of Washington; and the supreme judge of that Territory declared that it was contrary to the act creating the Territory and therefore unconstitutional. He held that no Territorial Legislature can go beyond the powers conferred or the grants contained in the act forming the Territory, and I think he held correctly. Therefore, female suffrage disappeared in the Territory of Washington; and in my humble judgment it has no more right to exist in the Territory of Wyoming than it had in Washington.

Now, I presume the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOREY] was going to cite section 610 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MOREY. No, sir; I desired to call the gentleman's attention to section 1860 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir; I have examined that section. In the very case to which I have referred the argument was made that section 1860 conferred upon the Territorial Legislature of Washington authority to pass an act giving women the right to vote, and the judge overruled the point. It has been expressly declared by the highest tribunal of Washington Territory that female suffrage was contrary to the organic act; and I insist that it is equally contrary to the organic act of Wyoming Territory. I will read you what the court said, all three judges assenting. I quote from Washington Territory Reports, volume 3, page 617, *Bloomer vs. Todd et al.*:

The organic act of the Territory, in this respect, furnishes a constitutional limitation beyond which the Legislature of the Territory can not rightly proceed. Congress created Territorial governments, and furnished the rule of conduct by which the government is to exist, and provided the limitations to each branch thereof. Legislation, of course, must not be in conflict with the laws of Congress, under and by which it is organized and the power to legislate is granted, and the rules enacted by Congress limit the power of the Legislature to make laws. * * * The privilege of voting is not a natural right, but a privilege conferred by law. It may be limited or enlarged by the Legislature within its own constitutional limitation of power.

Section 5, quoted above, provided, first, that at the first election held in this Territory every white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one, etc. * * * and it is manifest that but for this act of Congress the right to vote at such election would not have existed at all. It is, therefore, a privilege conferred upon the class named by that act. It is to be noted also that it is conferred expressly upon "every white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one years." Had it been the pleasure of Congress, the act might have limited it simply to male inhabitants or have extended it to persons under twenty-one years of age and not have limited it to males.

The same section provides further that the qualification of voters and of officeholders at all subsequent elections shall be such as shall be prescribed by the Legislative Assembly, "Provided, That the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States above the age of twenty-one years and those above that age who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act." These latter provisions in the act of Congress might have been omitted entirely and the privilege of voting remain vested in the white male inhabitant, without reference to citizenship or other qualification whatever, the words "white male inhabitant" being words of limitation as well as words granting the privilege of suffrage and of holding office.

I think this decision is a full answer to the gentleman. I grant that if Wyoming was a State she could in her constitution extend suffrage to all of her citizens without regard to sex. All the States have that right. A case involving this point has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is found in 21 Wallace, page 162, *Minor vs. Happersett*. Chief-Justice Waite rendered the decision. He held that it was competent for the State of Missouri in its constitution to restrict suffrage to "male citizens;" that women were citizens of the United States to sue and be sued, to hold property, etc., but that suffrage did not belong to them as a right. The possession of that privilege in one State did not confer it on women in those States where the constitution of the State denied it or was silent on the subject. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution by the original thirteen States female suffrage existed in only one of them, and that was New Jersey.

Female suffrage has been much lauded of late as the only means left to purify the ballot and to elevate politics. No man has a higher regard or a greater respect for woman in her proper and natural sphere than I have; but, sir, I maintain that, when she assumes to exercise the elective franchise, throws herself into the whirlpool of politics, takes part in ward meetings and partisan conventions, is pulled and hauled about the polls by "heelers" and "bummers," and becomes a campaign orator, instead of refining and elevating politics, she will be dragged from her high estate and sink to the general level of what some choose to call political infamy.

Mr. STRUBLE. I suppose the infamy is with the male sex.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Not entirely; else why did New Jersey give up female suffrage? I will read you the act passed November 16, 1807, by her Legislature. The preamble of that act recites:

Whereas doubts have been raised and great diversities in practice obtained throughout the State in regard to the admission of aliens, females, and persons

of color, or negroes, to vote in elections, as also in regard to the mode of ascertaining the qualifications of voters in respect to estate; and

Whereas it is highly necessary to the safety, quiet, good order, and dignity of the State to clear up the said doubts by an act of the representatives of the people, declaratory to the true sense and meaning of the constitution, and to insure its just execution in these particulars according to the intent of the framers thereof: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the council and General Assembly of this State, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That from and after the passage of this act no person shall vote in any State or county election for officers in the Government of the United States or of this State unless such person be a free, white, male citizen of this State, of the age of twenty-one years, worth £50 proclamation money, clear estate, and have resided in the county where he claims a vote for at least twelve months immediately preceding the election.

New Jersey abolished female suffrage, as the preamble states, for the "safety, quiet, good order, and dignity of the State." I find it stated in the old histories of that time that the women of New Jersey on election day, by changing their dress and bonnet, could and did vote in every ward of a town. I have no doubt it is so in Wyoming to-day, and that they do vote in as many precincts out there as they can reach on horseback or on foot after changing their frocks and bustles. [Laughter.]

If Wyoming should be admitted with Article VI, sections 1 and 2, of this proposed constitution in force, it is not impossible or improbable that in the future some woman will sit in the chair now occupied by the Delegate; she will come with frills and flounces, with bonnet and bustle. [Laughter.] And when she rises and addresses the Chair, how will the Speaker recognize her? Sir, will it be the gentleman from Wyoming or the lady from Wyoming? [Renewed laughter.] Will the rules have to be amended again so as to furnish the proper term of recognition, or will you, Mr. Speaker, recognize her under general parliamentary law? [Laughter.]

It is not beyond the pale of possibility that a woman may be sent to represent this new State in the other branch of Congress. In that event, Mr. Speaker, will it be "Mrs. Senator So-and-So," or "Senator Miss Jones?" How will the presiding officer of the Senate address her ladyship? I say and repeat that it is a dangerous innovation.

I know my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] a few moments ago asked my friend from Alabama [Mr. OATES] whether the Constitution of the United States would not prevent this. The Constitution of the United States says, Article I, section 2:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

The Supreme Court has declared a woman to be a citizen, a person, an inhabitant, with such rights and privileges as each State by constitution or statute may confer. I confess to the presumption that she would be eligible to a seat here or in the Senate.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman allow a question here?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Do you not think to put a good woman into the Senate might help it some? [Laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, if the gentleman himself were in the Senate I would immediately admit his proposition. [Laughter.] It might be a good thing to supply his place on this floor even with some first-class lady from Ohio.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. And so of yourself.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Oh, Tennessee has not yet adopted any of these "new-fangled" ideas. She has no disposition to take any such new departure or follow any of these progressive follies. Not that we are lacking in respect for true and exalted womanhood in my State. We hold, Mr. Speaker, that the home and not the forum is the place God intended woman to fill. With her gentle voice and her tender hand she smoothes the troubled brow and lulls to rest the weary limbs of him who labors for her comfort. Her refining influence, her watchful care at the fireside, molds the mind and forms the character of her sons and of her daughters.

In the home she controls the man of to-day; she rears the pride and dependence of the State in the future; she directs the energy and shapes the legislation of the country with a thousand-fold more potency than she could exercise by the ballot or in the Senate. Brought into rude contact with the coarse world she is either roughened or crushed. As mother and wife in her own realm her hand wields more power than any monarch. Let us not for any party or political purpose drag her from that lofty pinnacle, higher than that which she occupies anywhere in the civilized world, on which American chivalry has enthroned her. [Applause.]

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized for the purpose of allotting the time belonging to this side of the House, I would assign ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the best argument the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] has been able to produce against the suffrage feature of the Wyoming constitution is his apprehension of danger that some lady might occupy a seat on this floor dressed in a particular fashion. It seems to me that a case must be devoid of argument when this point is the only reason assigned against such a proposition. The gentleman who wrote the report of the minority of the committee also makes this suffrage provision about the only argument against the constitution of Wyoming.

Now, I would call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee and other gentlemen on this floor to the Constitution of the United States, section 1, Article XIV, which defines the word "citizen:"

All persons born or naturalized in the United States—

Mark the words, "all persons"—

and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The next clause of the same section of the Constitution says:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This amendment may not possibly be recognized by all of our friends on the other side, as it is one of the modern innovations.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. They are modern amendments, I admit, and I recognize the force of the gentleman's suggestion. They do not seem to weigh so heavily on the consciences of some members as the old provisions of the Constitution. But I will say further they substantially follow the old provisions of the Constitution and were adopted to cure false judicial interpretations.

The instrument as it came from the fathers provides—

That citizens of each of the States shall be entitled to all of the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States.

And, according to that very provision, at the time the Constitution was adopted a woman of New Jersey could under it have voted in every State in this Union, for women were allowed to vote in New Jersey at the time of its adoption. I know that this argument has been sought to be avoided by some men, but I have always thought it was a legitimate deduction from that provision of the Constitution.

Mr. OATES. But some of these men who thought otherwise are on the Supreme Bench of the United States.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I know that.

Now, I desire to call attention to the argument of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES]. He alluded to the views of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in regard to suffrage. I wish to call attention to the views of Thomas Jefferson on the question of suffrage, and I think they ought to have weight with the gentleman. He says we ought to guaranty a republican constitution to this State, in the sense in which the men who framed the Constitution understood republicanism. Jefferson says, in his letter to John Taylor, May 28, 1816, defining republicanism:

Witness the self-styled republicanism of Holland, Switzerland, Genoa, Venice, and Poland. Were I to assign to this term a precise and definite idea I would say purely and simply it means a government by its citizens in mass, acting directly and personally according to rules established by the majority; and that every other government is more or less republican in proportion as it has in its composition more or less of this ingredient of the direct action of the citizens.

The further the departure from the direct and constant control by the citizens the less has the government of the ingredient of republicanism.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] indulges in gloomy apprehensions if suffrage should become universal. I do not share that apprehension. I believe with Macaulay that the remedy for darkness is light, and I call the gentleman's attention and that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] again to the views of Mr. Jefferson. I hope that statesman has still some influence with his professed disciples. Said he in the same letter:

If, then, the control of the people over the organs of their government be the measure of its republicanism, and I confess I know no other measure, it must be agreed that our governments have much less of republicanism than ought to have been expected; in other words, that the people have less regular control over their agents than their rights and their interests require, and this I ascribe, not to any want of republican dispositions in those who form these constitutions, but to a submission of true principle to European authorities, to speculators on government whose fears of the people have been inspired by the populace of their own great cities and were unjustly entertained against the independent, the happy, and therefore orderly citizens of the United States.

Further on, defining the term "republican," he says:

On this view of the import of the term "republic" instead of saying, as has been said, that it may mean anything or nothing, we may say with truth and meaning that governments are more or less republican as they have more or less of the elements of popular election and control in their composition; and, believing, as I do, that the mass of the citizens is the safest depository of their own rights, and especially that the evils flowing from the duperies of the people are less injurious than those from the egoism of their agents, I am a friend of that composition of government that has most of these ingredients.

The gentleman from Alabama evidently has less faith in popular government than the great apostle of Democracy who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

That is the view of Mr. Jefferson. That is his enunciation of republicanism, and in that he simply followed out the idea which he laid down in the Declaration of Independence which has become world wide, "that governments are founded on the consent of the governed."

In regard to this question of suffrage in the Territories. It is not a question involved in this case. The question here is whether, the people in any particular locality having adopted a certain form of government and embraced in it a certain rule in reference to suffrage, we are to leave it to them to say who shall be voters in that community. It is the very essence of the principle of local self-government of which gentle-

men on the other side have claimed to be such strong friends; and it is republicanism in its very spirit.

Its denial would be a denial of the right of local self-government. One gentleman has said that States should not be allowed to come into the Union until they have a certain number of population, enough population to entitle them to one Representative in Congress. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this theory of Mr. Douglas was never enunciated until he laid it down as a means of retaining the sympathy of the Democratic party of the South. He did not want to break with them entirely; and then he said, for the first time, that it was desirable not to let the State of Kansas come into the Union until she had population enough for one Representative.

But he voted for the admission of Iowa with less than the requisite number; and he never enunciated that doctrine up to the Senatorial campaign of 1858, but he failed to retain the sympathy of the South, notwithstanding this.

The question to be determined in this case is whether the community about to be admitted is one that is likely to maintain in perpetuity a suitable constitutional government, and secure to the people therein the various liberties and rights pertaining to American citizens. Jefferson said this should not be denied in the Northwest Territories to over 60,000 people, and there is more than twice that number in Wyoming. There is no man on that side of the House who has produced any argument to show any defect in Wyoming in this regard. There is not a member of the committee who denies that the Territory of Wyoming has everything that is essential to self-government or who says that it has not organized a system that will secure to the people a permanent system of good government that will protect and preserve the rights of citizens, and unless that can be shown I do not care what may be the number of votes in the Territory.

It ought to be admitted into the Union of States if they have territory sufficient ultimately to make one of the great States of the Union; and on the question of whether Wyoming has that population and those elements of power and prosperity and progress there has not been one single argument presented that would raise a doubt in any one's mind.

Who shall prescribe who shall be voters in Wyoming if not the citizens themselves, and that they have admitted the women to vote is to me a guaranty that a very greatly needed element to secure purity, humanity, and justice in government as well as true republicanism has been introduced and secured in the fundamental law.

Mr. BAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. The question that has been under discussion this afternoon seems to involve questions that have not been under discussion in this House before recently; at any rate, I so apprehend from the remarks that have been made. I am glad that it is under discussion, because the discussion of this question I have reference to in regard to the question of suffrage will perhaps enlighten some gentleman upon the floor of this House as to the progress that has been made in that direction in different parts of this country.

From the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] who recently occupied the floor on that side of the House, he seems overawed with astonishment and wonder and even horror at the idea that some day—no far-distant day, perhaps—a lady or two or three might occupy seats upon this floor as members of this House, having the same rights as other members. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see ladies almost every day in this House. Ladies are in the galleries. And I sometimes notice that gentlemen on the other side cast sly glances in that direction; and while I do not see any of them with poke bonnets on—that bonnet that seems so much to disturb the gentleman from Tennessee—I have observed gentlemen from both sides of this House on several occasions "poking" out of the side door, soon to appear smiling in the gallery, seated between two ladies.

I wish to assure my Democratic friends that ladies are no more dangerous on the floor of this House than they are in the galleries; and as my friend from Tennessee is quite young yet he no doubt will live long enough to see ladies occupying seats on this floor, and having votes, and representing districts and constituencies, perhaps even from Tennessee, and doing it with credit to themselves and their constituents.

Again, Mr. Speaker, he seems to have worried himself somewhat in reference to whether a great number of ladies voted for the gentleman from Wyoming or not. He seemed to talk as though that was one of the questions involved in the admission of that Territory: whether many ladies voted for the gentleman from Wyoming. I have not troubled my mind about that. I have no doubt about that; in my judgment it did not make any difference whether they did or not. If the ladies of Wyoming voted for the gentleman representing Wyoming I admire their judgment in the selection of their man. They certainly made no mistake. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MCOMAS. Would not the ladies if they were here vote, and not refuse to vote so as to break a quorum?

Mr. KELLEY. I would not wonder.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in illustrating the evil results that may follow from the admission of women on this floor as members he seems to

have lost sight entirely of the fact that the greatest nation on the face of the earth, save and except the United States of America, is presided over by a woman, and has been for the last twenty-five or thirty years.

Mr. MCOMAS and other MEMBERS. For fifty years.
Mr. KELLEY. For fifty years, I am reminded. And again, Mr. Speaker, in the State of Kansas this is no new question, and I am free to say that I have been astounded at some of the remarks made here to-day in reference to this matter. Now, women are occupying to-day and have for years occupied public offices and have been eligible to office in that State. Many of them are county officers to-day—the county court clerks, registers of deeds, county superintendents of public instruction—and have been for years; and they make the best officers we have.

Mr. PICKLER. Has it unsexed them?

Mr. KELLEY. No, sir.

They are councilmen, mayors, police judges, and they vote for all these officers. It does not hurt their looks; if such a thing were possible, I think it makes them better looking. They attend strictly to business, and when one of the constituents of the gentleman from Missouri came over the line with his bottle of Kansas City whisky and got only a little intoxicated in the city of Cottonwood Falls, and was arraigned before the police judge, who is a lady, and fined \$15, and she threw in a fifteen-minute lecture, the gentleman immediately swore off on drinking and the court threw off the fine. This is supposed to be one of the reasons why the gentleman [Mr. TARNSEY] from that district thinks prohibition in Kansas is a failure.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the information of those gentlemen that the assistant attorney-general of the State of Kansas to-day is a woman, and she has entire control of the legal department of the State of Kansas, because the attorney-general of the State of Kansas, who, if present, would have that control, is absent from the State, and has been for some time; and in his absence the assistant attorney-general takes charge. Nobody ever complained that she, as a lawyer, did not conduct the legal part of that State properly.

In fact it is universally understood that the assistant attorney-general of the State of Kansas is a much better lawyer than the attorney-general himself. [Laughter.] And I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if this proposition should become more popular and should extend from some of those progressive States of the West and Northwest even as far as the State of Tennessee, and if it should become necessary for the women of that State to vote in making a selection of Representatives in Congress, they would be just as wise in their selection as were the women in Wyoming, and I have no doubt that the State of Tennessee would be represented upon this floor by gentlemen or ladies just as fit to represent it as the State of Wyoming will be when she is represented here by our worthy friend, Judge CAREY.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that just opposite me are three or four good-looking gentlemen from Georgia, and if the State of Georgia should ever determine to send two or three good-looking women here to occupy those seats, sitting as I do right opposite to them, I would not be at all frightened. [Laughter.] I would be perfectly willing to stand it, and I have no doubt the Speaker could stand it, and I have no doubt the gentlemen themselves could stand it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The question is whether the ladies could stand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Well, there is no law in Georgia, I hope, which would compel people, men or women, to come to Congress unless they desired to. We do not have any such laws in Kansas, at any rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another objection raised on the other side—I believe it was raised by our friend from Alabama [Mr. OATES], but, if not by him, it was raised by some other gentleman on that side—is that this is a party question, and that it seems to be the determination of the Representatives on this side of the House to force this issue and to admit just as many States as possible because we have the power and because it is a Republican Territory. If that be the case, I want to ask the gentleman how he can reconcile it with the statement and the fact, for it is a fact, that the Democratic central committee of Wyoming send a petition here asking unanimously for the admission of the State.

Mr. MANSUR. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him I think I can answer the question when I say that by a strict party vote in the Committee on Territories you picked out the two Republican Territories and refused to take up the Democratic Territories, which have decidedly larger populations.

Mr. KELLEY. Well, I am not posted with regard to that. I do not belong to that committee, and I presume the gentleman's statement is correct; but, even if it is correct, I do not see that there is any harm to result to any of them, because we shall soon get to the admission of those Territories also.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAKER. I yield the floor to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOREY].

Mr. BOUTELLE. Before the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANSUR] takes his seat I would like, with the permission of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOREY], to have him answer whether his objection is to admitting Wyoming before the other Territories or to admitting them at all because it is proposed to take Wyoming first.

Mr. MANSUR. We proposed in committee solidly to tack the four together, and, failing in that, we proposed to tack all four in a resolution and ask the House to take them all up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. All or none?

Mr. MANSUR. No, sir; we recommended taking all four.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then why do you not take Wyoming now?

Mr. MANSUR. We are taking it now. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRUBLE. And we propose that my friend shall take more of it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOREY] has the floor.

Mr. MOREY. Mr. Speaker, I will begin my remarks by answering the suggestion that has been made by my colleague on the Committee on Territories [Mr. MANSUR], that the majority of that committee singled out for admission the two Territories with the least population, postponing the Territories which had the larger populations. It is just that the committee should be set right in this matter. The various bills which were introduced into this House and referred to the Committee on Territories providing for the admission of these Territories as States or providing for the passage of enabling acts authorizing their admission were taken up in the order in which they were presented by the gentlemen who had introduced them into this House and had requested hearings upon them, and your Committee on Territories from day to day, from an early period in this session, patiently and considerately heard every man and every delegation who sought to be heard in advocacy of those measures or any of them.

These bills have been reported to this House in that orderly way, after the fullest and most careful consideration. The gentlemen representing the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, to which my colleague [Mr. MANSUR] has referred, were heard immediately upon their application to be heard. Every argument that they saw fit to advance has been patiently and diligently considered by the committee, and those bills are under consideration to-day and are pending upon hearings of parties who are interested in the admission of those Territories as States into the Union. I take it, sir, that the charge which has been made against the committee that it has, for partisan purposes, singled out the Territories having the smaller population, is not well founded in the history of that committee in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Wyoming, when admitted, will constitute the forty-third State in the American Union. The organization and the establishment of governments invested with power over the persons, the liberties, and the properties of the people are matters of the highest interest to the human race. The establishment of our National Government and the admission of new States to participation in the privileges and the duties of the National Government from one of the most instructive and interesting pages in the annals of human achievement and progress. The problem of constitutional government based on the free will of the governed was not solved by the struggle which secured our independence of the British crown. It was not until the adoption and ratification by the States of the Federal Constitution, that great American charter of human liberty, that republican government was firmly established.

The character of this great charter is declared in the words of its preamble, glowing with patriotism and philanthropy:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This Constitution became the supreme compact of Government of the people for themselves and for their posterity forever, subject to amendment by themselves alone, in the solemn manner provided in the Constitution itself.

ARTICLE VI.

2. This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The admission of new States is a power conferred on Congress by the Constitution, subject, however, to certain limitations preservative of the rights of the people of the existing States.

ARTICLE IV.

SEC. 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Constitution imposes on the National Government, among other things, the duty of guarantying to each State a republican form of government.

ARTICLE IV.

SEC. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the Legislature, or of the executive (when the Legislature can not be convened) against domestic violence.

In this way twenty-seven Territorial governments have been erected in the territory acquired by the United States by treaty and by purchase. The Indian Territory, although organized in 1834, has never had

Territorial government. In this Territory the Indian tribes or nations have furnished their own governments through their tribal councils and legislatures. As these Territories grew in population and wealth and complied with the provisions of the Constitution they have been admitted to statehood, until now there are but six of these inferior governments within the limits of the Republic: New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Idaho, Wyoming, and Alaska.

The people of Wyoming are knocking at our doors and asking to enjoy the privileges and assume the duties of a great State in the American Union. Has Wyoming population sufficient to organize a State government and furnish the protection of law to her people, their liberties, and their property, and does she come with a constitution republican in form? The Delegate from that Territory estimates the population to be 110,000; the minority report in this case puts it at 72,000. Taking a medium, say 90,000, the population of Wyoming is far above the average of the population of the other States when admitted into the Union. It is not claimed that the limits of the new State interfere in any way with the Territorial limits of any other State. She has wealth, public buildings, schools, churches, railroads, banks, cities, towns, all that is necessary to sustain and prosper the people of a great State. Her people are industrious, intelligent, patriotic, devoted to the Government, and no one has ever claimed that her constitution does not establish a "republican form of government."

The minority members of the Committee on Territories have filed an elaborate report against the admission of Wyoming as a State into the Union. They present two objections to the admission of this Territory—one that the constitution was not legally adopted, so lacking in foundation that it is abandoned by the ablest debaters on the other side—but I shall discuss only one, that which is made the burden of the minority report. They object because the constitution of Wyoming prohibits the denial or abridgment of the right of suffrage on account of sex and requires that ability to read the constitution shall be a qualification for voting. The question is not on the justice or expediency of woman suffrage; the question is, shall the people of Wyoming be permitted to settle that matter for themselves and in their own way? The views of members on the suffrage are not necessarily involved in this case.

Wyoming was made a Territory by act of Congress approved July 25, 1868. On December 10, 1869, the Territorial Legislature conferred the right to vote on the women of the Territory who were otherwise qualified by age and citizenship to vote. This extension of the suffrage was done by a Legislature elected by male voters only.

The same provision of law was re-enacted in 1879 and again in 1886, and has continued until this day; so that for a period of nearly twenty years there has been perfect political and civil equality of men and women in Wyoming.

It is claimed by gentlemen on the other side that this is in violation of the original Territorial act, which restricted the suffrage to male citizens. The gentlemen seem to have overlooked the provisions of the general law subsequently enacted which authorized the Territorial Legislatures to fix the qualifications of their voters.

Section 1860, Revised Statutes of the United States, reads:

At all subsequent elections, however, in any Territory heretofore organized by Congress, as well as at all elections in Territories already organized, the qualifications of voters and of holding office shall be such as may be prescribed by the Legislative Assembly of each Territory.

But it is claimed that this proposition has been settled against the Territory by the Territorial courts of Washington Territory.

We are aware that there was such a case decided adversely to the power of the Territory to remove all discriminations on account of sex in the election laws. But, sir, within the past thirty days the Supreme Court of the United States in the Idaho test-oath case have decided the question in favor of the legality of the Territorial law, maintaining the equality of the sexes in their civil and political rights. I refer to the case of *Davis vs. Beason*. The proposition is stated in these words:

That at all elections in any Territory subsequently organized by Congress, as well as at all elections in Territories already organized, the qualifications of voters and for holding office shall be such as may be prescribed by the Legislative Assembly of each Territory, subject, nevertheless, to the following restrictions:

First. That the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States above the age of twenty-one or persons above that age who have declared their intention to become such citizens;

Second. That the elective franchise or the right of holding office shall not be denied to any citizen on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude;

Third. That no soldier or sailor or other person in the Army or Navy, or attached to troops in the service of the United States, shall be allowed to vote unless he has made his permanent domicile in the Territory for six months; and

Fourth. That no person belonging to the Army or Navy shall be elected to hold a civil office or appointment in the Territory.

These limitations are the only ones placed upon the authority of Territorial Legislatures against granting the right of suffrage or of holding office.

The opinion was delivered by Mr. Justice Field, and there was no dissenting opinion.

That woman is a citizen, both of the nation and the State where she resides, and eligible to be a voter, is a proposition too plain to admit of serious denial.

She is a part of the body politic, a part of "the whole body of peo-

ple" who constitute the nation and the several States. When the framers of the Constitution began the preamble to that great instrument by the words "We the people of the United States," they meant all the people, without regard to sex.

In the case of *Minor vs. Happersett*, 21 Wallace U. S., page 162, we find the following syllabus:

The word "citizen" is often used to convey the idea of membership in a nation. In that sense, women, if born of citizen parents within the jurisdiction of the United States, have always been considered citizens of the United States.

Discussing the question fully and with great clearness, the court say:

Whoever, then, was one of the people of either of these States when the Constitution of the United States was adopted became *ipso facto* a citizen, a member of the nation created by its adoption. He was one of the persons associating together to form the nation, and was, consequently, one of its original citizens. As to this there has never been a doubt. Disputes have arisen as to whether or not certain persons or certain classes of persons were part of the people at the time, but never as to their citizenship if they were.

Other proof of like character might be found, but certainly more can not be necessary to establish the fact that sex has never been made one of the elements of citizenship in the United States. In this respect men have never had an advantage over women. The same laws precisely apply to both.

This political truth, as to women, is restated in the fourteenth amendment, which reads as follows:

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The enfranchisement of women, then, by the Wyoming Legislature rested upon unquestioned authority on the part of the Legislature to extend the right and upon the unquestioned legal capacity of woman to exercise the same.

After twenty years' experience with woman suffrage the people of that Territory have deliberately formed a constitution to be the supreme organic law of the new State and have placed in that constitution a solemn inhibition of the denial or abridgment of that right on account of sex.

The Territorial Legislature have asked by resolution for the admission of their State under the constitution. The political organizations of the State, without regard to party, make the same prayer. No protest against it has been heard, no remonstrance, no petition against it has been presented to your committee nor to this body.

No one dares to claim that it has not been beneficial to Wyoming and to her people. I quote the following words from a distinguished citizen of the Territory:

It has been stated that the best women in the Territory do not avail themselves of the privilege of the elective franchise. This statement is maliciously false. The women of Wyoming vote with as much universality as men, and no State or Territory can boast nobler and purer women. The foolish claim has also been made that the influence of the ballot upon women is bad. This is not true. It is impossible that a woman's character can be contaminated in associating with men for a few moments in going to the polls any more than it would be in going to the church or to places of amusement. On the other hand women are benefited and improved by the ballot. Most women in Wyoming accumulate more or less property, and under our laws manage their property, though married, as if single. The management of the control and conduct of business necessarily gives them new ideas and brings a knowledge of affairs that none of us get but by experience. This makes them more intelligent, gives them enlarged ideas of life and its duties, instills higher aims and makes them better wives and mothers. The fact is, Wyoming has the noblest and best women in the world, because they have more privileges and know better how to use them.

To conclude this very long letter I will say, woman suffrage is a settled fact in Wyoming and will endure as long as the State. It has accomplished much good. It has harmed no one. We are therefore all in favor of it, and none can be found to raise a voice against it.

The provisions of the Wyoming constitution on this question are found in Article VI, and are as follows:

SEC. 1. The rights of the citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges.

SEC. 2. Every citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, who has resided in the State or Territory one year and in the county wherein such residence is located sixty days next preceding any election, shall be entitled to vote at such election except as herein otherwise provided.

Section 9 of the same article provides:

SEC. 9. No person shall have the right to vote who shall not be able to read the constitution of this State. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person prevented by physical disability from complying with its requirements.

Shall these provisions stand as the work of the people of Wyoming? The members of the minority say no. In their report they demand that another convention shall be held by the people of Wyoming Territory; and the reason they give for this demand is that "all" may participate in the election of delegates and also in the ratification of the constitution which may be submitted. They recommend that sections 1 and 2 of the bill, erecting a State and fixing its boundaries, be stricken out, and that in lieu thereof a provision be inserted in the nature of an enabling act. As showing the idea of the minority as to the participation of "all" in this election of delegates and the ratification of the constitution which they may propose, I cite the following from the proposed amendment:

SEC. 2. That all male persons who shall have resided within the limits of said proposed State for sixty days, and are otherwise qualified by the laws of said Territory to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly thereof, are

hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory.

Our friends of the minority claim that a new convention should be held in order that "all" who are to be affected by its provisions may have an opportunity to vote for delegates to the convention which is to form a constitution, and that "all" may have an opportunity to vote upon the ratification of that constitution when it has been formed. Yet they provide that in the election for those delegates "male" citizens only shall be entitled to vote. While claiming in this report that they are in favor of "all" being heard upon the ratification of the constitution, they yet provide that only "male" citizens of the Territory shall be permitted to vote upon the ratification or rejection of that constitution.

Here we have the Democratic idea of fair play expressed in legislation. That idea is to disfranchise half the qualified voters of a great Territory who have by their suffrages for twenty years, as well as by their fortitude, their virtue, and their sacrifices in frontier life, helped to build up the institutions and the wealth of this new State. They propose to submit to one-half the voting population of the Territory the power to fix for all time the supreme law of the new State for all her people.

We are asked by the Democratic minority of this committee to undo what "all" the people of the Territory of Wyoming have done; we are asked to set aside the solemn constitution which has been formed by delegates chosen by "all" the voters of that Territory, voters who have been legal electors there for more than twenty years; we are asked to undo that work and send back, not to the people of Wyoming Territory, not to the legal voters of that Territory, but to "one-half" of the legal voters, the question of the framing of a constitution for "all" the people in that Territory. We are asked to take away from half the legal voters there the power to speak for themselves in forming the supreme law of that State for all time to come; and we are told by the minority of this committee that they ask this in the interest of submitting this to "all" the people!

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. The minority propose that—

All male persons resident in said proposed State, who are qualified voters of said Territory as herein provided, shall be entitled to vote upon the election of delegates, and upon the ratification or rejection of the constitution, under such rules and regulations as said convention may prescribe, not in conflict with this act, but no educational qualification shall be required of voters at either of said elections.

This minority, this Democratic wing of the Committee on Territories, proposes not only to disfranchise the intelligent women of Wyoming Territory, but to enfranchise those who can not even read the constitution that they are to vote to establish and confirm as the supreme law for these disfranchised women.

The constitution presented to this House was formed by the legal voters of that Territory, without regard to sex. Its provisions guaranty this sacred right against all encroachment for all time to come. More than that, it is provided that no man and no woman hereafter in the State of Wyoming shall be entitled to vote at any election who is not able to read the constitution of the State. There is a proviso, however, that excepts from this requirement those who from any physical defect are unable to read. This clause, Mr. Speaker, encounters the objection of the minority of this committee. They ask this Congress to undo this work that has been done by the intelligence and the virtue of the people of that Territory, and to send back to the male citizens, to the ignorant and the vicious, the power to establish the fundamental law of that State for generations to come.

Not only this, Mr. Speaker; the Democratic minority not only proposed to disfranchise one-half of the present voters of Wyoming, but they propose to break down the barriers which have been erected for the protection in all future years of the exercise of this sacred right. They propose that the constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, except as to Indians not taxed, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Under the proposition of this minority report, all male voters in Wyoming when it becomes a State, whatever their race or their color, are protected by the constitution against invasion of their political or civil rights. Not so with woman. Because she is a woman this minority propose to abandon both her political and her civil rights to the caprice or whim or prejudice of others over whom she can exercise no political influence and to withdraw from her all protection in the rights guaranteed to other citizens of the State.

But the members of this minority do not propose to relieve women from the obligations which they owe as citizens to their State and to the General Government. They provide:

The people inhabiting such proposed State—

That is, all the people, men and women alike—

do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof, etc.

The women of that Territory, without having any voice in the framing of this constitution, are made to make this sacred covenant with the Government of the United States.

Not only this; this minority report proposes that if this House should reject this proposition to send back to the people of Wyoming the form-

ing of this constitution, there shall be added to section 1 of this bill a provision that there shall be an election in the Territory of Wyoming on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1890, for a Representative in Congress to the Fifty-second Congress, and for State, judicial, and legislative officers. They also propose that—

At said election every male citizen of the United States, who is otherwise qualified under the laws of the Territory of Wyoming to vote, may vote for such officers and on the constitution and separate propositions submitted, and no others, and said election shall be conducted and returns made and canvassed in the manner provided in the laws of said Territory for the election of the Delegate to Congress.

It is not provided that the citizens of the Territory "shall" vote, but simply that every male elector "may" vote at this election. It is further provided that—

At said election each qualified elector may have written or printed upon his ballot the words "For the constitution" or "Against the constitution," and also the words "For female suffrage" or "Against female suffrage;" also the words "For eligibility of women to hold offices and sit on juries" or the words "Against the eligibility of women to hold offices and sit on juries."

But there is no requirement that any such vote shall ever be had. This minority simply propose as a trick that the male electors at this election "may" vote upon these propositions, and then go on and provide—

If at said election the majority of the legal votes cast shall be "for the constitution," the governor shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with the votes cast thereon, and upon separate articles or propositions, and a copy of said constitution, articles, and propositions.

Mr. Speaker, here is a transparent and palpable trick for the purpose of defeating the steps that have been taken by the people of that Territory to become a State of this Union. They provide that at this election the electors "may" vote upon the question of the constitution and upon these special questions of suffrage and the right to hold office and they then provide that if a majority of all the legal votes cast shall be in favor of the constitution the result shall be certified to the President of the United States and the Territory be admitted as a State. The manifest purpose of this absence of a requirement that a vote shall be had on these propositions and on the constitution was that there might be a default in that election. And in case of such default the constitution would be defeated and woman suffrage with it.

Mr. Speaker, there is still another wonderful proposition made by this minority. In case the two propositions to which I have adverted are rejected by this House, they propose to add to section 1 of the bill a provision that the State of Wyoming shall not be admitted into the Union until the proposed constitution shall be amended by limiting the suffrage to the male voters of that Territory. And they provide that the male citizens of the United States alone, of voting age, in that Territory shall vote in any of the elections provided in this proposition:

At said elections electors who may be qualified to vote under article 7 of said constitution as amended by this act shall be permitted to vote, and no other.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, here is the most remarkable proposition of this most remarkable report:

And if a majority of the legal votes cast on the question shall be for the amended constitution then the governor of the Territory shall certify the result to the President of the United States.

But what if the majority of the legal votes are not in favor of the amended constitution? Why, sir, here is a proposition in this minority report to submit this question to the male voters of that Territory, and if by a majority of their votes they vote to strike out woman suffrage from the constitution then it is to be reported to the President of the United States, and the State is to be admitted. But if a majority, even of men, do not vote to strike out woman suffrage, then it is not to be reported to the President of the United States, and Wyoming still stays out.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the proposition made by the minority of this committee, who bring it forward in the interest of full and fair consideration by the people of Wyoming Territory. This is in order, as they say, that this question may be submitted to the people of the Territory of Wyoming.

Then they flatter themselves with the idea they have done a generous thing by this people. They say:

It will be seen these proposed amendments will provide for an election for delegates to the constitutional convention, for the holding of a State convention, and for the submission of the constitution when framed to a vote of the people.

That is not true; the proposition is not to submit this new constitution to a vote of the people, but it is to submit it to a vote of half of the people.

Again they say:

If, after full discussion, the people of the proposed State are determined to retain the provision in reference to female suffrage and the eligibility of females to hold office, it will be for them to determine that proposition.

But it is an unfair statement. There is no proposed submission, after full discussion, to the people, as is stated by the minority in this report. It is unfair. It is disingenuous. It is not honest; that is, the report is not.

Not only this; they disclaim in the report any discussion of the merits of the proposition of female suffrage, and yet they adopt as their own language the words of Professor Goldwin Smith, that English-American, in an article entitled "Woman's place in the state." The minority use these words: "His article is hereto appended and made a

part of the views which the undersigned desire to submit." They adopt all he says and make it a part of their report.

It is peculiarly like in character to the arguments made on the other side to-day in opposition to the provisions of this constitution in relation to female suffrage.

Our friends on the other side seem to get into a panic when anything is said about the extension or enlargement of the right of suffrage.

Our friends on the other side seem to think if this constitution of Wyoming is to stand as the supreme law of that State that at once the offices of Senators and Representatives from that State will be filled by women, and the great revolution will spread over the land and we will have a Congress here, using the language of debate on the other side, which is not composed of gentlemen. And one distinguished member, my friend from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON], seems to be stamped by the idea that some Representative from the State of Wyoming may take a seat beside him clothed in a poke bonnet and bustle. [Laughter.] That is the kind of argument advanced here on this floor in support of the propositions of the Democratic minority of this committee.

And the minority of the committee take up the same train of thought, which culminates in this grand suggestion:

Some—

Speaking of those who fear and deprecate this agitation of the question of suffrage—

Some are sanguine enough to think that America will have rest when a black woman has been elected President of the United States.

That is the sentiment of the minority of this committee. I can imagine the fine frenzy of my distinguished friend from Illinois, the author of this report, when he contemplates the idea that he may some day see sitting in the Presidential chair of the nation a woman with a black skin. And then our friends on the other side say:

The abolition of subordination in the family, of the authority of its head, and of everything that tends to merge the civil personality of the wife in that of the husband, is the prime object at least of the extreme wing of the party, which would be achieved if man and wife could be seen fighting against each other at elections.

What a fearful prospect it was that came up before the view of the robust minority of this committee. What a horrible thing, that there should be a tendency to the abolition of the legal subordination of woman to man. What a horrible thought, that anything could be done by an American Congress which would tend to do away with the principle of law and the practice which for generations has merged the civil being of the wife into that of the husband. I pray God that the progress that has been made may go on until we have a legal enfranchisement of woman in all the States of this Union; that her legal identity as a member of the human family may be established and forever preserved. I have no sympathy with the fears that are expressed by my friends on the minority of the committee.

Then they say—

That there will be a revolution of the relations between the sexes.

Mr. MANSUR. I raise the point of order that the hour has been exhausted, and if any further time is consumed it will be out of the time allowed for to-morrow on that side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has exhausted the hour.

Mr. BAKER. We have ten minutes that are to be divided, and I suggest that the gentleman from Ohio occupy five and my friend from Missouri the remainder.

Mr. MANSUR. No; the whole of the ten minutes is ours.

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

Mr. MOREY. Then I will avail myself of the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD.

A fear is expressed that women, if permitted to vote, will seek the enactment of laws "in their own interest and against that of man."

It is assumed, sir, that the exercise of the right of suffrage by woman will change the relations of the sexes. There never was a greater mistake.

The race is homogeneous and will never be divided in its aims and desires. It is assumed that woman desires the ballot to legislate for woman. This, too, is a grievous mistake. She desires the ballot that she may legislate for the race, for her sons and her daughters, for her husband and herself.

Then the minority grow warlike and shake their gory locks at the peaceful female suffragists. Let me read from their report:

But the fact is that muscle has a great deal to do with the matter. Why has the male sex alone made the laws? Because law, with whatever majesty we may invest it, is will, which, to give it effect, must be backed by force, and the force of the community is male. As Gail Hamilton quaintly but forcibly expressed it, "every ballot is a bullet." Muscle is the coarse foundation on which the most intellectual and august fabric of legislation rests. Divorce the law from the force of the community and the law will become ineffectual. If the case of the Queen regnant is cited, the answer is that a Queen regnant has the public force at her back. Suppose the women, when invested with political power, were to make the laws which they threaten to make in their own interest and against that of the man, would the men execute the law against themselves?

Sir, these suggestions are as untrue as they are coarse. In the United States the law is our sovereign and to it the patriotism of our people yields an unhesitating obedience.

Out of 60,000,000 people only about 12,000,000 vote, and still the other 48,000,000, a great majority of whom are able to make physical re-

sistance, if so inclined, stand ready to vindicate by their lives if need be the majesty of the laws which they have had no voice in making.

A simple answer, however, to the question of the minority, "Why has the male sex alone made the laws?" is that the female sex have forever been denied the right to help make the laws by which they are governed.

To attribute this to their lack of physical courage is neither just nor manly. I have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the autobiography of my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and from that I learn that while the great war for the Union was testing the patriotism and valor of the American people my friend was taking lessons in statesmanship at home. What were the women of the country doing then? Anna Ella Carroll, moved by the loftiest patriotism, her genius quickened by her love of country, was the friend and counselor of the great Lincoln and lighted his way in the gloom of that awful period.

Who has not read of Dorothea Dix and the army of noble nurses; of Elizabeth Blackwell and the Sanitary Commission? Who has not read of Clara Barton, whose chosen work was on the field of battle, caring for the wounded, burying the dead? For four years she endured the rigors and was exposed to the dangers of soldier life. Shrinking from no danger, she stood side by side with the surgeons on the field of battle, exposed to shot and shell, her clothing pierced by balls and torn by shot. There was Mother Bickerdyke, who was a strong woman in her prime during the dark hour of the nation. She gave her entire time for four years to the service of the country, laboring in hospitals, going out on the battle-field after the contest was over and viewing those scenes of carnage that make the heart grow sick, lifting wounded soldiers in her brave arms to bear them to places of safety at the risk of her life. And there were thousands of other brave and loyal women who, in camp and hospitals, at home and at the front, and even on the field of battle, did a noble and heroic part in the prosecution of the great war for union and free government.

By what right does my friend [Mr. SPRINGER], who prepared this minority report, challenge the right of the women of the country to enjoy the highest and dearest right that can be exercised under the Government which they sacrificed so much to save?

The minority have called witnesses to repeat stale arguments against woman suffrage in order to defeat the will of the people of this new State, which seeks to be admitted to an equality with the other States, under a constitution framed by delegates of her own choosing and ratified by the suffrages of her people.

In answer to these arguments I will here give opportunity to speak, not for themselves alone, but for all mankind, two citizens of the Republic who, in their lives and characters and in their noble works, have not only honored their sex, but have dignified the human race.

Against the sentiments of the minority, borrowed from Goldwin Smith, I place the words of Mary A. Livermore:

A new day has dawned, and humanity has moved forward to an era where wrong and slavery are being displaced and reason and justice are being recognized as the rule of life. Science is extending immeasurably the bounds of knowledge and power. Art is refining life, giving to it beauty and grace. Literature bears in her hands whole ages of comfort and sympathy. Industry, aided by the hundred-handed elements of nature, is increasing the world's wealth, and invention is economizing its labor. The age looks steadily to the redressing of wrong, to the righting of every form of error and injustice. And a tireless and prying philanthropy, which is almost omniscient, is one of the most hopeful characteristics of the time. Notwithstanding deplorable corruption in politics, dishonesty in business, and immorality in social life, there is so humane a spirit dominating the age in which we live that even the brute creation share in it, and we have hundreds of societies organized to prevent cruelty to animals.

It could not be possible in such an era but that women should share in the justice and kindness with which the time is fraught, and the last quarter of a century has lifted them to higher levels.

The doors of colleges, professional schools, and universities, closed against them for ages, are opening to them. They are invited to pursue the same course of study as their brothers, and are graduated with the same diplomas, and the question of woman's collegiate education is practically settled.

Trades, businesses, remunerative industries, and the liberal professions seek women; and their capacity for public affairs receives large recognition in the United States. They are elected or appointed to such offices as those of county clerk, register of deeds, pension agent, prison commissioner, State librarian, overseer of the poor, school supervisor, school superintendent, executors and administrators of estates, trustees, guardians, engrossing clerks of State Legislatures, superintendents of women's State prisons, college principals and professors, and members of boards of State charities, lunacy, and correction. And in all these positions women serve with men, who acknowledge most graciously the practical wisdom and virtue they bring to their duties.

Women are occupying positions as accountants and book-keepers, physicians and surgeons, painters, sculptors, and architects, authors and journalists, clergywomen and lawyers, and when admitted to practice law at the bar of their own States they have the right to practice at the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. President Grant appointed over five thousand women to the office of postmistress. Even the laws relating to women, which are the last to feel the change in public opinion, usually dragging a whole generation behind—even these are being annually revised and amended, and their fall to keep abreast of the advancing civilization. For the gradual evolution of women during the last half century has led them to protest against the injustice of the laws that concern them.

Lord Brougham pronounced the common law of England "a disgrace to any heathen nation," so far as it related to women. And this law prevailed almost everywhere in the United States until the woman-suffrage movement was inaugurated some thirty of forty years ago. Then began changes in the laws for women, and, legitimately following this gain in their favor, the right to vote has been given them on questions connected with the public schools in fourteen States, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Oregon, Indiana, and New Jersey have given women school suffrage on terms and for purposes more

or less restricted. So, also, have the Territories of Idaho, Dakota, and Wyoming.

In Utah and Washington Territories women have exercised the right of suffrage until recently. In Utah they lost it by the passage of the Edmunds bill, aimed at the abolition of Mormon polygamy, and in Washington by a decision of the Territorial supreme court on a technicality. In the States of Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island women are allowed to hold school offices, but not to vote on school matters. In California women are eligible to all educational offices except those from which the State constitution excludes them, and in Wisconsin they are eligible to any office connected with the schools but that of State superintendent. In Maine, Connecticut, and Tennessee women can hold "certain" school offices.

In Massachusetts women are limited to a vote for school committee. In Michigan, Vermont, and in New York until recently, only tax-paying women could vote. In Oregon only widows having taxable property and children to educate. In Indiana only women not married, nor minors, who pay taxes, and are listed as guardians, parents, or heads of families. Women have full suffrage in one Territory, Wyoming. There they have exercised it on the same terms as men since 1869, and they habitually vote in somewhat larger proportion to their numbers than do men. Women have a right to vote "by petition" on the granting of liquor licenses in Arkansas and Mississippi. In Kansas women have been given municipal suffrage in all cities of first, second, and third class, which last includes incorporated towns and villages containing only 500 inhabitants.

Something like nineteen years ago England gave municipal suffrage to unmarried women on the same terms as men. It accomplished such admirable results, especially in the management of public schools and the care of the poor, that Parliament granted the same right to the women of Scotland. In 1880, the women of the Isle of Man who owned real estate equal in value to \$20 a year were given the parliamentary franchise. When they voted for the first time in 1881 the local press announced that "the new political element acted in the most admirable manner." In Canada five provinces give a restricted municipal suffrage to women, and the concurrent testimony of all parties and of the minister of finance, Hon. George Foster, is that the result is altogether in the interest of temperance and high morality.

It is evident, therefore, to all who watch the movements of the times that the experiment of full woman suffrage will be made at no very remote day, not only in America, but among all civilized peoples. Women are throbbing with the same general unrest against a government to which they have never consented as men have manifested in their long struggle for liberty against kings, emperors, popes, and czars. "The ultimate form of government for the world is republican," says Matthew Arnold, "and America easily leads the future."

Public opinion, in our country, long ago decided that "Universal suffrage is the first truth and only basis of a genuine republic," and that "no just government can be formed without the consent of the governed." Our fathers enunciated and defended these doctrines by a generation of dispute with the British crown, and at last won their case in the arbitration of a seven-year war. They probably did not think of women at the time. They used the word "people," which includes women, and what they struggled for and won was a principle of universal application. For if the ballot is given man to protect him in "his life, liberty, and property," for the same reasons should it be given to woman, as she has the same "life, liberty, and property" to protect. And this is to-day very largely conceded, for no valid argument can be made against it.

During the last fifty years the evolution of woman has lifted her out of a legal relation to man which was that of a servant to a master or a ward to a guardian. To-day she stands by his side a disfranchised citizen. Every step of her advance from slavery to her present partial freedom has been hotly contested by men, and sometimes by women, who in selfish luxury and unthinking ignorance have been subsidized by demagogues and used as flails to beat back their struggling sisters from the attainment of their aims. The bitter conflict still goes on. There is no lack of vulgar innuendo or ignoble political dodge among the weapons of woman's opponents. Every rag of prejudice and every threadbare scrap of objection are brought into requisition when women demand their rights, although they have been shriveled a hundred times in the scorching fires of the last forty years' debate.

Also the words of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, addressed to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate:

And yet here we stand, after half a century of persistent effort, still wholly unrepresented in the Government, while having done all in our power, alike in peace and war, to maintain the grand institutions bequeathed us by the fathers.

Have you ever thought, gentlemen, that the vast possessions within our national boundaries, with all their future wealth and grandeur, belong to women as well as to men? We are the natural heirs to one-half this magnificent estate. What would you think of the sons of a family who should seize the whole of a private estate and dole out to the sisters a pittance in charity when asked to restore their legal share of the inheritance? And what should we think of the women who in such circumstances failed to assert their rights and assume their duties to guard and wisely use the wealth their fathers had accumulated for them as well as their brothers?

Those who enjoy the blessings of wealth should share in its responsibilities. Those who ask for rights under the Government should be prepared to assume its duties.

We do not question man's ability to manage our affairs, but we need the development of learning to manage our own. There is nothing more enervating than continual dependence.

We are here to-day, honorable gentlemen, to ask you to take the necessary steps for the speedy enfranchisement of woman for the three following reasons:

1. For the benefit that self-government will be to herself.
2. For the immense advantage it will be to the family to have liberally educated wives and mothers at the fireside.
3. For the benefit of the State in having woman's interest in the public good legally recognized.

In considering the first proposition we must view woman as a woman, to be educated for the whole round of human duties. In prescribing her rights we must not limit her sphere as wife, mother, housekeeper, teacher, or seamstress, as she may never fill one of these positions or may fill all. In deciding her rights, consider her simply as a citizen of the United States. The capacities or attractions of each individual must settle the question of education and sphere, of rights and duties. In conferring the right of suffrage on men we do not ask whether they are husbands, fathers, or blacksmiths.

In addressing those who already enjoy the right of suffrage one would naturally suppose that it would not be necessary to enlarge on the advantages of having a voice in deciding the laws and the rulers under which one lives.

And neither would it if each member of this committee understood that woman's wants and needs are similar to his own; that the cardinal virtues belong to her as well as to him; that personal dignity, the power of self-protection, are as important for her as for him; that woman loves justice, equality, liberty, and wishes the right to give her consent to the Government under which she lives as well as man does. Matthew Arnold says: "The first desire of every cultured mind is to take part in the great work of government."

The virtue of patriotism would be far greater among men, their devotion to the public good more earnest, if the influences of home life were not continually drawing them into a narrow selfishness.

Women naturally take no interest in questions where their opinions have no weight, in a sphere of action from which they are excluded. They are not supposed to know what is necessary for the public good, hence how could they influence their husbands to make that their first duty when in public life?

But when women are enfranchised their interest in the State will deepen. They will see that the good of their own children depends as much on the conditions of the outside world as on the environments of their own homes. Just as the diseases generated in the filthy lanes and narrow courts of our great cities are wafted to our palace homes, decimating the ranks of the young and beautiful, so if the moral atmosphere of society is corrupt the pure and innocent are the readiest victims. Our fragrant hedges and high stone walls are no protection against the insidious poison of vices permitted by laws in which woman has no voice. When the interest mothers feel for the welfare of their sons finds expression in the laws, the morals of the street will be elevated and a purer code of virtue govern our homes.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in this connection, if it has not heretofore been granted, that all gentlemen who desire may print remarks in the RECORD on this bill. There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. HEMPHILL, for the remainder of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. CARUTH, indefinitely.

To Mr. NORTON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. QUACKENBUSH, for one week, on account of important business.

ADMISSION OF WYOMING.

Mr. BAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to take the floor now?

Mr. MANSUR. Under ordinary circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would not take the floor at this time; but, sir, the character of the debate and the character of the attendance at this hour are so wonderful that I desire to emphasize the point by exercising the highest character of right that belongs to a Representative in addressing myself to the country, for surely I am not addressing myself to Congress. When I recognize by an actual count there are not exceeding twelve members present, it reminds me of the fact that we are attempting, as it were, to bring a State into this Union by a Caesarean operation rather than by those methods of careful preparation and all the ceremonies that surround a proper *accouchement* of an honored member of an honored family.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to emphasize that so much as to say that on this occasion we emphasize the fact that there are times when we must often ignore the evidence of our own senses, and in this I do not want to act upon the suggestion I am now throwing out by any manner of means; but simply addressing the country, I would say that certainly Hon. THOMAS B. REED, the Speaker of this House, can evidently see that there is no quorum here now by the exercise of his own senses, and that we are not doing business very rapidly in the way of educating the members of this House who are to vote on this question to-morrow.

I was talking to a gentleman who is now present, a member of Congress recently, and who knows little of what the bill proposes. He has not considered it himself; he admits, most frankly, that he does not know anything about it; but yet to-morrow the members of this House will act upon this measure, and without that deliberation and investigation they at least might obtain by hearing the discussion; but each will vote as the committee has, so to speak, instructed him. When we consider further that there are only certain amendments adopted and that the position assumed at least by the minority of the committee is not one of open hostility against the admission of Wyoming—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Let me suggest to the gentleman before he leaves the point he was making that there are four times as many on this side as on the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSUR. No, sir; I see one, two, three—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine himself to the question under consideration.

Mr. MANSUR. I desire to state here, then, so that it may go on record for the benefit of those who may possibly glance over the RECORD in the morning, what I understand to be the position of the minority. We state in this report that we are not absolutely fighting against the admission of Wyoming. But we have said, as we believe, that in the organic act by which Wyoming was made a Territory the right to vote was confined alone to the male people of that Territory; that in violation of that, with out even authority of a Territorial act of the Legislature calling the people to assemble in their respective voting places, but under a mere proclamation of the governor, they met at a certain time, and there were some 8,000 people represented, passed upon a constitution that had previously been submitted to the delegates who assembled under this call of the governor of the Territory.

Now, sir, the minority have even been willing, in view of what they understood to be a possibly fair sentiment in that Territory, to overlook that. But when we come to consider the question of female suffrage here it was so great an innovation on all the past, it was so wide a departure from the doctrines of our fathers who established the Constitution, that we did desire that the voice of the people should be taken under the sanction of law; and if the people voted without authority of law

there might be some punishment for the offense. That should be submitted separately and apart, and being so submitted, if it were adopted by the people of that Territory, that it could be certified here; and if the constitution itself, in a separate election to which it was to be ordered, was sustained by the people, that then they could come in under a proclamation by the President.

I repeat, sir, that the worst that could occur if Democratic ideas should prevail in this would be to submit this under the forms of law and have it adopted by the people, as we have every reason to expect that in all probability it would be, and that they would come here regularly by authority of law and be entitled to their representation in this Hall next winter at the assembling of Congress. That is admission, then, that the position the minority of this committee have recommended and the suggestions submitted by them are, as it were, not even accorded a hearing.

I will give way now to those gentlemen who desire to introduce matters by unanimous consent.

COTTON-SEED OIL.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD two telegrams which I hold in my hand, one coming from the business agent of the Alliance of the State of North Carolina and the other from the secretary, representing a membership of 90,000. The committee have ceased taking testimony and I just ask permission to have the telegrams printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The telegrams are as follows:

RALEIGH, N. C., March 15, 1890.

Hon. C. W. McCLAMMY,
House of Representatives:

We know the Conger bill, No. 283, and the Butterworth bill, No. 679, if passed by Congress, will greatly damage if not destroy the cotton-seed-oil industry of the South, and thereby do great damage to the interest of the farmers and laborers of the South. We do most earnestly protest against its passage and recommend that it do not pass.

W. H. WORTH,

State Business Agent, North Carolina Farmers' Alliance.

RALEIGH, N. C., March 15, 1890.

Hon. C. W. McCLAMMY,
House of Representatives, Washington:

I am most decidedly opposed to bills Nos. 283 and 679, known respectively as the Conger and the Butterworth bills. I think I can safely say every cotton farmer in North Carolina is also opposed to them. If these bills become laws the entire cotton-seed industry in the South will be destroyed.

E. C. BEDDINGFIELD,

Secretary North Carolina Farmers' State Alliance.

REVIVAL OF AMERICAN SHIPPING TRADE.

Mr. CUMMINGS obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following memorial:

Resolutions passed unanimously at the fourth national convention of the American Shipping and Industrial League, Washington, D. C., February 5, 6, and 7, 1890.

The American Shipping and Industrial League, zealously pursuing its object, the promotion of the development of American labor and distribution of the products thereof by the enlargement and extension of the merchant marine of the United States, at its session in Washington City, February 5, 6, and 7, 1890, reaffirms the declaration made at its last annual meeting.

Whereas our best foreign markets naturally are those of Central and South America, the West Indies, Eastern Asia, and Australia, but from which we are now practically excluded by inadequate transportation facilities of our own; and

Whereas the distribution of American products could be better effected through the instrumentality of American merchants and their own ships, which would earn the freight that always has to be paid in cash, whether there be profit or loss on the cargo; and

Whereas the nationality of a ship in which goods are transported generally carries with it, to a great extent, the command of the market to which the goods are consigned, and also controls the exchanges by which payments are effected; and

Whereas the decay of American shipping has had and must naturally have an injurious effect upon all industries, because it forces the country to pay enormous sums in cash for foreign transportation, which sums might and should be returned to our country through our own merchants owning their own shipping; and

Whereas a merchant marine is absolutely essential to the maritime defense of the nation, since without it we will not have seamen to man the Navy in time of war; and

Whereas the rapidly developing industrial power of the South makes it certain that, with the aid of that section, the time is at hand when the United States will be able, with proper protection of the shipping interests, to defy the open and fair competition of the world in the foreign export trade: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That this convention urge upon the Congress of the United States proper measures for the revival and extension of the merchant marine and declare that among such measures we recognize as timely and effective the bill known as the "tonnage bill," which provides that every vessel, sail or steam, built and owned in the United States, and engaged in the foreign trade, plying between the ports of the United States and foreign ports or between foreign ports and other foreign ports, shall be allowed the sum of 30 cents per gross registered ton for each 1,000 miles sailed, outward and inward, and pro rata for any distance traveled less than 1,000, on any voyage or voyages. "The payments at the rate of 30 cents per ton for each 1,000 miles traveled as herein provided shall continue for the term of ten years at that rate, and thereafter for another term of nine years at a reduction of 3 cents per ton each year upon each 1,000 miles traveled, and pro rata for any less distance." And in recommending this bill for immediate passage we do it upon the ground that it will place the merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade upon an equality with that of other nations.

Resolved, That this convention further urge upon Congress the immediate provision for the defense of the coast and seaport cities of the United States, on the lakes as well as the seaboard.

Resolved, That we hail with gratification the acts of Congress providing for the rebuilding and equipment of a strong and efficient Navy, so necessary for

maritime defense and for the security of our commerce and carrying trade on the high seas.

Resolved, That this convention further urges upon Congress the great importance of adequate provision for the improvement of the harbors and rivers of the whole country concurrently with the restoration and development of our ocean commerce, so that all sections and States of the Republic shall participate in and enjoy the benefits of restored and enlarged commerce with each other and the outside world through their natural water ways and harbors, developed by the fostering hand of the nation.

Resolved, That the United States mails ought to be carried between this and foreign countries in American ships, under our own flag, as soon as practicable, consistently with certainty and celerity of the service and that for such service this Government ought to pay a just compensation, regardless of the price at which other nations are willing to provide similar service.

Resolved, That the vast present and prospective manufacturing and commercial interests of this country entitle them to a foreign mail service the promptness, celerity, and certainty of which shall be insured, in peace and in war, by national patriotism, national pride, and national ambition to extend our influence, our commerce, and our markets throughout the world.

Resolved, That such service can only be relied upon, in peace and war, when performed by American hands, warmed by American hearts, under the American flag.

Resolved, That this convention heartily indorses the naval reserve bill, providing for the enrollment of a naval militia, etc., and recommends to Congress the immediate passage of said bill.

[SEAL.]

CHAS. S. HILL,

Secretary and Commissioner.

JOSEPH WHEELER, President.

On motion, it was unanimously resolved and directed that a copy of the above should be presented to the President and Vice-President of the United States, to each member of the Cabinet, to both Houses of Congress, and also to the governor and Legislature of each State of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The time has arrived under the special order when it becomes necessary to declare that the House is in recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock a. m. (Thursday, March 27, 1890).

REMONSTRANCES AGAINST EXPENDITURES FOR WAR LIKE PURPOSES.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following memorials; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Remonstrances of Back Creek, Fairmount, Deer Creek, and Marion Monthly Meetings of Friends, of Grant County, Indiana, against proposed large expenditures of public money for naval, coast defense, and other warlike measures.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your petitioners, of Deer Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, Grant County, State of Indiana, numbering 225 adult persons, respectfully, but earnestly, entreat your honorable bodies to reject the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee, and other measures which propose a large expenditure for the Navy and so-called coast defenses, and other warlike preparations, all of which we believe are a menace to the peace and security of the nation.

ARTHUR W. JAY,

MIRA SMALL,

Clerks.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your petitioners, of Back Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, Grant County, State of Indiana, numbering 135 adult persons, respectfully, but earnestly, entreat your honorable bodies to reject the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee, and other measures which propose a large expenditure for the Navy and so-called coast defenses, and other warlike preparations, all of which we believe are a menace to the peace and security of the nation.

SAMUEL C. WILSON,

A. J. ROOK,

Clerks.

N. HILL, Correspondent.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your petitioners, of Fairmount Monthly Meeting of Friends, Grant County, State of Indiana, numbering 424 adult persons, respectfully, but earnestly, entreat your honorable bodies to reject the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee, and other measures which propose a large expenditure for the Navy and so-called coast defenses, and other warlike preparations, all of which we believe are a menace to the peace and security of the nation.

ENOS HARVEY, Clerk.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your petitioners, of Marion Monthly Meeting of Friends, Grant County, State of Indiana, numbering 437 adult persons, respectfully, but earnestly, entreat your honorable bodies to reject the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee, and other measures which propose a large expenditure for the Navy and so-called coast defenses, and other warlike preparations, all of which we believe are a menace to the peace and security of the nation.

Signed by direction and on behalf of the aforesaid meeting, held at Marion, Grant County, Indiana, third month, 5th, 1890.

SARAH ANN SMALL, Clerk.

ISAAC ELLIOTT, Clerk for the Day.

JOEL OVERMAN, Corresponding Secretary.

ADMISSION OF WYOMING.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the remaining two hours of this debate, I believe, are to be equally divided.

Mr. SPRINGER. How is that?

Mr. BAKER. The remaining two hours are to be divided, I believe, between the friends and the opponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is mistaken. The side represented by the gentleman from New York has occupied three hours and thirty-one minutes.

Mr. BAKER. What portion of the time—

The SPEAKER. The other side has occupied two hours and eight-een minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Then the other side can have the floor. How much time will remain to this side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine that. It will require something in the nature of a mathematical calculation to determine. [Laughter.] The Chair will recognize some gentleman in opposition to the bill.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I make any objection to the passage of this bill to admit Wyoming into the Union. The cause of the State is so earnestly championed by the Delegate who has represented its interests so faithfully and so ably in this House since the day I entered it that I sympathize with him in the enthusiasm he has manifested in favor of the immediate creation of this Territory into a State of the Union. I may say personally that it would gratify me to congratulate him hereafter as the Senator from the new State of Wyoming. But, Mr. Speaker, there are to my mind some objections to the admission of this Territory at this time, and I must urge them here and vote my convictions against the passage of the bill.

The manner in which the proceedings have been conducted up to this instant to make this new State have been rather rapid, rather rushing; too inconsiderate, it seems to me, to be applied to the creation of a new State in this Union.

The movement was set on foot by the county commissioners of the Territory, at whose instance does not appear. The county commissioners of my State are elected to manage the financial affairs of the county to some extent; to levy certain taxes; to determine the amount to be expended generally in the county; to build bridges; to construct certain public buildings; control the county road system, and matters of that kind. It would not be regarded as absurd and ridiculous were they to petition the governor of the State to call a convention to adopt amendments to the constitution; but if they were to attempt to invest the governor and other officers of the State with powers for that purpose, such as these boards requested them to exercise, wholly without the authority of law, their course would be regarded as extremely presumptuous.

These commissioners asked the governor of the State with two or three other officials to proceed to district the State and apportion the number of delegates to the several districts, and do such other acts as may be necessary to call together delegates for the purpose of passing upon the fundamental law that should rest upon the people of that Territory for an interminable period, and might be fixed in such a way that it would be next to impossible to amend it in its objectionable features. Reading from the report (part second, the views of the minority) will show how rapidly this whole business was rushed in that Territory. The proclamation for this convention was issued on the 3d day of June, 1889, the election was held on the second Monday of July, and the convention assembled at Cheyenne, the capital of the Territory, on the first Monday in September, and proceeded to formulate a constitution. The convention adjourned on the 31st day of September, and the election for the ratification of the constitution was held on the 5th day of November thereafter. Only thirty-five days intervened between the time when the convention adjourned and the holding of the election on the constitution.

To us living in the older States where communication is rapid, where it is easy for the people to get together, this may not seem like very rushing work; but if gentlemen will look at the map of the Territory of Wyoming and consider for a moment the conditions of that Territory, they will find that it is larger than several States of the Union, as is mentioned in the report. There is but one line of railway running through that Territory, and that line of railroad is within 50 or 60 miles of the southern border of the Territory, and there is one other line of railway merely entering the Territory. The notice of any one of these transactions of which I read but a moment ago could not have been properly given in five weeks' time. There were many citizens of the Territory who knew nothing about them, when they should have been fully informed.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that there are tracts of territory in Wyoming as large as the State of Ohio in which no election was held at any time upon the Territorial question or upon this constitution. I venture to say that there are tracts of country there as large as the State of Connecticut, as large as the State of New Jersey, in which a hundred families do not reside.

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentleman allow me a single suggestion?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have no objection.

Mr. CAREY. I know the gentleman would not willingly make a misstatement—

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, sir.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman has said that there is one railroad in our Territory and another entering it. I wish to say that we have one railroad running entirely through the Territory from east to west; another coming from the east runs nearly to the center of the Territory; and there is another line running north and south. We have also the Burlington and Quincy road running 30 or 40 miles in the northwest corner.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am glad to be corrected. I said that looking at the map—and I have taken a very recent one.

Mr. CAREY. We grow so rapidly out there that the maps do not keep up with us.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The maps keep up as rapidly as the population grows; and I have just said I have no doubt there are portions of that Territory as large as several of the minor States of this Union in which a hundred families do not reside.

Mr. Speaker, this rapidity of movement, this method of election, is illustrated in the remarks of the gentleman from Wyoming himself. Speaking upon the vote on the ratification of the constitution, he says:

There were cast 8,195 votes, 1,923 votes being against the constitution only. There was not an election throughout the Territory for any other purpose; everybody appeared for the constitution.

In the vote cast nearly 20 per cent. were against the constitution. What becomes of the assertion "Everybody appeared for the constitution."

That is a mere opinion of the gentleman. Then reading again from page 15 I find the gentleman using this language:

The vote in 1888 was 18,210. The population can not be properly based on the vote. But there is but little of politics in Wyoming.

The population, as I have shown by the maps exhibited, is scattered over 100,000 square miles of territory; and taking the best estimate of the population given by the gentleman himself there is in that Territory just one person to a square mile. Within thirty days after notice each one of these elections takes place among a people scattered over 100,000 square miles of territory. Under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it was utterly impossible that there could have been held a fair, just, and proper election upon the ratification of this constitution. It contains provisions of a peculiar character. It contains a provision which in its present form would disfranchise every person coming into Wyoming hereafter, except those who can read the English language.

This provision should certainly be modified or corrected so that our German-speaking citizens, our Scandinavian citizens, our citizens of other non-English-speaking nationalities—Dutch, French, Austrian, Russian—who may wish to go into that Territory and become citizens may not be disfranchised. This is not a matter of construction. The language of the provision, taken with the fact that this is generally an English-speaking people, would preclude any persons from being citizens unless they could read the constitution of the State in English.

Then there is this provision as to woman suffrage. As was shown yesterday, female suffrage exists in that Territory in contravention of the law which constituted the Territory. Yet female suffrage was permitted to be an element in constituting this constitution, which is to disfranchise the male citizens of other parts of the Union, which is to disfranchise all who do not read the English language.

Section 9, Article VI, of that instrument is as follows:

No person shall have the right to vote who shall not be able to read the constitution of this State. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person prevented by physical disability from complying with its requirements.

Here is an invitation to immigration! Plainly this new-born State says to all men who can not read, "Stay out of my borders." In addition to those of foreign birth, the native of this land who, surrounded by poverty in childhood, obtained no education is disfranchised the day he settles here. The veteran of the Union armies, who seeks a home upon the public domain in Wyoming, if he can not read, must yield up one of the priceless rights of citizenship. Four times as many acres as there are in the farms of Ohio, of public lands subject to entry under our homestead laws, are thus withdrawn from that privilege to these men and all others similarly situated.

Illiteracy is to be punished. The negroes of the South, unfortunate in this respect, are virtually forbidden to come to Wyoming in search of homes. With this discouragement to immigration, this practical exclusion of the men who constitute a large portion of the human labor, the predictions of the gentleman from Wyoming of a rapid increase in the population resulting from statehood are not likely to be realized. An educational qualification such as this, if to become effective some years hence, might not be so objectionable. Let this House send this constitution back to the people of that Territory with such instructions as may awaken them to a sense of the unwisdom and undesirable features of its provisions upon suffrage and eligibility to office, and let the whole of the people have an opportunity to consider and vote upon them. Delay long enough for this purpose can do no harm and may do very much good.

Mr. Speaker, we have been, by the action of the Committee on Rules, precluded from offering amendments to this bill. There are three amendments, however, of the minority of the committee that we are permitted to vote upon. One of these provides for referring this constitution back to the people and permitting them to vote upon these vital questions. What objection can there be to that? Do gentlemen fear that if this question be referred back to the people and they be permitted to vote on it these provisions will be stricken out? Then they ought to be stricken out.

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentlemen permit me another question?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If it is not to be taken out of my time.

Mr. CAREY. What do you mean by "the people" of the Territory—the voters in the Territory to-day or only the men?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If I could determine the matter myself, I should refer the question only to the male citizens. But as the provision is in the laws of your Territorial government—

Mr. CAREY. You would take the right away from those people to say whether they want to continue in the exercise of suffrage.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I would permit those who generally throughout the United States are recognized as citizens entitled to vote—I would permit them only to determine this question. But that is not possible. All that I propose now is, following the amendment offered by the minority of the committee, to submit the whole question to the whole people—not to one-third of them, not to one-fourth of them, but to give all of them a fair opportunity to vote upon the question. Let the fact of this election be published abroad. Let the counties that do not lie on the railroads, that lie out in the rural districts—let those counties have an opportunity to pass on these questions.

But I was asking what objection can there be to the proceeding proposed by the minority of the committee? Has any objection been offered? None has been offered in my hearing during this debate, except that the resubmission of this question might involve some trouble and inconvenience to the people of that Territory. Sir, the fundamental rights of the people of the Territory are worth tenfold the amount of trouble and inconvenience to which they would be put in order to pass upon these questions in a proper manner.

Do you object because you fear some political mischance? The chairman of this committee [Mr. BAKER] in his opening remarks alluded to the conduct of what is now the minority side of this House in the preceding Congress with regard to the bill which admitted the two Dakotas, Montana, and Washington. I could heartily congratulate that gentleman if he and his colleagues had manifested as much fairness as many of the Democrats did on that occasion, if he had presented to us at this time a bill embracing four Territories, giving us, so far as the political aspect is concerned, a chance for one to three. You have brought in here a bill to admit the Territory which has the smallest population of the four seeking admission; and you have refused to report up to this time a bill for the admission of the Territory of New Mexico, which has three times the population of the Territory of Wyoming, which has greater wealth, which has more railroads and everything else which indicates material prosperity in greater abundance than Wyoming.

You propose to admit to a seat in this House and to seats upon the floor of the Senate a Representative and two Senators representing a smaller number of people than live in the county in which I have the honor to reside, less than half as many people as there are in the district I represent. The city of Columbus—my home—has a larger tax duplicate, more banking capital, greater manufactories, larger commerce, more valuable public buildings, more school facilities, and contains more school-children, and more men and women than this Territory which you now propose to invest with statehood; yet it is but a very small portion of the great State of Ohio, whose two Senators are hereafter to be counterbalanced by the two Senators from Wyoming.

I should think that gentlemen on the other side of the House would pause and consider, even in their haste to win unfairly political advantages, whether they are willing to admit a Territory into the Union of States and give it this great power in Congress with so few people as it has, in the face of the lesson of Nevada, which to-day, after over a quarter of a century of statehood, has a smaller number of votes, yes, about one-third as many votes as the number of voters in the district electing each of them to Congress.

Mr. CAREY. How does the case of Nevada compare with that of Florida, which was given 13,000,000 acres of land, and which, on account of its position on the seacoast has had abundant opportunities of access?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If there is objection to that which was done in the case of Florida forty-five years ago, it ought to be a lamp to light the feet of this House at this time, not an encouragement to us to perpetrate another wrong of like character. But I do not admit that there was any such mistake in that case. Twenty-five years after admission Florida had nearly 200,000 people.

The gentleman has introduced tables here to show that certain States in days gone by, after their admission, did not cast many votes. Yet at the time they were admitted they had about the requisite number to entitle them to a member of this House. The ordinance which permitted the formation of five States from the territory northwest of the Ohio River proposed over a century ago the rule that the number of people to constitute any of those States should be 60,000.

Mr. CAREY. But two of them were admitted with 33,000.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not think the gentleman's figures are exact. They were, however, admitted with a smaller number than 60,000. The basis of representation also was much smaller at that time than it is now. A national census will soon be taken. A census of this

Territory can be taken before the meeting of this Congress at the next session; and this census would show whether Wyoming has half as many people as will be required in the next apportionment for a Representative in Congress. If it comes here with one-half as many people and if its constitution is so amended as to be, in my estimation, truly and purely republican in form, I will vote for its admission. But I regard that feature which provides for disfranchising all citizens unless they can read the Constitution in the English language as utterly unrepresentative, undemocratic, un-American, and unworthy the indorsement of this House.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCKALEW].

Mr. BUCKALEW. Mr. Speaker, over twenty years ago I assisted in creating the Territory of Wyoming; also in assigning to it a Pennsylvania name. I should now be perfectly willing to change that Territory into a State, to admit it among our sisterhood of States as an honored member, if, in my judgment, the conditions proper to such transition now existed.

We are told by this committee that this Territory contains 62,000,000 acres of land, of which from four to five millions are arable without resort to artificial means of irrigation; and according to the estimates which are made by the geologist of the Territory the amount of land that can be made arable by resorting to artificial irrigation is 12,000,000 acres. Here, then, is a Territory of 62,000,000 acres, of which sixteen or seventeen million acres only are capable of being made suitable for the purposes of agriculture, and consequently of supporting a dense population. And these are the estimates that we are to accept with some considerable degree of allowance, because they are made merely upon conjecture; they are vague or general estimates, which may not be realized when they come to be tested in the future by time and trial.

Now, as to the mineral resources of that Territory, which are painted in such grand colors, I find in the end we are told that the whole of the mineral production of that Territory is coal, of which the insignificant amount at present is 2,000,000 tons per year. Sir, when this Territory shall have yielded mineral products to any considerable extent and of course have acquired population along with production, it will be time, and not until then, to present to Congress this question of admission.

But, sir, what I propose is to say a few words in behalf of the one-fourth of the voters of that Territory who voted against this application to Congress at a voluntary election, when there was no legal obligation upon the election officers or upon anybody else to participate in the proceedings or to conform to, law or fairness in what was done. These persons—a very considerable proportion, one-fourth of the whole number reported as voting—said "No."

Now take this question of irrigation. We are told in this committee report that about two million and a half of acres are now artificially provided with water; but there is no supply from what are called supply basins, no extensive or great works by which large quantities of land can be made fertile. It is only by tapping the streams and some small sources, at comparatively light expense, that this proportionately small quantity of land has been assisted into a condition of fertility. We have established already by act of Congress a scheme or plan of assisting our new Territories that have waste and arid lands to obtain large and permanent supplies of water for the purposes of irrigation.

This policy was established at the last session of Congress; and we have a bureau organized with scientific experts for the examination of our Western and Southwestern region, where this question of irrigation is so important and where some system of irrigation is so indispensable to the future prosperity of the country. If matters are allowed to take their natural course, this Government will appropriate money to that object; for we know that in those Territories there is not the ability among the inhabitants to do the work. Those Territories are yet small in population, limited in resources, and it requires the powerful arm of the Government to be stretched out to accomplish any large and permanent results for the future.

The Government has undertaken that, and in this very Territory of Wyoming, where no supply basins have been erected and where at several points a large outlay would be necessary, the Government will come to the assistance of the people of the Territory and will give to them by generous appropriations of money that which is of tenfold more importance and value to them than any possible political organization in the form of a new and weak State government could be. And I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the intelligent, sagacious inhabitants of that Territory, as well as of two or three others that might be named, have already taken into account this important and vital question to their own prosperity and that they believe it wise policy to defer State organizations and allow the General Government, while it controls the lands and holds political jurisdiction in those sections, to carry out this system of beneficent Government patronage and assistance. They were wise in voting against a premature entrance into the Union, establishing a State jurisdiction over their lands, ousting the United States from all local concern in their affairs except as an owner of undisposed-of lands.

Now, for one I am perfectly willing to give to this Territory of Wyoming, and to the Territories of Arizona and of New Mexico, partially perhaps to Idaho also, reasonable contributions of the public moneys while they remain in the Territorial condition, in order to enable them to establish and maintain a condition of things indispensable to their future prosperity and welfare. But if they slip out from under our hand and assume positions in the Union as sovereign States they will take along with them into that changed condition necessarily all of the responsibilities for their own future. Then what will become of this great work of irrigation? What will happen in regard to it? Why, sir, the enterprises necessary to supply water will fall into the hands of corporations in every one of the new States where irrigation is required. This will be the practical result, for necessarily to the large outlays for the great basins and works, corporate capital, and corporate capital alone, will be adequate.

Such works can only be accomplished through the agency of associated capital, and the inhabitants of the Territories, then new States, will be subject to corporate control over this vital question of their water supply. I would have the Government of the United States, as far as reasonable and proper, undertake the work while these Territories remain under our control, in a Territorial condition, and establish such works, holding the necessary lands adjoining, as was provided in the House bill of last session, until the works are perfected, then pass the title to individual owners upon an increased price, which will reimburse a large part of the outlay; and ultimately I would turn the works over to the States when organized and allow them to hold the title in trust for the benefit of the people. So that in future times they will not be ground down by corporate greed, and the waters of heaven will not be doled out to them under corporate charters, but be obtainable under beneficent and wise arrangements adopted in the interests of all the people.

One point further—I have not time to speak at length on this question—and I will close. I can well understand how this movement for a new State was gotten up. The governor of the Territory and the chief-justice of the Territory obtained petitions, not from the people, but from certain little office-holders of the Territory, doubtless invited and inspired by them; and then, without law and in contempt of the United States, those officials divided the State into districts, and the governor's proclamation to the people directed them what they should do. Thus they get up a bogus convention in contempt of law, and upon a meager vote of perhaps 5,000 male inhabitants of that Territory the constitution was adopted and sent here for our acceptance.

What is the consideration for this? Seats in the Senate and in this House; a State governorship, State judgeships and other State offices to be portioned around as far as they will go, to be imposed upon the people of the Territory for support; and the bribe held out to the political majority in Congress was to be two Senators and a Representative on this floor from the new State. That is the bribe to pass this bill through Congress. That is the bribe which the local office-seeking interest in the Territory hold out to the political majority in Congress. The temptation is strong, I admit it; but is it too strong to be resisted? Why, sir, there is no necessity at this time, nor will there be within some years, for adding to the political majority in the Senate of the United States. I would ask gentlemen, in conclusion, would it not be well to allow a few of the Territories in political accord with them to remain in the Territorial condition for a few years longer, and bring them in hereafter when they will need votes in the other House? That would be sensible. That would be political wisdom. At present there is no political necessity for this measure. It remains to be seen whether that unwise appeal made to the majority in this House is to be listened to and prevail in this body. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO].

Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Speaker, the principle of home rule is a most sacred one, and one which it would ill become me to question here or elsewhere. But home rule presumes that there are a sufficient number of rulers. A State is not constituted by acres, by minerals, by trees, by steers, or horses, or donkeys; a State is constituted of men, and in the case of Wyoming, presumably, of women; and there should be a sufficient population within the borders of the Territory before it can be admitted or shall be admitted as a State into the Union. Again, Mr. Speaker, while the principle of home rule is a sacred one and an important one, the right of admission into the Union is also a sacred one. Now, the gentlemen on the other side with great alacrity apply this principle of home rule to the sparse population of Wyoming, while they deny it arrogantly to the larger population of New Mexico.

We are asked by gentlemen on the other side to hasten by our votes the granting of home rule to the womanhood of Wyoming while persistently denying it to the manhood of Arizona. We are told by gentlemen on the other side that we must not, in the light of the principles of home rule, question what they have put into the constitution of Wyoming. On the other hand, gentlemen on the other side state that we shall question that which they put into the constitution of another State. I am asked by my vote to accept the principle of woman suffrage in Wyoming and I am asked to reject the polygamous feature

in suffrage in Utah. If you are going to enforce the principle of home rule do it justly, applying it even-handedly to all the Territories which ask to become States of the Union.

I am in favor of the most liberal laws to enable every Territory in the Union to become a State. I am in favor of the cardinal principle of home rule, but I can not under the cry of home rule close my eyes to the injustice of admitting the present Territory of Wyoming while you exclude other Territories from admission. Now, I believe that you have the same right to exclude Wyoming because of its constitution that you have to exclude the constitution of Utah. This constitution of Wyoming was formulated by thirty-nine men, possibly assembled in a back room, and ratified by a little over 6,000 people, men and women. If not the worst constitution which has ever been adopted, it is to my mind certainly abreast of the worst. There is in this constitution almost everything to which I am opposed as sound in politics, in morals, or in economics. You usher this State into the Union by wholesale spoliation of the public domain. A distinguished gentleman on the other side said that the same thing was done in Florida. I do not care if it was done in every State in the Union; and as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] so well replied, if they have wasted the public lands which belonged, not to the people of Wyoming or of Florida, but to the whole people of the United States, in former times, the greater reason exists why we should not do it in this case.

These grants of land of the people of the United States are for penitentiaries, for educational buildings, for all sorts of institutions, for fish hatcheries; and, as the gentleman from Alabama, in reply to my interrogatory yesterday, said, there is no restriction as to who may purchase these thousands and thousands of acres. They may be all bought by one syndicate; they may be all bought by one man; they may be all bought, as the gentleman suggested, by foreigners. Yes, and you have placed in this constitution a provision in order to enable foreigners to buy these lands with which you are to purchase your penitentiaries and with which you are to experiment in your fish hatcheries.

Here is one provision in the constitution with reference to the purchase of land that I will call the attention of my friend from Alabama to. They have incorporated in the organic law of this proposed State that foreigners shall hold land, instead of conforming to the act we have passed in the Forty-ninth Congress that they shall not hold land. "No distinction," say these thirty-nine gentlemen in the back room in formulating the constitution which was indorsed by a little over 6,000 votes of the people of Wyoming, and which the gentleman from Wyoming says they went through a blinding snow-storm to deposit—"No distinction shall ever be made by law between resident aliens and citizens as to the possession, taxation, and enjoyment and descent of property."

Let me say to my friend from Wyoming that if this constitution had been made by three hundred delegates chosen at an open, fair election in an open convention it never would have had that provision in it, and if it had been voted upon at an election of 200,000 people instead of 6,000 it would have been rejected three to one in any American State or community.

Now, then, gentlemen, you take from the fast-receding public domain, which should be the safety-valve of republican institutions in America, thousands and thousands of acres of land and give it to this feeble and sparse community to make it a State, and you put in the constitution of that new State that foreign syndicates and the landlords of Europe, who are finding that the laws of that country in reference to land are becoming obnoxious to the growing democracy there, and who are hastening hither to get hold of the fertile acres of America, that they and their odious system shall find lodgment here. You have placed in the constitution and laws of the new State in distinct and radical terms a new law which would never be indorsed by the people of the United States. You have invited the ostracised, odious, and exiled landlords, forced by the indignant population in Europe to seek other lands for investment, to come here; you have advertised in that constitution of Wyoming that here is the Mecca to which these land-hungry, selfish robber barons may hasten their steps and invest in lands. They can buy from the State of Wyoming millions of acres of these lands to be held by one vast syndicate. The next step in such a constitution should have been a provision reviving the feudal system.

Mr. MORGAN. May they not have had something to do with putting it in there?

Mr. McADOO. My friend suggests, may they not have had something to do with putting that provision in the constitution? These people are in every part of our land, and they are nowhere more alert and more anxious to acquire property than in the new Territories about to become States. We have seen—

Mr. CAREY. What is the law in your own State?

Mr. McADOO. The constitution of New Jersey has no such prohibitive provision as this and there are no public lands in the State of New Jersey.

Now, I state that this constitution captains to my mind almost every vicious principle in government, and the only good clause I find in it is the one that allows it to be amended. To my mind the only and

proper way to amend it would be to obliterate and begin it over again. [Laughter and applause.]

These thirty-nine men in the back room formed a constitution which is ratified by 6,000 votes, by which we are to grant millions of acres, and the American people are to have their rights abridged in that land which the blood and the brains and the patriotism of the whole American people, and not the people of Wyoming, acquired.

Now, on the question of woman suffrage, reference has been made to the State of New Jersey. It was said on this floor that that was the only State in the Union which ever had woman suffrage. Well, they did not have it long, and they did not get it regularly, any more than they did in Wyoming in the enabling act which created that Territory; but at any rate so far as the State of New Jersey is concerned this was away back almost in the colonial period. There never was, I am informed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES], who has made a very exhaustive search of that question, a decision of the court, either State or Federal, to uphold the construction given and under which women voted. They voted in New Jersey by a sort of unanimous consent of a small population.

It never arrested public attention in that State; and there has never been a whisper of reviving it from the day the new constitution of 1844 was formed until the present time; and there never will be, in my opinion.

The question of woman suffrage is so vast a one that I could not hope to discuss it in the limited period now allowed me. The literature of that subject is very great. The discussion has been conducted with signal ability on both sides. It goes without saying that every man who respects himself respects woman. The noblest, the gentlest, the most chivalrous of men have idealized woman in all ages. Now, a small faction of the sex—an insignificant faction (do not mistake the noise about this question)—ask that in this day we shall cease to idealize woman, shall no longer consider her as the fairest and best, if the frailest portion of humanity; that, in the language of the old ranters on the stage, we shall "have at it" in a competitive combat to the death. "Go to! Have at thee, villain!" [Laughter.] It is proposed that we shall no longer consider woman as fair and pure and gentle, but shall consider her as robust and manly, and at times, in political contests, probably vulgar.

No proposition was ever made in the United States which, in my opinion, would do more to destroy our institutions than the enforcement or allowance of female suffrage. The state very properly keeps away from religious questions. The state has no right to infringe the domain of religion. The Acts of the Apostles, if made into acts of Congress, would lose all their force and efficacy. [Laughter.] But the most skeptical of rulers and of men have found out that religion is a potent factor in controlling the human mind, so far as government is concerned—I care not what religion it is. He would be a daring man who would undertake to govern and a brave man who would venture to live in a faithless state. Now, it is probably a lamentable fact, but in our day it is true that women are the mainstay of religion—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield the gentleman two minutes longer.

Mr. McADOO. Go to any of your churches in the United States or England, or more particularly in France, on a Sunday morning; look around you and you will realize that women are the mainstay of the church, the leaven of faith in a materialistic age, the very pillars of active religious life. Force them into the political arena, in contact with all the baser phases of humanity, the gross selfishness and duplicity of intense political contests, and you have taken the main prop from faith in every country where it prevails.

Why, sir, one wing of this army have attacked the Christian religion, because they say that St. Paul is the greatest enemy that woman has. Well, speaking simply as a man of the world, St. Paul was one of the greatest men that ever lived, a man of giant intellect and most noble and godlike character. Throughout the ages he looms up like a great towering mountain crowned with beacon fires to light the dullness of night. He did not declare any new law with reference to woman; he did not give any dogmatic opinion of his. St. Paul simply declared what the law of God and nature was with reference to sex. He saw written, as it were in letters of fire, the truth as to the true sphere of woman.

Woman does not belong to a class or a clique; she represents a sex with elemental and mental characteristics entirely different from those of men. Her sphere under our advanced civilization is enlarging. With advanced education, with the new needs of society, her sphere of usefulness will everywhere extend. The law with reference to her in this and other lands has very properly made great advancement. In my own and other States the statutory law has enlarged her privileges to the very verge of destroying the unity of the family relation. No one will be readier than I to advance her rights and privileges and to aid her in her struggles under the changed conditions of life that mark our age. New avenues of employment and usefulness are opening up to her, and in them she is entitled to find consideration and fair play. God and nature have designed her for nobler pursuits than those con-

nected with ballot or bullet. Her temperament unfits her for using the one and her muscle has not been developed for the other. Great lawgivers and savage Amazons are exceptions in the sex.

It was only yesterday I learned that several of the graduates of our highest female colleges, admirable and talented young women, have taken their culture and their learning down into the very slums of New York, are spending their lives among the poor there, helping them—not talking woman suffrage or politics to them, but preaching the gospel of baths, clean morals, and good food, and in that way doing more for those poor people than woman suffrage can ever do. [Applause.] God bless woman in a mission like that!

But whenever in the great communities of America you adopt this principle of woman suffrage, whenever you take her from her pedestal as an ideal of all that is pure and good, you undermine morals and religion and corrupt our politics even beyond what they are at the present day. If there were nothing else in this constitution of Wyoming as a ground of objection save this clause allowing female suffrage I could not give it my approval. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the orders of this House, under the direction of the Committee on Rules, have so arranged the debate on this bill that the greater portion of it must of necessity be addressed to a beggarly account of empty benches. This discussion was continued last evening until half past 6 o'clock, when there were but a dozen members present, and this morning was resumed at 11 o'clock, when not more than twenty-five members were in attendance.

It seems to me that the question of the admission of a new State into this Union is of sufficient importance to be afforded equal consideration with that which is given in this House to a private claim or to the question of turning out a Democratic Representative and putting a Republican in the seat. For some reason or other, however, not known to me, but perhaps to the majority, it has been determined to "railroad" this bill through without proper consideration—without opportunity on the part of members to consider the various provisions of the constitution which comes here without any sanction of law, and is of no validity unless Congress shall breathe into it the breath of legislative life.

The position I have taken in regard to the admission of Territories as States is an advanced one. In the last Congress I favored, and so did the Democratic party on this floor, the admission of the four new States which came into the Union last fall. During the term of that Congress the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman reported bills looking to the admission of Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona into the Union as States. The precedent in some respects of those bills has been cited here by gentlemen on the other side. I only regret that they have not followed the precedent of the last Congress, which was to treat all these Territories fairly and equally, and to furnish equal facilities for each of them to come into the Union.

The gentleman from New York stated that I was only awaiting an opportunity to present an "omnibus bill," in order that four new States might be brought into the Union at this Congress, as four were brought in at the last. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this Congress another "omnibus bill" providing for the admission of Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona, treating all of them alike, as was done last Congress. This course seems to be objectionable to gentlemen on the other side. They assert that we must deal with each of these proposed States separately and by a distinct measure. I suppose this proceeding finds its origin in one of the passages in the Mikado; they want to "make the punishment fit the crime."

This proposed State of Wyoming presents here a constitution which enfranchises women. We are next to take up the bill to provide for the admission into the Union of the proposed State of Idaho, the constitution of which contains a provision disfranchising Mormons, both male and female. I could not quite understand at first the reason for this discrimination, but a friend of mine writing from Wyoming says that in that Territory the Mormons vote the Republican ticket, while in Idaho they are suspected of a desire to vote the Democratic ticket. Hence the gentlemen on the other side want separate bills to treat these two cases according to the different conditions existing. In Idaho they deprive the Mormons, both male and female, of the right to vote; in Wyoming, where the Mormons vote the Republican ticket, not only the Mormon himself, but his polygamous wife, is allowed to vote.

Mr. CARLISLE. And all his wives.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, all his wives and his polygamous daughters are allowed to vote.

So it appears that Mormonism is objectionable only when the person entertaining that belief is suspected of a desire to vote the Democratic ticket. I am of opinion, Mr. Speaker, that if the Mormons in Utah would give an indication of their willingness to vote the Republican ticket gentlemen on the other side would bring in a bill here, and "railroad it" through with even more rapidity than we see in the case of this bill, to make a State out of the Territory of Utah. They would then see in the beautiful valley of the Jordan more pictures of beauty and grandeur than were ever before opened to mortal view; they would discover in the Mormon temple at Salt Lake a second temple of Solo-

mon, reared in all its grandeur by an industrious and brave people, who are entitled, it would be claimed, by every consideration of justice to be admitted into the Union, in order to send two Republican Senators to the other branch of Congress and a Republican Representative to this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in dealing with each of these Territories by a separate bill according to the party exigencies of gentlemen on the other side. I believe that the question of admitting a State into the Union should be dis severed from party considerations; that all Territories applying for admission should be treated alike. Therefore I have not opposed the admission of Wyoming; but I have opposed the manner in which this Territory—the smallest in population and resources of all our Territories—is to be admitted first into the Union because it is the most certain to vote the Republican ticket and send to Congress two Republican Senators and a Republican Representative.

The Territory of New Mexico has been organized for over forty years. By a solemn treaty with Mexico when this Territory was brought into the Union we guaranteed to her people at the earliest practicable time all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. For forty years that Territory has been knocking for admission into the Union. At the beginning of this session her Delegate [Mr. JOSEPH] introduced a bill to admit the Territory. That bill is still in the Committee on Territories; and I read in this morning's paper that it had been referred to a subcommittee with the view of taking into consideration the propriety of bringing in an act to provide for admission under the constitution already made, against the wishes of the Delegate, whose bill provides for an enabling act under a proper apportionment.

But gentlemen on the other side seem to be of opinion that the apportionment in the proposed constitution, formulated by a Republican partisan convention last summer, will insure the election of a Republican Legislature and of two Republican United States Senators, by disfranchising, practically, the Democratic voters of that Territory; and if they can invent some plan by which to bring in New Mexico as a Republican State under an iniquitous apportionment bill, disfranchising the Democratic citizens of the Territory, New Mexico will be ushered in as a full-fledged State; otherwise it must be kept in tutelage until it can bring forth "fruits meet for repentance," the assurance that it will vote the Republican ticket!

The convention which framed the proposed constitution of New Mexico was wholly partisan. Democrats did not participate in the election of the delegates. Ex-Governor Edmund G. Ross, of New Mexico, in a letter to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANSUR], dated January 5, 1890, thus exposes the partisan character of the proposed constitution:

Primarily, that refusal was based on the exceeding unfairness of the apportionment fixed in the act of the Legislature authorizing the election of the delegates to the convention. That apportionment made it impossible for the Democrats to elect anything approaching a proportionate representation in that convention. It was so fixed with the avowed purpose, by the reputed author of the convention bill, of preventing such a representation.

Including and since the election of 1882 the popular vote of the Territory for Delegate in Congress has been Democratic by more than 1,500 majority at every election, though by reason of an equally unfair apportionment for the election of members of the Legislature (which was made the basis of the apportionment for the election of the convention), the several Legislatures have uniformly been Republican.

To illustrate that unfairness a few examples will suffice. The counties of Colfax and Mora are contiguous northern counties. At the last general election they cast, respectively, 1,680 and 2,212 votes, or an aggregate of 3,892—Democratic by majorities of 168 and 700 respectively. They were each allowed four delegates in the convention, making eight. The county of Bernalillo is Republican by 430 majority. It has a voting population of 3,564, 328 less than Colfax and Mora, yet was given ten delegates, two more than was allowed the larger number of voters in Colfax and Mora.

The Democratic county of Doña Ana, with 2,015 voters, was allowed three delegates, while the Republican county of Valencia, with 2,054 voters, was allowed six.

The Democratic county of Grant, with 2,297 voters, had three delegates, while the Republican county of Socorro, with 2,524 voters, had six.

These data were before the convention and there can be no justification of these inequalities.

These constitute one-half of the counties and more than one-half the population of the Territory, and fairly illustrate the character of the system of apportionment that has prevailed in the election of our Legislatures and of delegates to this constitutional convention.

To have gone into that election under such conditions would have been folly and suicidal.

The Democrats were practically and intentionally disfranchised, but unwilling to be placed in the attitude of obstructionists until all efforts for a compromise should have failed, it was determined to seek an arrangement whereby this unjust disparity could be at least partially remedied, and they were permitted, without an absolute sacrifice of self-respect, to contest the election of delegates to the convention.

Accordingly a conference between the central committees of the two political parties was asked and had.

The whole number of delegates to the convention was 73. Though in a large majority on the popular vote and believing themselves entitled to and could elect, with a fair apportionment, a corresponding majority of the delegates, the Democratic committee proposed to concede to the Republicans, as the basis of an arrangement under which they would consent to go into the election, a majority of 5 in the convention.

That more than fair proposition was rejected by the Republican committee, and it was then determined to take no part in the election.

It is now proposed by the partisan majority in this House to disregard the fair and just enabling act introduced by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. JOSEPH] and to foist this partisan constitution on

the people of that Territory. The apportionment for the members of the Legislature is based upon substantially the same unequal representation which was adopted for the election of the constitutional convention. Hence it seems that New Mexico, which has more population than Wyoming and Idaho combined, is to be either kept out of the Union or brought in under a constitution which will effectually suppress the Democratic majority in the Territory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have desired, as I have said, that these four Territories, New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho, and Wyoming, should be treated alike; that conventions should be held just as was done in the case of the four States which were brought into the Union by the action of the last Congress—conventions in pursuance of law, the election of delegates and the vote upon the ratification or rejection of the constitution being conducted with proper solemnity of law and under due penalties. In the present case of Wyoming we do not find these conditions met. This movement for the statehood of Wyoming is not based upon any legal enactment either by Congress or of the Territorial Legislature.

The gentlemen on the other side—the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] in opening this case and the Delegate from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]—have stated that the convention was held in pursuance of—what? Of an act of Congress or of the Territorial Legislature? Not at all; but in pursuance of the provisions of a bill which was pending in the Senate of the United States in the last Congress, and which did not pass that body, although the majority there was Republican. And if it was pending in that body during the last Congress and did not pass, I have the right to assume it was the judgment of the Republican majority in that body they did not want to pass it.

The House had already recommended a bill for the admission of Wyoming into the Union, and the Republican Senate had recommended one, and if that Republican majority desired to pass it they would have done so; and gentlemen assign as an excuse for inaugurating the statehood convention without any enactment that there was pending a bill in Congress for that purpose. Why not wait until Congress passes the bill or until the Legislature of the Territory could call a convention and authorize a legal election?

But gentlemen claim there was precedent for this unauthorized calling of the convention. There is no precedent for the movement which has brought this constitution here. In the State of California there was a constitution formed without an enabling act of Congress and without any act of the Territorial Legislature because there was no Territorial government in California. When California was admitted into the Union there was a government there which was a part of the Government of Mexico, and that government came into the Union on the cession of that Territory to the United States.

The SPEAKER. The hour has expired. Does the gentleman desire to continue?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will occupy the remainder of the time allowed to this side of the House.

There was, therefore, established a military government in California, unauthorized, except by the orders of the President of the United States, to supersede the Government of that conquered territory. That military commander, acting on the necessities of the case, called an election for delegates to a constitutional convention. It was called under the sanction of the military power. It was the best and only course that could be pursued. It was warranted by the necessities of the case, that where no government exists some must be instituted. The convention was held, a constitution was formulated, submitted to popular vote, ratified, and a government was set in motion.

A State government in California was running, with both branches of the Legislature, with judges of the circuit and districts courts, and with all the minor officers executing the functions of the law for nearly one year before California was admitted into the Union. That was no precedent for this case. Wyoming had a government authorized by Congress having all the functions of a political entity, of a body politic. It was a government instituted in pursuance of a law of Congress, and there was no pretext or excuse for any portion of the citizens to institute a government hostile to that, and which could have had no validity unless it could supersede the existing government.

The governor, in the case of Wyoming, without any authority of the Legislature, without any authority of Congress, issued a proclamation calling for an election of delegates, and divided the Territory into election districts and prescribed the number of persons to be elected as delegates. That convention was held, a convention which should have been composed of fifty-five members according to the call of the governor, but when the constitution, on the 30th of September last, was signed, there were only thirty-nine members present to affix their names to that instrument.

Gentlemen on the other side have given an excuse for that not quite satisfactory. The delegates wanted to go home, and could not remain to sign their names. I suppose they did want to go home and did not want to remain to sign this constitution.

This constitution was promulgated on the 30th day of September last and submitted to a popular vote without any law authorizing it. There were only thirty-five days after this constitution was submitted

to a vote until it was voted on, namely, on November 5; and at that election but 6,000 people, men and women both voting, came to the polls and voted for the constitution, while 1,900 or nearly 2,000 voted against it. Eight thousand voters participated in the adoption of that constitution. As many illegal votes could have been polled as any one might have chosen to put into the ballot-boxes. It is claimed at one place 300 votes were cast for this constitution in a back room of a drug-store where only three persons participated; and these 300 fraudulent votes are a part of these 6,000 which gave this constitution validity. This fraud was perpetrated in the town of Newcastle, in Crook County, and a cigar-box was used for a ballot-box.

In this way this constitution has come into existence. And I assert again it has no validity, no binding force, no authority whatever, except what may be given to it by Congress. And I want to know whether this House is ready to give it that validity which the law has not given to it up to this time.

I insist this Territory should come into the Union in an orderly way, in pursuance of an act of Congress or of the Territorial Legislature. And in order to secure its admission in an orderly way the minority of the Committee on Territories have proposed some amendments to this bill which ought to be voted on and adopted to-day. I ask gentlemen who are going to vote on these amendments to give them careful consideration by reading the "Views of the minority," where they are set forth at length. The amendments are just in themselves, and I commend them to the favorable action of the House to be adopted in connection with this bill.

The first amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to the effect that instead of the immediate admission of Wyoming under this constitution a convention should be held in pursuance of the law of Congress, an election for members of which shall be held in June next, the convention to assemble in July, and the constitution so framed to be submitted to a vote of the people to be ratified by a majority of the male voters of the Territory over twenty-one years of age, who are otherwise qualified; and that when the constitution as so made is adopted then the same procedure shall take place as was had in regard to the two Dakotas, to Montana, and Washington: that the President of the United States shall issue his proclamation, as in the case of the four States mentioned, and thus bring Wyoming into the Union. This is treating that Territory just as the other four were treated, and certainly Wyoming has no right to claim any other advantage.

Now, I want to ask gentlemen whether any injustice could possibly be done by this arrangement? Under this amendment the Territory of Wyoming can be here as a State when Congress assembles in December next. Is that not time enough for a Territory with not over 70,000 population to be admitted? Is that not time enough when it is the least of the four in population and resources now seeking admission? Why, New Mexico, as I have already stated, has a larger population to-day than both Wyoming and Idaho combined.

I have stated that, in submitting the question of the election of delegates and the ratifying of the constitution by the people, the suffrage should be confined to the male citizens over twenty-one years of age. Why? Because the Congress of the United States has never authorized Wyoming to adopt female suffrage in that Territory. On the contrary, it has been expressly prohibited, and I call the attention of the House to the act passed by Congress for the organization of the Territory, approved on the 25th day of July, 1868. I respectfully request gentlemen to give their attention to the reading of this statute. This is entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Wyoming," and section 5 is as follows:

That every male citizen of the United States, above the age of twenty-one years, including persons who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and shall be residents of said Territory at the time of the passage of this act, shall be entitled to vote at the first and all subsequent elections in the Territory, and shall be eligible to hold any office in said Territory, etc.

And it is further provided—

That the right of suffrage and the right to hold office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States, etc.

That is the enabling act, or rather the act of Congress organizing that Territory. Similar provisions were embodied in the organization of the Territory of Washington, and in that Territory a few years ago a case arose which settles this question as far as precedents are concerned.

The Legislature of the Territory passed a bill authorizing female suffrage. A case arising under that act went to the supreme court of the Territory, and will be found reported in the third volume of Washington Territory Reports, wherein the court held that the word "citizen," in the act establishing the Territory of Washington, which is the same in Wyoming, meant male citizen, and declared the act allowing female suffrage to be unconstitutional.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON], in his remarks on this bill on yesterday, referred to this case, and clearly and forcibly demonstrated that the Territory of Wyoming had violated the law of Congress by allowing female suffrage. I desire to call the attention of the House further to that case.

The case was very fully argued, and a very able and elaborate decision

is reported in the volume to which I have referred, beginning on page 599. The plaintiff in the case was named Nevada M. Bloomer, and the suit was against John Todd, J. E. Gandy, and H. A. Clarke, judges of election. The plaintiff sued the judges of election who had conducted the municipal election at Spokane Falls for refusing to receive her ballot.

In that case the supreme court of Washington held that under the colonial laws, under the English law, and under the law existing when the Constitution was established, as well as under the laws prevailing at the time of the passage of the act organizing the Territory of Washington, it was the universally accepted doctrine that suffrage was confined to male citizens.

In the opinion the court say:

In the State courts a long line of decisions upon the same subject-matter continues to be followed, even though the general sense thus given to the words are not satisfactory to the courts of a later date. The doctrine of *stare decisis* is applicable in its full force within the territorial jurisdiction of the courts making such decisions, and this rule is usually followed because it is deemed better to follow that which is already established rather than reopen a question and thereby disturb rights once adjusted. The construction of statutes and constitutions should be uniform and unvarying. They should not be made to mean to-day one thing and another thing to-morrow or at any subsequent time. If the interpretation or construction put upon it by the court is unsatisfactory, it is, in this country, in the power of the people to obviate the difficulty by a new constitution, or an amendment thereto, or by changing a statute.

It is for this purpose that constitutions are made; that there may be stability in the government which thus furnishes the fundamental law; that varying moods of public opinion, clamors of the populace, or even public sentiment, shall not affect the public law of the land, and thus leave us without any stable and unchanged guide—when the public passions or resentment of the populace might carry the state out upon a sea of revolution, with only passion for a guide.—*Bloomer vs. Todd et al.*, 3 *Washington Territory Reports*, page 614.

And again, referring to the Robinson case, 131 Massachusetts Reports, decided by Chief-Justice Gray, the learned counsel for the election judges in their argument state the law as follows, and this view was fully sustained by the court:

The word "citizen" arose for consideration in that case. The same rule of construction which should be applied here was applied there. The history of the common and statute law is carefully and elaborately stated, showing the relation borne the government by females, both under our own and the English systems, and the conclusion is there reached, as we insist it must be here reached, that, while the law is fully broad enough to include females in its provision, yet it was not so intended, and, therefore, must be limited by judicial construction.—*Id.*, page 607.

The opinion of the supreme court of Washington Territory in the Bloomer case is one of the ablest and most conclusive I have ever read. It is supported by an unbroken line of authorities, in this country and in England, and to every unprejudiced mind it must be regarded as unassailable from any legal or constitutional standpoint.

That decision is supported by other decisions in similar cases; and I call the attention of gentlemen to the case referred to by the counsel in the Bloomer case of Lelia J. Robinson, decided by the supreme court of Massachusetts Mr. Justice Gray, then chief-justice of the supreme court of Massachusetts and now a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, rendering the decision. The court held in that case that an unmarried woman is not entitled to be examined for admission as an attorney and counselor of the court. And why? Because, said Mr. Chief-Justice Gray:

The word "citizen," when used in its most common and most comprehensive sense, doubtless includes women; but a woman is not by virtue of her citizenship vested by the Constitution of the United States or by the constitution of the Commonwealth with any absolute right, independent of legislation, to take part in the government, either as a voter or an officer, or to be admitted to practice as an attorney. (*Minor vs. Happersett*, 21 Wall., 162; *Brodwell vs. Illinois*, 16 Wall., 130.)

And numerous other cases are cited and references given in support of that position.

Again:

By the law of England, which was our law from the first settlement of the country until the American Revolution, the Crown, with all its inherent rights and prerogatives, might indeed descend to a woman or to an infant; but under the degree of a Queen, no woman, married or unmarried, could take part in the government of a state. Women could not sit in the House of Commons or the House of Lords, nor vote for members of Parliament. They could not take part in the administration of justice, either as judges or as jurors, etc.

Mr. STRUBLE. The gentleman thinks that that goes further than the mere question of admission to the bar?

Mr. SPRINGER. That was the question involved, but the court held in its opinion that it applied to voting as well as admission to the bar, and that the language of the Constitution, properly construed, meant male citizens only.

Mr. STRUBLE. And you are satisfied? You rely upon the dictum of the court?

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, the dictum of Mr. Justice Gray in a case properly before the court is, in my opinion, higher authority and better worthy of consideration than the unauthorized action of an unauthorized convention in the Territory of Wyoming.

Mr. STRUBLE. The gentleman means to say that the dictum of a court is more potent than the voice of 100,000 people voting.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman desires to appeal from the su-

preme court of Massachusetts in a case where it gave a unanimous opinion to a town meeting.

Mr. STRUBLE. The voice of 100,000 people in the Territory of Wyoming would have more weight.

Mr. SPRINGER. But 100,000 people did not vote. Only thirty-nine delegates signed the constitution, and only 6,000 voters, male and female, voted for the constitution, and they never considered for a moment the legal or constitutional question involved. The law granting female suffrage was passed by the Territorial Legislature, and the infallibility of such Legislatures has never been claimed.

Mr. Speaker, it has been asserted time and again that there was a severe snow-storm prevailing in that Territory on the day before the election and that this prevented the people from turning out on the day of the election. One would have supposed from the statements made that the elements had broken loose as never before known at that season of the year.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Not now.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I want to—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have in my hand the report of the majority of the committee in this case, and on page 3 I find this statement given by the committee as the reason why there was so small a vote in this Territory on the ratification of this constitution:

The small vote is satisfactorily explained by the memorial accompanying the constitution (Appendix F) and the argument of the Delegate.

First, I will call attention to the memorial which is given as the basis of this statement. The memorial says:

The constitution so framed was submitted as directed, according to the provisions of section 7 of Article XXI thereof, and was ratified by nearly five-sixths of the citizens voting thereon, by a vote small in itself, and yet large in view of the little opposition felt by the people, and of the facts that no other issue was presented, and that the day of the election followed one of the severest snow-storms ever known at that season and was also marked by extreme cold, rendering it practically impossible for the people of many precincts to reach the polls.

That is the statement, gentlemen, of this memorializing committee, indorsed by the majority of the Committee on Territories, and by the Delegate [Mr. CAREY] in his statement to the committee, and published in this report, wherein he stated:

The day being very inclement, a severe snow storm having prevailed the day before the election, no effort was made to get out the vote.

It occurred to me that our friends on the other side had emphasized this snow-storm rather "severely," and I concluded I would call upon the proper officer of the Weather Bureau to find out just what kind of weather they had in Wyoming on the day of election. [Laughter.] I, however, subsequently remembered that the day before election was the day on which this storm is alleged to have taken place.

I wrote to General Greely to get a statement of the weather on the day of the election. In reply General Greely sent me a statement of the weather in Wyoming on the 5th day of November, the day of election. I discovered on a careful examination that the allegation was that it was not the day of the election when the severe snow storm was, but the day before the election, and I wrote another note and asked him to send me the state of the weather on that day, and he has done so, and I will print in the RECORD the two notes I received from General Greely on that subject, and call the attention of the House to the condition of the weather in the Territory of Wyoming as revealed by the officials of the Signal Service Corps, not gotten up for political effect to railroad a constitution through this House. I desired to obtain the cold facts. (I use the word "cold" advisedly, in reference to cold facts.) There were only three stations in Wyoming at which observations could be taken, and I asked for stations in Montana, Salt Lake City, at Rapid City, S. Dak., and at Denver, Colo., and I have both of these statements here. That which is written in the first line of the table is the condition of the weather the day before the election and that which is written in the second line is the weather on the day of the election.

The letters of General Greely are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,

Washington, D. C., March 18, 1890.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg to transmit herewith, as requested in your communication of the 17th instant, a statement of the weather in Wyoming Territory on November 5, 1889.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELY, Chief Signal Officer.

HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER,
House of Representatives, Washington City.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,

Washington, D. C., March 19, 1890.

MY DEAR MR. SPRINGER: I take pleasure in handing you herewith, as requested in your communication of the 18th instant, the additional data from November 4, 1889, for certain stations in Wyoming and contiguous territory.

Very respectfully,

A. W. GREELY, Chief Signal Officer.

HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER,
House of Representatives, Washington City.

The statement of the state of the weather in Wyoming Territory, etc., is as follows:

Table showing the observed maximum and minimum temperature; velocity, in miles, and direction of the wind; precipitation, in inches, and character of the weather at 8 a. m. and 8 p. m. (seventy-fifth meridian time) on November 4 and 5, 1889, at the stations specified.

[NOTE.—The figures and words in the first line in each brace are for the day before the election.]

Stations.	Temperature.				Wind.				Precipitation in inches.			Character of weather.	
	8 a. m.		8 p. m.		8 a. m.		8 p. m.		8 a. m.	8 p. m.	Total.	8 a. m.	8 p. m.
	8 a. m.	8 p. m.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Velocity.	Direction.	Velocity.	Direction.					
Cheyenne, Wyo.....	1.6	7.2	25	1	5	N. W.	3	N. E.	0	0	0	Cloudless	Cloudless.
Fort McKinney, Wyo.....	7.5	16.0	30	5	8	W.	4	W.	0	0	0do	Do.
Fort Washakie, Wyo.....	14.0	20.0	22	10	6	W.	3	S.	.06	0	.06do	Do.
Fort Custer, Mont.....	30.0	36.0	47	15	3	W.	4	W.	0	0	0do	Do.
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	9.0	17.0	28	8	2	S. W.	4	S. W.	0	0	0do	Do.
Rapid City, S. Dak.....	21.0	28.0	35	7	0	0	2	S. W.	0	0	0do	Do.
Denver, Colo.....	14.0	30.0	36	12	4	S. E.	11	S. W.	†T.	0	†T.do	Do.
	31.5	41.0	54	22	3	S. W.	11	S. W.	0	0	0do	Do.
	33.0	37.0	44	30	8	E.	5	S. E.	0	0	0do	Do.
	32.0	39.0	45	27	1	S. E.	7	S. E.	0	0	0do	Do.
	17.6	20.2	30	16	8	N. E.	7	S. W.	*.01	†T.	*.01do	Do.
	28.2	36.4	55	11	8	W.	1	N. W.	0	0	0do	Do.
	21.6	22.1	30	20	5	N.	3	W.	*.01	†T.	*.01do	Do.
	4.2	17.1	32	3	5	S.	7	S.	0	0	0do	Do.

* Melted snow. † T. indicates trace of precipitation.

SIGNAL OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON CITY, March 18, 1890; March 19, 1890.

Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, House of Representatives, Washington City.

A MEMBER. What was the state of the weather?

Mr. SPRINGER. At Cheyenne, Wyo., the capital of the Territory, the day before the election the maximum temperature was 25° above zero; at 8 p. m. it was 7.2° above zero. The maximum temperature on the day of the election was 30°.

Mr. CAREY. Where was that?

Mr. SPRINGER. At Cheyenne.

Mr. CAREY. I want to state that in the southern part of the Territory this has been the worst winter ever known.

Mr. SPRINGER. I prefer to take the report of the Weather Bureau to your statement, because I am going to discredit your statement about the weather at that time.

Mr. CAREY. That was in the southeast corner of the Territory.

Mr. COVERT. That was "the winter of their discontent."

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, it seems to have been "the winter of their discontent," but you will see before I get through that it was made "glorious summer" by the official reports of the Signal Service Corps. The temperature went up to 25° by noon on the day before the election and on the day of the election the temperature was 30° above, which would not be considered very cold in a dry atmosphere. In other parts of the Territory the thermometer indicated 46° above zero on the day of the election.

Now, as to the storm of wind blowing. At 8 o'clock in the morning at Cheyenne it was blowing at 5 miles an hour and at 8 o'clock in the evening it was blowing at 3 miles an hour. At other stations in the Territory there was a dead calm or a velocity of 2 miles an hour. [Laughter.]

At 8 o'clock in the morning the weather at Cheyenne was "cloudless" and at 8 o'clock in the evening there was a "cloudless" sky. On the day of the election it was even warmer than this, and even more cloudless and if possible a less velocity of wind. At Fort McKinney, in the northern part of the Territory, there was snow at 8 a. m. on the day before the election to the extent of six-one-hundredths of an inch. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAREY. Fort McKinney is the lowest part of—

Mr. SPRINGER. I will show you what your statement is worth. At Fort McKinney the precipitation was .06 of an inch, and the weather was cloudless the whole of the day before the election. [Laughter.] At Fort Washakie the thermometer went up in the course of the day to 28° above zero. The weather at Washakie was cloudless on the day of the election, and no precipitation whatever. [Renewed laughter.] It was cloudless nearly all the way through, as you will see by this statement, till we get down to Rapid City, in South Dakota, where the thermometer at 8 o'clock a. m. on the day before election registered 17.6, and at 8 o'clock p. m. 20.2, and where we found by meteorological observation a trace of snow—one-hundredth part of an inch of snow had fallen. [Laughter.]

There was a fierce gale blowing at the rate of 1 mile an hour at 8 p. m. the day before the election. [Renewed laughter.] The thermometer went up to 55° on the day of the election.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Has not the snow melted since it came into the hands of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; but your facts have melted away in view of the official reports. [Laughter.]

So that this great, severe snow-storm that kept all these people from the polls, this tremendous breeze that kept the people in their homes the day of the election and prevented them from voting, has dwindled down, when confronted with the official reports on the weather, to a gale blowing at the rate of 1 mile an hour, and the severe snow-storm to a trace of melted snow. [Renewed laughter.] These are the facts in the case.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Will the gentleman state the extent of that Territory in miles from one extreme to the other.

Mr. SPRINGER. These observations were taken at Cheyenne, at Fort McKinney, at Fort Washakie, in the Territory, and at Fort Custer, in Montana, at Salt Lake City, at Rapid City, at Denver, at all the stations in the Territory and all those around it. So that Wyoming was not only not in the midst of a snow-storm, but the surrounding country, as appears from these figures, was free from storms or severe cold. In Idaho, the Territory immediately west and northwest of Wyoming, there were 14,000 votes polled on November 5. There was as severe a storm there as there was in Wyoming.

The storm was not so severe as to keep the people of Idaho from the polls. Nothing of the kind. Now, Mr. Speaker, I assert that all this talk about a snow-storm keeping the people of Wyoming away from the polls has been exploded by these facts, and this shows the false pretenses that have been resorted to to get this House to give vitality to a constitution which the people of Wyoming refused to indorse. The people regarded that election as a farce and did not attend the polls. They were kept away from the polls, not by storms, but by their own disinclination to attend.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Not now; my time is too limited. The gentleman will excuse me. Now, we are asked to accept this constitution, which received but 6,000 votes, although the Delegate from Wyoming insists that there are 20,000 voters in the Territory and 100,000 people. Are those 100,000 people and those 20,000 voters in the Territory to have a constitution forced upon them by Congress, which received the sanction of only 6,000 votes, men and women both voting, and which can have no legal sanction whatever except what is given to it by this House and by the other House of Congress? I want to know whether we are prepared to accept a constitution which is so radical in its provisions and which has been gotten up in the manner I have pointed out.

Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to some of the provisions of this constitution briefly, because my time is short. The article on the question of suffrage, to which I take exception and which has been incorporated into this constitution, is as follows:

The rights of the citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges.

And in the bill of rights it is declared that suffrage is an inherent and inalienable right. I have shown, I think, already that the Territory of Wyoming had no right to admit women to the franchise in that Territory. They had no right to admit them, and hence the amendment which I propose. We do not deny the right of a State, properly constituted, to change its constitution and adopt female suffrage, but it must be done by the male voters, who are alone author-

ized to vote in all the States of the Union and who are alone authorized by the law of Congress to vote in the Territory of Wyoming. We insist, therefore, that this Territory must come into the Union in the regular way.

The first amendment we propose provides for the election of a convention to be composed of delegates elected in the usual way, just as was done in the cases of the two Dakotas and of Montana and Washington, and the submission of the constitution to the people. Then, if in this way, through the action of the male voters, they choose to have female suffrage, it will be their business and not ours. But I deny your right to force it upon them, just as you threaten to do by the passage of this bill.

There is no State in the Union whose constitution contains such a provision as this. No gentleman upon either side can predict the consequences which will come to this country if this principle is admitted into the constitution of one of the States of this Union, and I ask you to move slowly and deliberately before you take this radical departure from the policy of the fathers, from the policy which prevails in all the enlightened governments of the world. Before you depart from the settled convictions of the civilized governments of the world and plunge into a new and untried system of suffrage, I ask you at least to pause and give the subject that fair and deliberate consideration to which it is entitled.

We also offer another amendment, in case the first is voted down, to resubmit this constitution to the people at an election to be held under authority of law, where illegal voting can be prevented, an election to be held next November, at which the people shall vote for State officers, and at the same time shall vote "for female suffrage" or "against female suffrage," "for the eligibility of women to hold office and to sit on juries" or "against the eligibility of women to hold office and to sit on juries." If the majority of the people vote for the constitution, then the State is to be admitted upon that vote, as in the cases of the two Dakotas and Washington and Montana; and if they vote against female suffrage or against the eligibility of women to hold office and to sit on juries, then and in that event the constitution is to be amended in accordance with the vote and the will of the people so expressed. Can anything be more fair and reasonable than that?

If this amendment is rejected, we submit a third amendment, by which it is proposed to strike out the provision in the constitution granting female suffrage and confine the suffrage to males, and submit the amended constitution to the people, and if they vote "for the amended constitution," then and in that event the State shall come into the Union under that constitution without further action of Congress.

These are the amendments which we propose, and I assure you, gentlemen, that we have not delay in view. We have simply in view the orderly method of procedure in matters of this kind. Surely the question of admitting a State into this Union is one worthy of the careful and mature thought of this House and of the country. We ask you to proceed in this case in the careful, deliberate, orderly way in which we proceeded to the admission of States which came into the Union in the last Congress. We ask you to treat Wyoming now and Idaho afterwards just as we treated the four States which came in last year, and which were very glad to come in under that method. We ask you to deal justly with the people of Wyoming, and not force the constitution upon them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the admission of all these Territories into the Union. I do not agree with some of my colleagues who are opposed to admitting them now. I believe the time has come in the march of events when the power of this Union should move westward. These new States are coming here to vote for unlimited coinage of the silver dollar and I welcome them for that purpose. They are coming here to vote for an honest revision of the tariff, in the interest of the people of the whole country, and I welcome them here for that purpose. They are coming here to vote down the trusts and the great monopolies that are grinding the life-blood out of the people of the West, and I welcome them here for that purpose.

They are coming here in the near future, Mr. Speaker, however much you may count upon their votes now, to take their places with the other Democratic States of the Union, and I do not want to retard them a moment. Let them come. The sooner they come here the better it will be for the country, and I welcome them to an equality with the other States of the Union. But, Mr. Speaker, I insist that they must come in in a regular, fair, and orderly way, in a way which will voice the sentiment of the people, and not come in to meet a partisan exigency. We should not tie the hands of the people and prevent the legal expression of their will—

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOREY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he sits down. I desire to ask him as a member of the committee this question: The minority has made three several recommendations of amendments to this bill. Now, I desire to ask the gentleman if the minority propose any amendment except those which look to the striking out of the clause in this constitution granting female suffrage and the clause making ability to read the Constitution a condition of voting. Do you make any other recommendations than those?

Mr. SPRINGER. We do. We recommend the submission of the whole question to the people, at an election to be held in pursuance of an act of Congress, at which delegates will be elected to a constitutional convention, which will frame an entirely new constitution, and this whole instrument now before Congress be swept away, as it ought to be, in my judgment, in order to give the people a chance to make their own constitution, instead of having one forced upon them.

Mr. MOREY. But is there any single amendment proposed by the minority to strike out anything else except what I have stated?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes!

Mr. MOREY. I say there is not.

Mr. SPRINGER. We propose to wipe it all out, and failing in that we propose to resubmit the constitution already framed to the people, apart from the question of female suffrage, which is to be submitted separately. If this amendment should fail we propose to strike female suffrage from the constitution and resubmit the amended constitution to the people for ratification or rejection.

Mr. Speaker, there were some other matters to which I desired to call attention, but my time having expired I can not do so. I thank the House for the kind attention I have received.

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to occupy nearly all of the time remaining to this side, but I understand there are several gentlemen who wish a few minutes each, and I therefore ask the Chair to call time on me when I shall have spoken twelve minutes.

Mr. Speaker, no one can say much on a great question like this in so short a time, but I wish, first, to direct attention briefly to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES], my colleague on the Committee on Territories, who has cited the only authority presented here, according to my present recollection, going in the direction of a condemnation of the movement and action of the people of Wyoming in the steps they have taken looking to the admission of that Territory into the Union, and hereafter will, if time permits, consider one or more other points of interest.

The gentleman cited an authority found in 7 Howard, the Rhode Island case (Luther, plaintiff in error, *vs.* Borden *et al.*), and he read from the argument of Mr. Webster, who was one of the attorneys for the defendant in error. He did not read from Mr. Webster, the great constitutional lawyer and statesman, speaking in the Senate of the United States or delivering an opinion as a jurist, but from Daniel Webster speaking as the paid attorney of one of the parties to the suit.

I admit, sir, that the language of Mr. Webster, speaking only as a paid attorney, is entitled to great respect and consideration at our hands; but when we consider the facts in that noted trial, to which I will briefly advert, it will be seen that the opinion of Mr. Webster can not be properly claimed to be in conflict with the principles that are applicable to the case before the House.

Now, what were the facts in that case? They were that, in opposition to the old chartered government, in opposition to the steps taken by that government to have a new constitution framed, in opposition to the resolution passed by the legal authorities and constituted government of Rhode Island, certain citizens of that State, for their own reasons and clearly in violation of established government, undertook to have a constitution framed and adopted. They proceeded, in violence and in clear revolution, to overthrow the established authority of the State government which, in earlier and later form, ran back to 1663.

In other words, by a violent movement, assuming they had the authority, against the established government and law of their State, they sought to erect a constitution in opposition to, and in overthrow of, the legally existing one. Mr. Webster was on the side of the State government, and of course took the position which the State authorities maintained in opposition to the purpose of those citizens who, without sanction of law and against law, proposed to establish a new constitution.

Is there any parallel, I ask members of this House, I ask the gentleman from Georgia, between the Rhode Island case and the peaceable, orderly movement of one hundred thousand people in Wyoming in the direction, not of revolution, Mr. Speaker, but of evolution, from Territorial bondage toward the flag and the Constitution of the Federal Government, toward a rightful and equal participation in governmental affairs, the highest aim and the dearest political right of American freemen?

Is there an analogy between this case cited by my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] and this community out upon the plains with a population of 100,000 people gathered from all sections, from colleges, from farms, from ranches, from all of the avocations of life, enterprising, intelligent, loyal? Yet here this community which, in the spirit of patriotism, in the spirit of honest desire, seeks to become one of the States of this Union, must be characterized by such gentlemen as my colleague on the committee, Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois, as proceeding in violation of law and of the Constitution, as guilty of violent and revolutionary conduct. Such a position as this can not be too strongly condemned.

If these people were acting in opposition to the law of Congress, if there were in the statute-book a single sentence in condemnation of

this manner of proceeding, if Congress had ever pronounced against woman suffrage, if Congress had ever pronounced against compulsory education, if Congress had ever inveighed against educational qualifications of electors, if Congress had put in the way of this peaceable proceeding any section of law, I would have felt it my duty to act otherwise than I have; but nowhere in the statute-book, nowhere in the Constitution or laws can be found anything which says to that people or any other of similar situation, "You shall not put yourselves in harmonious relations with the States of the Union. You shall not by public, peaceable, and orderly methods, such as the people of Wyoming adopted, be permitted respectful and successful hearing at the hands of the Congress of the United States in an honorable attempt to gain admission as a State.

Now, we are told that woman suffrage is not to be allowed in Wyoming, and I wish to speak briefly to this point. It is conceded by gentlemen on the other side that not a line is to be found in the Constitution denying to Wyoming the right to establish woman suffrage. It is conceded a State admitted into the Union may properly provide for woman suffrage. If it is constitutional, then, for a State already admitted to provide for female suffrage, as a legal proposition it is competent here and now for Congress to permit this community of 100,000 people, acting peaceably and deliberately, to form their constitution admitting women in that new State to the elective franchise. There is no escape from this legal proposition.

What then have we to do? Shall we, as the gentleman from Illinois would have us do, send this constitution back with the condemnation of the House of Representatives, with the condemnation of the Congress of the United States, and say to Wyoming, "You shall not come into the Union until you take care that no innovation is made in reference to the right of suffrage; you shall not come in until you condemn the right of women to vote; you shall not come in until you have first condemned that which for years you have allowed and approved?"

Mr. Speaker, for nearly a quarter of a century the people of this Territory have had woman suffrage within their borders. It has been demonstrated to their satisfaction. The women of Wyoming have for about twenty years exercised the right of suffrage; have gone to the polls and deposited their ballots. They have served on juries. They have answered all reasonable demands of citizenship in their experience as electors under Territorial law, and because of these facts the men of the Territory, uniting without reference to party, have consented to the provisions continuing to them the right of suffrage.

It is now properly in their constitution for future State government, and placed there by the deliberate act of a constitutional convention composed of men only, Democrats and Republicans, and with but one dissenting voice. They ask that it may remain in and continue a part of their constitution, and I maintain it is our duty to permit the people of Wyoming, irrespective of our individual views, to settle this question for themselves now and hereafter. Congress has not in all these twenty years pronounced against the right of female suffrage in Wyoming; has never by statute expressed disapproval of the legislation of that Territory conferring this privilege, and shall we now, after so long a time, after full knowledge of what the people of that Territory have done in allowing women to participate in the suffrage—shall we now, when this constitution of State government is presented, deny this right granted in that constitution? I insist it comes with bad grace from gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, after this long acquiescence, to say, "We will not have you as a member of this Union of States unless you will go back on your record, unless you will repeal your laws, unless you will change your constitution, unless you will narrow down the scope of republicanism, of true democracy, and limit the right of suffrage in Wyoming, in opposition to the will of the people, to men alone."

Are we then willing to record here and now that we deny the constitutional right of a loyal, intelligent body of American citizens, living under Territorial form, to frame a constitution in accordance with their highest and best judgment, that instrument containing not a single proposition which can rightly be condemned as un-republican? I am unwilling to assume this attitude. I am unwilling to make such a record. I am unwilling thus to condemn the highest principle of local self-government.

To sustain this constitution, to recognize this right of the people in the Territories to decide for themselves these local questions, in no manner commits any of us to the abstract principle of female suffrage. We do not by affirmative action on this measure assert that we favor the extension of this suffrage to other States.

We do no more than affirm our allegiance to the Constitution of our country, which contemplates that the people of each State, old or new, may ordain their own constitutional forms, they being republican in character. We declare that we will not, because we may differ as to the wisdom of a policy clearly admissible and proper in a constitutional sense, force upon the people of a new State our individual views; and while we may disapprove certain propositions in this instrument, this disapproval may not and should not lead us in the least to hesitate when passing on a question of highest privilege to the citizens of a State or Territory.

As a member of this House and as a member of the Committee on

the Territories, the majority of whom are responsible for the favorable recommendation on this bill, it affords me more than ordinary gratification to believe there will be no hesitation with members on this side the Chamber in voting for the admission of the Territory of Wyoming on this constitution.

Her people have been long in Territorial condition; they have proven their capacity for intelligent and successful State government; they have made satisfactory exhibit of material conditions assuring us that within her borders are inexhaustible resources to sustain a large permanent population; they have given abundant evidence of their progressive Americanism, of their devotion to our forms of Government, and now they stand in dignified but respectful manliness and womanliness at the doors of our great American Union and pray that exalted but constitutional boon, the right to be of us and with us in all the further great and grand development awaiting the mightiest Republic on which the sun ever shone. Let us answer them as becomes their equals. [Applause.]

Mr. BAKER. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the question of the introduction of new States into the Union has always been a question of political power and political action. It has so happened that from the very beginning of this Government, at least as far back as the memory of men now living extends, the Democratic party, since the downfall of slavery, since it attempted to use the introduction of States to keep up the political power of slavery on this continent, has always opposed the admission of new States into the Union. And especially has the Democratic party had its eye of unqualified vengeance and opposition upon the introduction of every State that has been carved out of that magnificent territory over which the ægis of the great declaration of liberty, the ordinance of 1787, was cast. Hostility, either open and declared, as now, or covert and insinuating, as in the Fiftieth Congress, has always been the policy of the Democratic party.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], a member of the Committee on Territories, who has succeeded, by some process of which I am not acquainted, in having himself embalmed in a great publication as having achieved the most remarkable feat of parliamentary work ever accomplished on this continent, in securing the admission of the Dakotas, Washington, and Montana, was one of the most insidious, persistent, and unrelenting enemies of the admission of either of these magnificent States into the Union; and he was driven ultimately, by the breaking down of the solid front of his own side under the leadership of the gallant gentleman from New York, whose vacancy here I so much regret, to change front.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was here myself, and I know exactly what was done.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then the gentleman does not state what was done. Mr. GROSVENOR. The scheme under which one of the Dakotas was passed in this House was a scheme to defeat ultimately the result that we worked out; and when the bill came back from the Senate with all four of the States in it, which proposition had been offered as a Republican measure, the break that was made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] alone made such a break on that side as enabled us to concur in the action of the Senate, and thus we admitted the four new States.

Now, it is said that by this action, proposed here to-day, we are to commit ourselves to the doctrine of female suffrage now existing by law in the Territory of Wyoming. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement what has been so well said by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE], by referring to this legal proposition: Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is there any condition made in regard to the qualification of an elector, except that we forbid any State in the Union to deprive any person of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Beyond that, every question of the qualification of the voter is left to the State itself.

Now, then, what do we do in the case of Wyoming that is practically different from the case of the two Dakotas and Montana? In the case of these States we admitted them with constitutions that conferred suffrage solely upon males, and not females, but to-day either one of these States may change its constitution, without any consent by or consultation with the General Government, and confer suffrage upon the women of those States. So that we have never undertaken to put up a barrier against the power of the State to confer suffrage upon anybody, but have simply forbidden them to withdraw suffrage from the colored people or refuse to confer suffrage upon any man, otherwise qualified, by reason of race or color. So the State of Wyoming, when it comes into the Union under that constitution allowing female suffrage, a provision recognized in the Constitution, would have power to change it the next day, without notice to the General Government and without its consent.

The other States that have come in with exclusive male suffrage in their constitutions have the power to change these provisions to-day or to-morrow or any day that they see proper. A vote here, therefore, for the admission of Wyoming can not be construed by any possi-

ble logic into a vote in favor of the doctrine of female suffrage, a doctrine which, I wish to say in this connection, I am not at all alarmed about, so far as I am personally concerned. But my vote here can never fairly or justly be considered or understood to mean that in accepting this constitution I voted in favor of female suffrage. But the admission of Wyoming is a political question, and the Republican party on this floor is not afraid of it and ought not to be afraid to meet and dispose of it. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes remaining for the debate, I wish to call the attention of the House to the situation as to the proposed State of Wyoming. Wyoming asks admission under the constitution which is presented here and is before this House, desiring no other privileges than have been conferred upon each of the other States on their admission to the Union. She comes asking to be admitted upon an equality with the other States, under a bill and with a constitution which fit each other; the constitution fits the bill and the bill fits the constitution completely and in all particulars.

It has been said by gentlemen on the other side, so many of whom have been agonizing in spasms about this matter for the last twenty-four hours—by my honored friend from Alabama [Mr. OATES]—that it is going to result in breaking down this great Republic; that we are going to abdicate in favor of women in the government of this land. My friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] says that it is an innovation on things; that it is a purely Republican measure; that this bill had better be changed in its title and made to read, "A bill to increase the electoral vote in favor of the Republican candidate for President in 1892." My good friend from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO] seems to think it is to overturn and overthrow the whole system of land laws of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to all of these gentlemen and to this House that the bill is exactly, in its land provisions, like all the bills, in respect of those things providing for the admission of the other States, that have been passed by Congress heretofore. Suppose we defeat the bill—this Republican measure, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] calls it—what is the result? Why, the result is a Democratic victory, according to my friend. If the bill prevails and Wyoming comes into the Union, as she has a constitutional right to do, then, according to my friend, it is a Republican triumph, and Republicanism is guaranteed, under a republican constitution, to a great State, which is now ready to perform the full functions of statehood and enter upon its duties as a member of the Union in conjunction with all her sister States.

My good friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] in his minority report says that they do not care to put in the way of Wyoming any obstructions to immediate admission; and yet he has fought the bill from its introduction up to this time with all the power at his command.

He did the same thing during the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses as to the Dakotas. During both those Congresses he stood here upon this floor insisting with great earnestness at one time that Dakota was entitled to admission into the Union only as a whole, and then he turned square around and insisted that it should be divided upon the Missouri River line and that line extended to the Canadian frontier.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BAKER. I am not mistaken. For thirteen years the Democratic party stood solidly against the admission of the two Dakotas, until, forsooth, they could hook on Montana and Washington, under the expectation that two Democratic States would be secured to offset the two Dakotas, which it was thought would be Republican. But they did not get the two Democratic States. Of course our Democratic friends think they may still secure the Democratic Senators from Montana. [Laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. You beat us.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, in spite of all unrighteous opposition the Republicans have prevailed in the State of Montana, and have secured their Senators, very much to the regret of my friend from Illinois, notwithstanding his opposition to the Dakotas. Following the record made during ten years of consistent opposition to the Dakotas, he has had himself written up as being their firmest friend. In the Magazine of Poetry he is already embalmed in history as the one person entitled to all credit for the admission of the four States last admitted. Hear what he has procured to be said of himself. I read from the July number of the Magazine of Poetry, page 331:

The Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, of Illinois, the distinguished member of Congress who for many years has ably represented the district which once sent Abraham Lincoln to the National House, and whose name will go to the future crowned with honor, as he was author and manager of the bill by which the two Dakotas, Montana, and Washington were admitted to statehood—a parliamentary triumph without a precedent.

[Cries of "Hear!" "Hear!" and laughter.]

The Magazine of Poetry, Mr. Speaker. It is wonderful.

Mr. MOREY. I desire to know whether that is accompanied with a chromo. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I say that the position of my friend from Illinois has not been inconsistent. Emerson says that "consistency is a bugbear to men of small minds;" but consistency is not a bugbear to my friend from Illinois. He stands here now and wants the Democratic party to be solid with him against the admission of Wy-

oming when not a voice is heard from Wyoming from the Democratic party, from the Republican party, or from anybody in opposition to the admission of that State to-day.

In a little while the Magazine of Poetry will no doubt record him as the faithful advocate of Wyoming.

Such is the attitude of my friend from Illinois, which I firmly believe is not dictated or supported by the solid Democratic party in this country or in this House. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to Wyoming, we owe it to ourselves that she shall be admitted upon the constitution which they have adopted, and that we shall not undertake to dictate to them what they shall have in their constitution or what they shall not have. They have the right to frame a constitution which shall be republican in form. This they have done. We do not propose to vote it up nor do we propose to vote it down, but we simply vote in favor of Wyoming's right of local self-government, a right guaranteed by the Constitution to every community and to every State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the Clerk will read the special order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the previous question is considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is now ordered, and the House is pursuing the order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not surprised that the gentleman desires to cut off amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is not in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am aware of that. But I now send to the Clerk's desk and move the adoption of the first amendment recommended by the minority of the Committee on the Territories.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out sections 1 and 2 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following, and number the other sections accordingly:

"Sec. 1. That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Wyoming, as at present described, may become the State of Wyoming, as hereinafter provided.

"Sec. 2. That all male persons who shall have resided within the limits of said proposed State for sixty days, and are otherwise qualified by the laws of said Territory to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly thereof, are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory; and the qualifications for delegates to such convention shall be such as, by the laws of said Territory, persons are required to possess to be eligible to the Legislative Assembly thereof; and the aforesaid delegates to form said convention shall be apportioned among the several counties within the limits of the proposed State, in proportion to the aggregate number of votes in each of said counties for Delegate in Congress at the election held in said Territory on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1888. One delegate shall be allowed for every 300 votes cast in each county and one delegate for any fraction of 150 votes cast in each county. That said apportionment shall be made by the governor, the chief justice, and the United States attorney of said Territory; and the governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order an election of the delegates aforesaid in said Territory to be held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in June, 1890, which proclamation shall be issued within thirty days after the passage of this act; and such election shall be conducted, the returns made, the result ascertained, and the certificates to persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of the said Territory regulating elections therein for Delegate to Congress. All male persons resident in said proposed State, who are qualified voters of said Territory, as herein provided, shall be entitled to vote upon the election of delegates, and upon the ratification or rejection of the constitution, under such rules and regulation as said convention may prescribe, not in conflict with this act, but no educational qualification shall be required of voters at either of said elections.

"Sec. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the 4th day of July, 1890, and after organization shall declare, on behalf of the people of said proposed State, that they adopt the Constitution of the United States; whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State. The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, except as to Indians not taxed, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State:

"First, that perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested, in person or property, on account of his or her mode of religious worship;

"Second, that the people inhabiting said proposed State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof, and to all lands lying within said limits owned or held by any Indian or Indian tribes; and that until the title thereto shall have been extinguished by the United States the same shall be and remain subject to the disposition of the United States, and said Indian lands shall remain under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the Congress of the United States; that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without the State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands belonging to residents thereof; that no taxes shall be imposed by the State on lands or property therein belonging to or which may hereafter be purchased by the United States or reserved for its use; but nothing herein, or in the ordinance herein provided for, shall preclude the said State from taxing, as other lands are taxed, any lands owned or held by any Indian who has severed his tribal relations, and has obtained from the United States or from any person a title thereto by patent or other grant, save and except such lands as have been or may be granted to any Indian or Indians under any act of Congress containing a provision exempting the lands thus granted from taxation; but said ordinance shall provide that all such lands shall be exempt from taxation by said State so long and to such extent as such act of Congress may prescribe;

"Third, that the debts and liabilities of said Territory shall be assumed and paid by the said State; and

"Fourth, that provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

"Sec. 4. That in case a constitution and State government shall be formed in compliance with the provisions of this act, the convention forming the same shall provide by ordinance for submitting said constitution to the people of said State for their ratification or rejection, at an election to be held in said Territory on the Tuesday after the first Monday of November, 1890, at which election the qualified voters of said proposed State shall vote directly for or against the proposed constitution, and for or against any provisions separately submitted. The returns of said election shall be made to the secretary of said Territory, who, with the governor and chief-justice thereof, or any two of them, shall canvass the same; and if a majority of the legal votes cast on that question shall be for the constitution, the governor shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon and upon separate articles or propositions, and a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions, and ordinances. And if the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form and if all the provisions of this act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election, and thereupon the proposed State of Wyoming shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union under and by virtue of this act on an equal footing with the original States from and after the date of said proclamation: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall, in any wise, interfere with the right and ownership of the United States to the Yellowstone National Park reservation and the exclusive control over the same by the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 131, nays 138, not voting 60; as follows:

YEAS—131.

Abbott,	Crain,	Lane,	Rogers,
Alderson,	Crisp,	Lanham,	Rowland,
Allen, Miss.	Culbertson, Tex.	Lawler,	Rusk,
Anderson, Miss.	Cummings,	Lee,	Sayers,
Andrew,	Dargan,	Lester, Ga.	Seney,
Bankhead,	Davidson,	Lester, Va.	Sherman,
Barnes,	Dibble,	Lewis,	Shively,
Barwig,	Dockery,	Malsh,	Spinola,
Biggs,	Dunnell,	Martin, Ind.	Springer,
Blanchard,	Dunphy,	Martin, Tex.	Stewart, Ga.
Bland,	Edmunds,	McAduo,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Elliott,	McClammy,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Ellis,	McClellan,	Stone, Ky.
Briekner,	Enloe,	McCreary,	Stone, Mo.
Brookshire,	Fitch,	McRae,	Stump,
Brown, J. B.	Fithian,	Mills,	Tarsney,
Brunner,	Flower,	Montgomery,	Tillman,
Buchanan, Va.	Forman,	Moore, Tex.	Tracey,
Buckalew,	Forney,	Morgan,	Tucker,
Bullock,	Fowler,	Mutchler,	Venable,
Bynum,	Geissenhainer,	Oates,	Walker, Mo.
Campbell,	Gibson,	O'Ferrall,	Washington,
Carlisle,	Goodnight,	O'Neil, Mass.	Wheeler, Ala.
Carlton,	Grimes,	Outhwaite,	Whiting,
Catchings,	Hare,	Owens, Ohio	Wike,
Chipman,	Hatch,	Parrett,	Wilkinson,
Clancy,	Hayes,	Peel,	Willcox,
Clarke, Ala.	Haynes,	Pennington,	Williams, Ill.
Clements,	Heard,	Pierce,	Wilson, Mo.
Clunie,	Herbert,	Price,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cobb,	Holman,	Reilly,	Wise,
Cooper, Ind.	Hooker,	Richardson,	Yoder.
Covert,	Kilgore,	Robertson,	

NAYS—138.

Adams,	Connell,	Laidlaw,	Reed, Iowa
Anderson, Kans.	Cooper, Ohio	Laws,	Reyburn,
Arnold,	Craig,	Lehlbach,	Rife,
Atkinson, Pa.	Culbertson, Pa.	Lodge,	Rockwell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Cutcheon,	Mason,	Rowell,
Baker,	Dalzell,	McComas,	Russell,
Banks,	Darlington,	McCord,	Sawyer,
Bartine,	Dingley,	McCormick,	Scul,
Bayne,	Dolliver,	McKenna,	Simonds,
Beckwith,	Dorsey,	McKinley,	Smith, Ill.
Belden,	Ewart,	Milliken,	Smith, W. Va.
Belknap,	Farquhar,	Moffitt,	Smyser,
Bergen,	Featherston,	Moore, N. H.	Snider,
Bingham,	Flick,	Morey,	Stewart, Vt.
Bliss,	Frank,	Morrill,	Stivers,
Boothman,	Funston,	Morrow,	Stockbridge,
Boutelle,	Gear,	Morse,	Struble,
Bowden,	Gest,	Mudd,	Taylor, E. B.
Brewer,	Greenhalge,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, Ill.
Brower,	Grosvenor,	Nute,	Thomas,
Browne, Va.	Grouit,	O'Donnell,	Thomson, Colo.
Buchanan, N. J.	Hall,	O'Neil, Pa.	Townsend, Pa.
Burton,	Hansbrough,	Osborne,	Turner, Kans.
Butterworth,	Harmer,	Owen, Ind.	Vandever,
Candler, Mass.	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Walker, Mass.
Cannon,	Hermann,	Payson,	Wallace, Mass.
Carter,	Hill,	Perkins,	Wallace, N. Y.
Caswell,	Hit,	Peters,	Watson,
Cesadde,	Kelley,	Pickler,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cheatham,	Kennedy,	Post,	Williams, Ohio
Clark, Wis.	Kerr, Iowa	Pugsley,	Wilson, Wash.
Cogswell,	Ketcham,	Quackenbush,	Wright,
Coleman,	Kinsey,	Raines,	Yardley,
Comstock,	Lacey,	Randall, Mass.	
Conger,	La Follette,	Ray,	

NOT VOTING—60.

Allen, Mich.	Candler, Ga.	Flood,	Kerr, Pa.
Blount,	Caruth,	Gifford,	Knapp,
Boatner,	Cothran,	Haugen,	Lansing,
Brosius,	Cowles,	Hemphill,	Lind,
Browne, T. M.	De Haven,	Henderson, Ill.	Magner,
Bunn,	De Lano,	Henderson, N. C.	Mansur,
Burrows,	Evans,	Hopkins,	McCarthy,
Caldwell,	Finley,	Houk,	McMillin,

Miles,	Randall, Pa.	Swaney,	Van Schaick,
Norton,	Sanford,	Taylor, J. D.	Wade,
O'Neal, Ind.	Scranton,	Taylor, Tenn.	Whithorne,
Paynter,	Skinner,	Thompson,	Wickham,
Perry,	Spooner,	Turner, Ga.	Wilber,
Phelan,	Stahlnecker,	Turner, N. Y.	Wiley,
Quinn,	Stephenson,	Turpin,	Wilson, Ky.

So the amendment was rejected.

The following-named members were announced as paired until further notice:

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina.
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CANDLER, of Georgia.
 Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. SKINNER.
 Mr. KNAPP with Mr. STAHLNECKER.
 Mr. GIFFORD with Mr. TURPIN.
 Mr. WILSON, of Kentucky, with Mr. PAYNTER.
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. MCCARTHY.
 Mr. SCRANTON with Mr. HEMPHILL.
 Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR with Mr. CARUTH.
 Mr. WADE with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. MILES with Mr. BUNN.
 Mr. DE LANO with Mr. TURNER, of New York.
 Mr. WICKHAM with Mr. COTHRAN.
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. PERRY.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. TURNER, of Georgia.
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. BLOUNT.
 Mr. THOMAS M. BROWNE with Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. LANSING with Mr. WILEY.
 Mr. WILBER with Mr. RANDALL, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named members were announced as paired on this vote:
 Mr. BROSIOUS with Mr. QUINN.
 Mr. SPOONER with Mr. PHELAN.
 Mr. DE HAVEN with Mr. MANSUR.

Mr. COWLES was announced as paired with Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, on all political questions, from March 22 until April 1.
 Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee, with Mr. O'NEAL, of Indiana, for this day.

Mr. LIND with Mr. BOATNER, for this day.
 Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the recapitulation of the names of members voting be dispensed with.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object. I think we had better have the names read, not for delay, but to verify the vote, as it is a very important one. The Clerk recapitulated the names.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I observed that the name of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] was read in the list of those who voted in the negative. I understand that he voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BAKER. We do not want to go back on the returns. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The returns are not correct.

Mr. TARSNEY. I answered distinctly in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The mistake was made in recording. The mark was placed opposite the name of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] instead of opposite the name of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR]. The gentleman from Missouri will be recorded in the affirmative.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the second amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Added to section 1 the following:

"*Provided*, That there shall be an election in the Territory of Wyoming on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1890, for a Representative in Congress to the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses, and for the State, judicial, and legislative offices, whose terms of office are created by the proposed constitution of the State of Wyoming, and such county, precinct, and municipal officers as may be provided for under such constitution and under the laws of the Territory of Wyoming; but no county or township officers shall be elected unless their terms are about to expire under the laws of the Territory creating such offices. At said election every male citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified under the laws of the Territory of Wyoming to vote, may vote for such officer and on the constitution and separate propositions submitted, and no others, and said election shall be conducted and returns made and canvassed in the manner provided in the laws of said Territory for the election of the Delegate to Congress. At said election each qualified elector may have written or printed upon his ballot the words "For the constitution" or "Against the constitution," and also the words "For female suffrage" or "Against female suffrage." Also the words "For eligibility of women to hold offices and sit on juries" or the words "Against the eligibility of women to hold offices and sit on juries." If at said election the majority of the legal votes cast shall be "for the constitution," the governor shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with the votes cast thereon and upon separate articles or propositions, and a copy of said constitution, articles, and propositions. It shall be the duty of the President of the United States, if it shall appear that a majority of all the votes cast at said election were in favor of the constitution, to issue his proclamation announcing the result of such election, and thereupon said State of Wyoming shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union under and by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the original States from and after the date of said proclamation: *And provided further*, That if it shall appear that a majority of the legal votes cast at said election were against female suffrage or against the eligibility of women to hold offices and sit on juries, then, in that event, the constitution of the said State of Wyoming shall be amended accordingly by virtue of such vote.

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment; and the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I call for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 133, nays 139, not voting 57; as follows:

YEAS—133.

Abbott,	Crisp,	Lawler,	Rogers,
Alderson,	Culberson, Tex.	Lee,	Rowland,
Allen, Miss.	Cummings,	Lehbach,	Rusk,
Anderson, Miss.	Dargan,	Lester, Ga.	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Davidson,	Lester, Va.	Seney,
Barnes,	Dibble,	Lewis,	Shively,
Barwig,	Dockery,	Maish,	Spinola,
Biggs,	Dunnell,	Mansur,	Springer,
Blanchard,	Dunphy,	Martin, Ind.	Stewart, Ga.
Bland,	Edmunds,	Martin, Tex.	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Elliott,	McAdoo,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Ellis,	McClammy,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Enloe,	McClellan,	Stone, Mo.
Brookshire,	Fitch,	McCreary,	Stump,
Brown, J. B.	Fithian,	McMillin,	Tarsney,
Brunner,	Flower,	McRae,	Tillman,
Buchanan, Va.	Forman,	Mills,	Tracey,
Buckalew,	Forney,	Montgomery,	Tucker,
Bullock,	Fowler,	Moore, Tex.	Van Schaick,
Bunn,	Geissenhainer,	Morgan,	Venable,
Bynum,	Gibson,	Mutchler,	Walker, Mo.
Campbell,	Goodnight,	Oates,	Washington,
Carlisle,	Grimes,	O'Ferrall,	Wheeler, Ala.
Carlton,	Hare,	O'Neil, Mass.	Whiting,
Catchings,	Hatch,	Outhwaite,	Wilkinson,
Chipman,	Hayes,	Owens, Ohio	Willcox,
Clancy,	Haynes,	Parrett,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Heard,	Peel,	Wilson, Mo.
Clements,	Herbert,	Pennington,	Wilson, W. Va.
Clunie,	Holman,	Pierce,	Wise,
Cobb,	Hooker,	Quinn,	Yoder.
Cooper, Ind.	Kilgore,	Reilly,	
Covert,	Lane,	Richardson,	
Crain,	Lanham,	Robertson,	

NAYS—139.

Adams,	Connell,	Lacey,	Reed, Iowa
Anderson, Kans.	Cooper, Ohio	La Follette,	Reyburn,
Arnold,	Craig,	Laidlaw,	Rife,
Atkinson, Pa.	Culberson, Pa.	Laws,	Rockwell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Cutcheon,	Lodge,	Rowell,
Baker,	Dalzell,	Mason,	Russell,
Banks,	Darlington,	McComas,	Sawyer,
Bartine,	De Haven,	McCord,	Seull,
Bayne,	Dingley,	McCormick,	Simonds,
Beckwith,	Dolliver,	McKenna,	Smith, Ill.
Belden,	Dorsey,	McKinley,	Smith, W. Va.
Belknap,	Ewart,	Milliken,	Smyser,
Bergen,	Farquhar,	Moffitt,	Snider,
Bingham,	Featherston,	Moore, N. H.	Spooner,
Bliss,	Flick,	Morey,	Stewart, Vt.
Boothman,	Funston,	Morrill,	Stivers,
Boutelle,	Gear,	Morrow,	Sticksbridge,
Brewer,	Gest,	Morse,	Struble,
Brower,	Greenhalge,	Mudd,	Sweeney,
Browne, Va.	Grosvenor,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, E. B.
Buchanan, N. J.	Grout,	Nute,	Taylor, Ill.
Burrows,	Hall,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Burton,	Hansbrough,	O'Neill, Pa.	Townsend, Colo.
Butterworth,	Harmer,	Osborne,	Townsend, Pa.
Candler, Mass.	Henderson, Ill.	Owen, Ind.	Turner, Kans.
Cannon,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Vandever,
Carter,	Hermann,	Payson,	Walker, Mass.
Caswell,	Hill,	Perkins,	Wallace, N. Y.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Peters,	Watson,
Cheatham,	Houk,	Pickler,	Wheeler, Mich.
Clark, Wis.	Kelley,	Pugsley,	Williams, Ohio
Cogswell,	Kennedy,	Quackenbush,	Wilson, Wash.
Coleman,	Kerr, Iowa	Raines,	Wright,
Comstock,	Ketcham,	Randall, Mass.	Yardley.
Conger,	Kinsey,	Ray,	

NOT VOTING—57.

Allen, Mich.	Flood,	O'Neill, Ind.	Thompson,
Andrew,	Frank,	Paynter,	Turner, Ga.
Blount,	Gifford,	Perry,	Turner, N. Y.
Boatner,	Haugen,	Phelan,	Turpin,
Bowden,	Hemphill,	Post,	Wade,
Brosius,	Henderson, N. C.	Price,	Wallace, Mass.
Browne, T. M.	Hopkins,	Randall, Pa.	Whitthorne,
Caldwell,	Kerr, Pa.	Sanford,	Wickham,
Candler, Ga.	Knapp,	Scranton,	Wike,
Canth,	Lansing,	Sherman,	Wilber,
Cothran,	Lind,	Skinner,	Wiley,
Cowles,	Magner,	Stahlnecker,	Wilson, Ky.
De Lano,	McCarthy,	Stephenson,	
Evans,	Miles,	Taylor, J. D.	
Finley,	Norton,	Taylor, Tenn.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. WALLACE, of Massachusetts, with Mr. ANDREW, for the rest of this day.

Pending the announcement of the vote,

Mr. POST said: Mr. Speaker, am I recorded as voting?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. POST. I wish to vote "no."

Mr. SPINOLA. I object.

The SPEAKER. There is no need for objection. Under the rule the Chair is not permitted to entertain the gentleman's request.

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the recapitulation of the names of members voting be dispensed with.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object.

The Clerk recapitulated the names.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I send the other amendment to the desk.

The Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes that this amendment is not the one which was presented in print in the "Views of the minority."

Mr. SPRINGER. After consultation with the minority of the committee I have struck out one sentence.

The SPEAKER. That requires unanimous consent.

Several MEMBERS on the Republican side. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a typographical error there in the number of a section, which I wish to have corrected.

Mr. BAKER. This is on a par with the rest of the opposition to the bill. I object to any change in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman desires to change "section 7" to "section 6."

Several MEMBERS. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will read the amendment as it stands in the "Views of the minority."

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, I insist that that is a typographical error. The amendment should read "section 6," instead of "section 7," and I wish to have it corrected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has asked unanimous consent.

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not require unanimous consent to make it as it was written.

Mr. STRUBLE. I do not think that can be admitted, Mr. Speaker. For one, I object to it. Let the print stand as it is.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman can not object to the fact that in the printing of this amendment either the printer or some one else made a mistake and referred to the wrong section. I simply desire that the text shall be made to refer to the section which was actually proposed to be amended.

Mr. STRUBLE. I would have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker, if I had time to examine the amendment, but this has not been called to our attention, and I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, I call it to the gentleman's attention now.

The SPEAKER. If the amendment is adopted, and upon examination this is found to be a mistake, it can be corrected. To correct it now would require unanimous consent, and objection is made. The Clerk will read the amendment as it stands in print.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Add to section 1 the following:

"Provided, That the State of Wyoming shall not be admitted into the Union until the proposed constitution thereof shall be amended as follows:

"First amendment: Strike out the first section of article 6, entitled 'Suffrage,' which section is in these words: 'The right of the citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges,' and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. The rights of the citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote or hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil and religious rights and privileges."

Second amendment: Insert the word 'male' after the word 'every' and before the word 'citizen' in the first line of section 2, of article 6, so that the section will read:

"SEC. 2. Every male citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years and upward who has resided in the State or Territory one year and in the county wherein such residence is located sixty days next preceding any election shall be entitled to vote at such election, except as herein otherwise provided: And provided, That there shall be an election in the proposed State of Wyoming on the Tuesday next after the first Monday of November, 1890, for Representative in Congress for the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses, for State, judicial, and legislative officers whose offices are created by the proposed constitution of the State of Wyoming, and for such county, precinct, and municipal officers as may be provided for under the said constitution of the State and under the laws of the Territory of Wyoming; but no county or township officers shall be elected unless their election would take place under the provisions of the laws of the Territory of Wyoming at that time. At said election electors who may be qualified to vote as provided in article 7 of said constitution as amended by this act shall be permitted to vote, and no other. And said election shall be conducted and returns made and canvassed in the manner provided in the laws of the Territory of Wyoming for the election of the Delegate in Congress from said Territory. At said election there may be written or printed on each ballot the words 'For the amended constitution' or the words 'Against the amended constitution.' And if the majority of the legal votes cast on this question shall be for the amended constitution then the governor of the Territory shall certify the result to the President of the United States together with a statement of the votes cast thereon and a certified copy of the amended constitution; and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States upon the receipt of such statement of votes cast and copy of such amended constitution, if it shall appear that said amended constitution has been ratified by a majority of the legal votes cast on that question, to issue his proclamation announcing the result of the election thereon; and thereupon the State of Wyoming shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union under and by virtue of this act on an equal footing with the original States from and after the date of such proclamation: And provided further, That no election shall be held in the Territory of Wyoming as provided in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth sections of the schedule of the proposed constitution of the State of Wyoming; but in lieu of such election there shall be an election in said Territory as provided in the foregoing provisions of this act."

The question was taken on agreeing to the amendment; and the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 132, nays 138, not voting 59; as follows:

YEAS—132.

Abbott,	Culbertson, Tex.	Lawler,	Richardson,
Alderson,	Cummings,	Lee,	Robertson,
Allen, Miss.	Dargan,	Lehlbach,	Rogers,
Anderson, Miss.	Davidson,	Lester, Ga.	Rowland,
Bankhead,	Dibble,	Lester, Va.	Rusk,
Barnes,	Dockery,	Lewis,	Sayers,
Barwig,	Dunnell,	Maish,	Seney,
Biggs,	Dunphy,	Mansur,	Shively,
Blanchard,	Edmunds,	Martin, Ind.	Spinola,
Bland,	Elliott,	Martin, Tex.	Springer,
Blount,	Ellis,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Ga.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Enloe,	McClammy,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fitch,	McClellan,	Stockdale,
Erickner,	Fithian,	McCreary,	Stone, Ky.
Brookshire,	Flower,	McMillin,	Stone, Mo.
Brown, J. B.	Forman,	McRae,	Stump,
Brunner,	Forney,	Mills,	Tarsney,
Buchanan, Va.	Fowler,	Montgomery,	Tillman,
Buckalew,	Geissenhainer,	Moore, Tex.	Tracey,
Bullock,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Tucker,
Bynum,	Goodnight,	Mutchler,	Venable,
Campbell,	Grimes,	Oates,	Walker, Mo.
Carlton,	Hare,	O'Ferrall,	Washington,
Catchings,	Hatch,	O'Neil, Mass.	Wheeler, Ala.
Chipman,	Hayes,	Outhwaite,	Whiting,
Claney,	Haynes,	Owens, Ohio	Wike,
Clarke, Ala.	Heard,	Parrett,	Wilkinson,
Clements,	Herbert,	Peel,	Willcox,
Clunie,	Holman,	Pennington,	Williams, Ill.
Cobb,	Hooker,	Pierce,	Williams, Mo.
Cooper, Ind.	Kilgore,	Price,	Wilson, W. Va.
Crain,	Lane,	Quinn,	Wise,
Crisp,	Lanham,	Reilly,	Yoder.

NAYS—138.

Adams,	Craig,	Laidlaw,	Reyburn,
Anderson, Kans.	Culbertson, Pa.	Laws,	Rockwell,
Arnold,	Cutcheon,	Lodge,	Rowell,
Atkinson, Pa.	Dalzell,	Mason,	Russell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Darlington,	McComas,	Sanford,
Baker,	De Haven,	McCord,	Sawyer,
Banka,	Dingley,	McCormick,	Seull,
Bartine,	Dolliver,	McKenna,	Simonds,
Bayne,	Dorsey,	McKinley,	Smith, Ill.
Beckwith,	Farquhar,	Milliken,	Smith, W. Va.
Belden,	Featherston,	Moffitt,	Smyser,
Belknap,	Flick,	Moore, N. H.	Snider,
Bergen,	Funston,	Morey,	Spooner,
Bingham,	Gear,	Morrill,	Stewart, Vt.
Bliss,	Gest,	Morrow,	Stivers,
Boothman,	Greenhalge,	Morse,	Stockbridge,
Boutelle,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Struble,
Bowden,	Grout,	Niedringhaus,	Sweney,
Brewer,	Hall,	Norton,	Taylor, Ill.
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	O'Donnell,	Taylor, E. B.
Burton,	Harmer,	O'Neil, Pa.	Thomas,
Butterworth,	Haugen,	Osborne,	Townsend, Colo.
Candler, Mass.	Henderson, Ill.	Owen, Ind.	Townsend, Pa.
Cannon,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Turner, Kans.
Carter,	Hermann,	Payson,	Vandever,
Caswell,	Hill,	Perkins,	Walker, Mass.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Peters,	Wallace, N. Y.
Cheatham,	Houk,	Pickler,	Watson,
Clark, Wis.	Kelley,	Post,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cogswell,	Kennedy,	Pugsley,	Williams, Ohio
Coleman,	Kerr, Iowa	Quackenbush,	Wilson, Wash.
Comstock,	Ketcham,	Raines,	Wright,
Conger,	Kinsey,	Randall, Mass.	Yardley.
Connell,	Lacey,	Ray,	
Cooper, Ohio	La Follette,	Reed, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—59.

Allen, Mich.	Cowley,	Magner.	Taylor, J. D.
Andrew,	De Lano,	McCarthy,	Taylor, Tenn.
Boatner,	Evans,	Miles,	Thompson,
Brosius,	Ewart,	Norton,	Turner, Ga.
Brower,	Finley,	O'Neill, Ind.	Turner, N. Y.
Browne, T. M.	Flood,	Paynter,	Turpin,
Browne, Va.	Frank,	Perry,	Van Schaick,
Buchanan, N. J.	Gifford,	Phelan,	Wade,
Bunn,	Hemphill,	Randall, Pa.	Wallace, Mass.
Caldwell,	Henderson, N. C.	Rife,	Whithorne,
Candler, Ga.	Hopkins,	Scranton,	Wickham,
Carlisle,	Kerr, Pa.	Sherman,	Wilber,
Caruth,	Knapp,	Skinner,	Wiley,
Cothran,	Lansing,	Stahlnecker,	Wilson, Ky.
Covert,	Lind,	Stephenson,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. CARLISLE, for the rest of this day.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. COVERT, on this question.

Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia, with Mr. MAGNER.

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

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment which I send to the desk, relating to the Yellowstone reservation. It has been submitted to our friends on the other side, and is, I believe, unobjectionable. It is intended to protect the rights of the United States in that reservation.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding this proviso:

"Provided, That nothing in this act contained shall repeal or affect any act of Congress relating to the Yellowstone National Park, or the reservation of the park as now defined, or as may be hereafter defined or extended, or the power of the United States over it; and nothing contained in this act shall interfere with the right and ownership of the United States in said park and reservation

as it now is or may hereafter be defined or extended by law; but exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, shall be exercised by the United States, which shall have exclusive control and jurisdiction over the same; and the said State shall not be entitled to select indemnity school lands for the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections that may be in said park reservation as the same is now defined or may be hereafter defined."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] asks unanimous consent to offer this amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman will not object. This bill puts the Yellowstone Park in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. KILGORE. Let the bill go back to the committee and I shall not object.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read the amendments proposed by the Committee on the Territories, as follows:

Amend section 9, line 3, by inserting, after the word "thereof," the following: "And the personal property of the United States now being in the Territory of Wyoming and which has been in use in the said Territory in the administration of the Territorial government, including books and records, and the property used at the constitutional convention which convened at Cheyenne in the month of September, 1859, are hereby granted and donated."

Also, insert in section 9, line 11, after the word "granted," the words "and donated."

Also, in section 11, line 16, after the word "institution," strike out the following:

"In Carbon County, 30,000 acres; for the penitentiary in Albany County, 30,000 acres; for the fish hatchery in Albany County, 10,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum in Laramie County, 30,000 acres; for the poor-farm in Fremont County, 30,000 acres; for a miners' hospital, 30,000 acres; for normal schools, 100,000 acres; for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions, 210,000 acres, making a total of 500,000 acres."

And insert the following:

"In course of construction in Carbon County, 30,000 acres; for the penitentiary in Albany County, 30,000 acres; for the fish hatchery in Albany County, 5,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum in Laramie County, 30,000 acres; for the poor-farm in Fremont County, 10,000 acres; for a hospital for miners who shall become disabled or incapacitated to labor while working in the mines of the State, 30,000 acres; for public buildings at the capital of the State, in addition to those hereinbefore granted for that purpose, 75,000 acres; for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions, 260,000 acres, making a total of 500,000 acres: *Provided*, That none of the lands granted by this act shall be sold for less than \$10 per acre."

Also, in section 16, line 14, after the word "courts," insert "in the said district."

Also, in section 18, line 5, strike out "courts" and insert "court;" in same section, line 8, strike out "courts" and insert "court;" in same section, line 28, strike out "courts" and insert "court."

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. There was an amendment which was agreed to by everybody, as I understood, but which was attached to the amendment which was objected to awhile ago; I mean the amendment relating to the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections of land. The proviso appearing in the text refers to an act of Congress passed at the last session, which allows the State of Wyoming to have indemnity for lands in permanent reservations. The other four States that came in last year were not allowed to take lands equal to the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

Mr. BAKER. That is already provided for by law, and I must object.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not provided for. The provision was attached to the amendment you offered and which was objected to.

Mr. BAKER. The amendment I offered covers the specific point desired.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it was objected to.

Mr. BAKER. The difficulty can be cured by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] withdrawing his objection. We can not consent to any change of the language at the point indicated by my friend from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. The provision which was objected to by the gentleman from Texas embraces control over the Yellowstone Park. It also relieves the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections of that park from the school lands of Wyoming. If the bill passes in this shape the State of Wyoming will be allowed the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections in the Yellowstone Park, which is a public reservation. It will be allowed indemnity for the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections in this park and can locate them throughout the State. In the other States they were not allowed indemnity land in permanent reservations. They should be made equal in the four States. It was understood gentlemen would move an amendment in the land feature, to apply as in other bills.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

The committee amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Is it not in order now to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Territories?

Mr. BAKER. After the order adopted by the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the question.

Mr. SPRINGER. I demand the yeas and nays on that motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to recommit the bill.

Mr. BAKER. I move to table that motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BAKER. Is it not in order to move to lay it on the table?

The SPEAKER. The question can be taken as well on the motion itself.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 129, nays 142, not voting 58; as follows:

YEAS—129.

Abbott,	Culberson, Tex.	Lawler,	Robertson,
Alderson,	Cummings,	Lee,	Rogers,
Allen, Miss.	Dargan,	Lester, Ga.	Rowland,
Anderson, Miss.	Davidson,	Lester, Va.	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Dibble,	Lewis,	Seney,
Barnes,	Dockery,	Maish,	Shively,
Barwig,	Dunnell,	Mansur,	Spinola,
Biggs,	Dunphy,	Martin, Ind.	Springer,
Blanchard,	Edmunds,	Martin, Tex.	Stewart, Ga.
Bland,	Elliott,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Tex.
Blount,	Ellis,	McClemmy,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Enloe,	McClellan,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fitch,	McCreary,	Stone, Mo.
Brickner,	Fithian,	McMillin,	Stump,
Brookshire,	Flower,	McRae,	Tarsney,
Brown, J. B.	Forman,	Mills,	Tillman,
Brunner,	Forney,	Montgomery,	Tracey,
Buchanan, Va.	Fowler,	Moore, Tex.	Tucker,
Buckalew,	Geissenhalner,	Morgan,	Walker, Mo.
Bullock,	Gibson,	Mutchler,	Washington,
Bynum,	Goodnight,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Campbell,	Grimes,	O'Ferrall,	Whiting,
Carlton,	Hare,	O'Neil, Mass.	Wike,
Catchings,	Hatch,	Outhwaite,	Wilkinson,
Chipman,	Hayes,	Owens, Ohio	Willcox,
Clancy,	Haynes,	Parrett,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Heard,	Peel,	Wilson, Mo.
Clements,	Herbert,	Pennington,	Wilson, W. Va.
Clunie,	Holman,	Pierce,	Wise,
Cobb,	Hooker,	Price,	Yoder.
Cooper, Ind.	Kilgore,	Quinn,	
Crain,	Lane,	Reilly,	
Crisp,	Lanham,	Richardson,	

NAYS—142.

Adams,	Craig,	La Follette,	Reyburn,
Anderson, Kans.	Culbertson, Pa.	Laidlaw,	Rife,
Arnold,	Cutcheon,	Laws,	Rockwell,
Atkinson, Pa.	Dalzell,	Lehlbach,	Rowell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Darlington,	Lodge,	Russell,
Baker,	De Haven,	Mason,	Ranford,
Banks,	Dingley,	McComas,	Sawyer,
Bartine,	Dolliver,	McCord,	Scull,
Bayne,	Dorsey,	McCormick,	Simonds,
Beck with,	Ewart,	McKenna,	Smith, Ill.
Belden,	Farquhar,	McKinley,	Smith, W. Va.
Belknap,	Featherston,	Milliken,	Smyser,
Bingham,	Flick,	Moffitt,	Snider,
Bliss,	Frank,	Moore, N. H.	Spooner,
Boothman,	Funston,	Morey,	Stewart, Vt.
Boutelle,	Gear,	Morrill,	Stivers,
Bowden,	Gest,	Morrow,	Stockbridge,
Brewer,	Greenhalge,	Morse,	Struble,
Brower,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Sweney,
Browne, Va.	Grout,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, E. B.
Buchanan, N. J.	Hall,	Nute,	Taylor, Ill.
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Burton,	Harmer,	O'Neill, Pa.	Townsend, Colo.
Butterworth,	Haugen,	Osborne,	Townsend, Pa.
Cannon,	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Turner, Kans.
Carter,	Henderson, Iowa	Payson,	Vandever,
Caswell,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Walker, Mass.
Cheadle,	Hill,	Peters,	Wallace, N. Y.
Cheatham,	Hitt,	Pickler,	Watson,
Clark, Wis.	Houk,	Post,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cogswell,	Kelley,	Pugsley,	Williams, Ohio
Coleman,	Kennedy,	Quackenbush,	Wilson, Wash.
Comstock,	Kerr, Iowa	Raines,	Wright,
Conger,	Ketcham,	Randall, Mass.	Yardley.
Congell,	Kinsey,	Ray,	
Cooper, Ohio	Lacey,	Reed, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—58.

Allen, Mich.	De Lano,	Norton,	Thompson,
Andrew,	Evans,	O'Neill, Ind.	Turner, Ga.
Bergen,	Finley,	Owen, Ind.	Turner, N. Y.
Boatner,	Flood,	Paynter,	Turnpin,
Brosius,	Gifford,	Perry,	Van Schaick,
Browne, T. M.	Hemphill,	Phelan,	Venable,
Bunn,	Henderson, N. C.	Randall, Pa.	Wade,
Caldwell,	Hopkins,	Rusk,	Wallace, Mass.
Candler, Ga.	Kerr, Pa.	Scranton,	Whitthorne,
Candler, Mass.	Knapp,	Sherman,	Wickham,
Carlisle,	Lansing,	Skinner,	Wilber,
Caruth,	Lind,	Stahnecker,	Wiley,
Cothran,	Magner,	Stephenson,	Wilson, Ky.
Covert,	McCarthy,	Taylor, J. D.	
Cowles,	Miles,	Taylor, Tenn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Upon what ground?

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The only proper ground is one where there is reason to suppose a gentleman's name was not called.

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. The Chair has no reason to suppose I am not stating the fact.

The SPEAKER. Not at all. The gentleman did not hear his name called?

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. That is the reason I have given.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman state he was in his seat at the time the roll was being called, was listening, and did not hear his name called?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman says he did not hear his name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must make his own statement, and the Chair will act on it.

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. I was here on the second call, but I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is sufficient.

Mr. SPRINGER. That has been considered sufficient.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled upon this point repeatedly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Gentlemen on the other side have stated they were in the Hall and were allowed to vote.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will point to such an instance the Chair will be obliged.

Mr. SPRINGER. The RECORD will show it.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD will.

Mr. MORGAN. But, Mr. Speaker, it has been customary heretofore to ask gentlemen under such circumstances if they were listening for their names when they were called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been entirely impartial.

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. I was listening and intending to vote, but did not hear my name.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says that he comes within the rule—

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. I was listening.

The SPEAKER. At the time when your name should have been called?

Mr. OWENS, of Ohio. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the name of the gentleman from Ohio.

The name of Mr. OWENS, of Ohio, was called and recorded as above.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. BERGEN with Mr. VENABLE, on the Wyoming question.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the names will be read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. There has been so much confusion during the vote that the names ought to be recapitulated.

The Clerk read the names of those voting.

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

Mr. BAKER. In order now that my friends on the other side may have the opportunity to vote right once on this question, I ask the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill, on which the gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 127, not voting 63; as follows:

YEAS—139.

Adams,	Congell,	Lacey,	Ray,
Anderson, Kans.	Cooper, Ohio	La Follette,	Reed, Iowa
Arnold,	Craig,	Laidlaw,	Reyburn,
Atkinson, Pa.	Culbertson, Pa.	Laws,	Rife,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Dalzell,	Lehlbach,	Rockwell,
Baker,	Darlington,	Lodge,	Rowell,
Banks,	De Haven,	Mason,	Russell,
Bartine,	Dingley,	McComas,	Sawyer,
Bayne,	Dolliver,	McCord,	Scull,
Beck with,	Dorsey,	McCormick,	Simonds,
Belden,	Ewart,	McKenna,	Smith, Ill.
Belknap,	Farquhar,	McKinley,	Smith, W. Va.
Bingham,	Featherston,	Milliken,	Smyser,
Bliss,	Flick,	Moffitt,	Snider,
Boothman,	Frank,	Moore, N. H.	Spooner,
Boutelle,	Funston,	Morey,	Stewart, Vt.
Bowden,	Gear,	Morrill,	Stivers,
Brewer,	Gest,	Morrow,	Stockbridge,
Brower,	Greenhalge,	Morse,	Struble,
Browne, Va.	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Sweney,
Buchanan, N. J.	Grout,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, E. B.
Burrows,	Hall,	Nute,	Taylor, Ill.
Burton,	Hansbrough,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Butterworth,	Harmer,	O'Neill, Pa.	Townsend, Colo.
Cannon,	Haugen,	Osborne,	Townsend, Pa.
Carter,	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Turner, Kans.
Caswell,	Henderson, Iowa	Payson,	Vandever,
Cheadle,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Van Schaick,
Cheatham,	Hill,	Peters,	Walker, Mass.
Clark, Wis.	Hitt,	Pickler,	Watson,
Cogswell,	Houk,	Post,	Williams, Ohio
Coleman,	Kelley,	Pugsley,	Wilson, Wash.
Comstock,	Kennedy,	Quackenbush,	Wright,
Conger,	Kerr, Iowa	Raines,	Yardley.
	Ketcham,		
	Kinsey,		

NAYS—127.

Abbott,	Barwig,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Buckalew,
Alderson,	Biggs,	Brickner,	Bullock,
Allen, Miss.	Blanchard,	Brookshire,	Bynum,
Anderson, Miss.	Bland,	Brown, J. B.	Carlton,
Bankhead,	Blount,	Brunner,	Catchings,
Barnes,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Buchanan, Va.	Chipman,

Clancy, Clarke, Ala. Clements, Clunie, Cobb, Cooper, Ind. Crain, Crisp, Culberson, Tex. Cummings, Dargan, Davidson, Dibble, Dockery, Dunnell, Dunphy, Edmunds, Elliott, Ellis, Enloe, Fitch, Fithian, Flower, Forman, Forney, Fowler, Geissenhainer, Gibson, Goodnight, Grimes, Hare, Hatch, Haynes, Heard, Herbert, Holman, Hooker, Kilgore, Lane, Lanham, Lawler, Lee, Lester, Ga. Lester, Va. Lewis, Maish, Mansur, Martin, Ind. Martin, Tex. McAdoo, McClammy, McClellan, McCreary, McMillin, McRae, Mills, Montgomery, Morgan, Mutchler, Oates, O'Ferrall, Outhwaite, Owens, Ohio Parrett, Pennington, Peel, Pennington, Price, Quinn, Reilly, Richardson, Robertson, Rogers, Rowland, Rusk, Sayers, Seney, Shively, Spinola, Springer, Stewart, Ga. Stewart, Tex. Stockdale, Stone, Ky. Stone, Mo. Stump, Tarsney, Tillman, Tracey, Tucker, Walker, Mo. Washington, Wheeler, Ala. Whiting, Wike, Wilkinson, Wilcox, Williams, Ill. Wilson, Mo. Wilson, W. Va. Wise, Yoder.

NOT VOTING—63.

Allen, Mich. Andrew, Berge, Boatner, Brosius, Browne, T. M. Bunn, Caldwell, Campbell, Candler, Ga. Carlisle, Caruth, Cothran, Covert, Cowles, De Lano, Evans, Finley, Flood, Frank, Gifford, Hayes, Hemphill, Henderson, N. C. Hopkins, Houk, Kerr, Pa. Knapp, Lansing, Lind, Magner, McCarthy, Miles, Norton, O'Neil, Ind. O'Neil, Mass. Paynter, Perry, Phelan, Randall, Mass. Randall, Pa. Sanford, Scranton, Sherman, Skinner, Stahlnecker, Stephenson, Taylor, J. D. Taylor, Tenn. Thompson, Turner, Ga. Turner, N. Y. Turpin, Venable, Wade, Wallace, Mass. Wallace, N. Y. Wheeler, Mich. Whithorne, Wickham, Wilber, Wiley, Wilson, Ky.

Farquhar, Featherston, Flick, Funston, Gear, Gest, Grosvenor, Grout, Hansbrough, Harmer, Haugen, Henderson, Ill. Henderson, Iowa Hermann, Hill, Hitt, Houk, Kelley, Kennedy, Kerr, Iowa Kinsey, Lacey, La Follette, Laidlaw, Laws, Lehlbach, Lodge, Mason, McComas, McCord, McCormick, McKenna, McKinley, Milliken, Moffitt, Moore, N. H. Morrill, Morrow, Morse, Mudd, Niedringhaus, Nute, O'Donnell, O'Neill, Pa. Osborne, Owen, Ind. Payne, Payson, Perkins, Peters, Pickler, Post, Pugsley, Quackenbush, Raines, Ray, Reed, Iowa Reyburn, Rife, Rockwell, Rowell, Russell, Sanford, Sawyer, Seull, Sherman, Simonds, Smith, Ill. Smith, W. Va. Smyser, Snider, Spooner, Stewart, Vt. Stivers, Stockbridge, Struble, Sweney, Taylor, E. B. Taylor, Ill. Thomas, Townsend, Colo. Townsend, Pa. Turner, Kans. Vandever, Van Schaick, Walker, Mass. Watson, Wheeler, Mich. Williams, Ohio Wilson, Wash. Yardley.

NAYS—120.

Abbott, Alderson, Allen, Miss. Anderson, Miss. Bankhead, Barnes, Barwig, Bland, Blount, Breckinridge, Ark. Breckinridge, Ky. Brickner, Brookshire, Brown, J. B. Brunner, Buchanan, Va. Buckalew, Bullock, Bynum, Carlton, Catchings, Chipman, Clarke, Ala. Clements, Clunie, Cobb, Cooper, Ind. Covert, Crisp, Culberson, Tex. Cummings, Davidson, Dibble, Dockery, Dunphy, Edmunds, Elliott, Ellis, Enloe, Fitch, Fithian, Flower, Forman, Forney, Fowler, Geissenhainer, Gibson, Goodnight, Grimes, Hare, Hatch, Hayes, Haynes, Herbert, Hooker, Kilgore, Lane, Lanham, Lawler, Lee, Lester, Ga. Lewis, Maish, Mansur, Martin, Ind. Martin, Tex. McAdoo, McClammy, McClellan, McCreary, McMillin, McMinn, Mills, Montgomery, Moore, Tex. Morgan, Mutchler, Oates, O'Ferrall, Outhwaite, Owens, Ohio Parrett, Peel, Pennington, Pierce, Price, Quinn, Reilly, Richardson, Robertson, Rogers, Rowland, Rusk, Sayers, Seney, Shively, Spinola, Springer, Stewart, Tex. Stockdale, Stone, Ky. Stone, Mo. Stump, Tarsney, Tillman, Tracey, Tucker, Walker, Mo. Washington, Wheeler, Ala. Whiting, Wike, Wilkinson, Williams, Ill. Wilson, Mo. Wilson, W. Va. Wise, Yoder.

NOT VOTING—77.

Allen, Mich. Andrew, Arnold, Atkinson, Pa. Bartine, Bayne, Beckwith, Bergen, Biggs, Blanchard, Boatner, Brosius, Browne, T. M. Bunn, Butterworth, Caldwell, Campbell, Candler, Ga. Carlisle, Caruth, Clancy, Cothran, Cowles, Crain, Dargan, Darlington, De Lano, Evans, Ewart, Finley, Flood, Frank, Gifford, Greenhalge, Hall, Heard, Hemphill, Henderson, N. C. Holman, Hopkins, Kerr, Pa. Ketcham, Knapp, Lansing, Lind, Magner, McCarthy, Norton, O'Neil, Ind. O'Neil, Mass. Paynter, Perry, Phelan, Randall, Mass. Randall, Pa. Scranton, Skinner, Stahlnecker, Stephenson, Taylor, J. D. Taylor, Tenn. Thompson, Turner, Ga. Turner, N. Y. Turpin, Venable, Wade, Wallace, Mass. Wallace, N. Y. Whithorne, Wickham, Wilber, Wiley, Wilcox, Ky. Wright.

So the bill was passed.
 Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my vote recorded.
 The SPEAKER. On what grounds?
 Mr. ENLOE. On the ground that I entered the Hall, specially to vote, during the call and before my name was reached. I was listening for it and did not hear it called.
 The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening for his name at the time when it should have been called?
 Mr. ENLOE. I was.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the name of the gentleman from Tennessee.
 Mr. ENLOE's name was called, and his vote recorded as above.
 The following additional pairs were announced:
 Mr. WALLACE, of New York, with Mr. CAMPBELL.
 Mr. RANDALL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. O'NEIL, of Massachusetts, for the rest of the day.
 Mr. HOUK with Mr. PHELAN, on this vote.
 Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.
 Mr. SPRINGER. I ask for the recapitulation of the votes.
 The Clerk read the names of those voting.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above.
 Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also move to lay that motion on the table.
 Mr. SPRINGER. I call for a division of the motion. I ask for a separate vote on the motion to lay on the table. I desire to give the gentleman an opportunity of recording himself on that question.
 Messrs. STRUBLE, BAKER, and others. Then let us have the yeas and nays.
 Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.
 Mr. STRUBLE. I will not insist.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division of the question.
 The question was taken on the motion to lay on the table; and on a division there were—yeas 110, noes 93.
 Mr. SPRINGER. Let us have the yeas and nays on this.
 The yeas and nays were ordered.
 Mr. BAKER. I rise to a question of order. Is not this a dilatory motion? [Laughter.]
 Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman made it himself; he ought to know. [Renewed laughter and applause.]
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.
 The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 120, not voting 77; as follows:

YEAS—132.

Adams, Anderson, Kans. Atkinson, W. Va. Baker, Banks, Belden, Belknap, Bingham, Bliss, Boothman, Boutelle, Bowden, Brewer, Brewer, Browne, Va. Buchanan, N. J. Burrows, Burton, Candler, Mass. Cannon, Carter, Caswell, Cheadle, Cheatham, Clark, Wis. Cogswell, Coleman, Comstock, Conger, Connell, Cooper, Ohio Craig, Cutbertson, Pa. Cutcheon, Dalzell, De Haven, Dingley, Dooliver, Dorsey, Dunnell,

So the motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table was agreed to.
 The following additional pairs were announced:
 Mr. DARLINGTON with Mr. CRAIN, on all political questions, for this day.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. CLANCY, on all political questions for, this day.
 Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. BIGGS, for the rest of this day.
 The vote was recapitulated.
 The vote was then announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced the passage of the bill (H. R. 8458) authorizing the purchase of tents by the Secretary of War, and for other purposes, without amendment. It also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which concurrence was requested:
 A bill (S. 2942) making additional appropriation for the construction of a light-ship with steam fog-signal for the mouth of the Columbia; and
 A bill (S. 3279) to suspend the enforcement of the act approved March 2, 1889, entitled "An act to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers."

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills, with a view of taking up the Army appropriation bill.
 Mr. BREWER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I

find from looking at the RECORD that the Army appropriation bill was reported through the Clerk. I raise the point of order that it was not properly reported to the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. I can not hear what the gentleman says.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan is well taken; but the report can now be made and the bill will go to the committee.

Mr. BREWER. Do I understand that the report can be made now and then referred to the committee? It is not on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. It is not on the Calendar, but it will be as soon as it is reported.

Mr. BREWER. Strictly speaking, I apprehend it would not be under the rules.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Speaker, as the Chair has held that the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan is well taken I desire to report the bill and ask for its immediate consideration. The bill was reported by handing it to the journal clerk at the desk.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that there is so much confusion in the Hall that we can not hear what is being said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BREWER] makes the point of order that the Army appropriation bill, being a general appropriation bill, should have been reported to the House; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CUTCHEON] now makes the report to the House and it is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOCKERY. I reserve all points of order on that bill.

The SPEAKER. And all points of order will be reserved.

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that that was my only object in making the point, that I might have the privilege of reserving all points of order.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I am perfectly willing that all points of order shall be reserved.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills, Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will now read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the order was to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this bill, but on general appropriation bills.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill H. R. 7619, being the bill to provide for the support of the Army.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The point I want to make is that it will require an order of the committee to take the bill up.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be taken up in their order unless the committee otherwise direct.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Does the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BREWER] give way with the fortifications bill?

Mr. BREWER. I have announced to the members of the committee that I shall ask to take up the fortifications bill on Saturday.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Chairman, this matter has as a matter of fact been upon the Calendar since—

Mr. CASWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is utterly impossible to hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CUTCHEON] moves that the committee now take up for consideration House bill 7619, being the Army appropriation bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will now report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7619) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the formal first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. I am not aware that there is any desire for general debate upon the bill. The bill is the ordinary routine bill for the support of the Army—

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the formal first reading of the bill; that we proceed to read it by paragraphs until we come to some part upon which gentlemen wish to debate, if there are any such paragraphs in the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Pending that, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, or rather an inquiry for information. I will ask the gentleman from Michigan whether there is any new legislation in the bill?

Mr. CUTCHEON. I think that there is nothing in the bill that can be called new legislation. There are some new appropriations. There is an appropriation for barracks and quarters that are beyond the appropriation of last year, but still it is for a recognized object. I think there is nothing that can be called new legislation.

Mr. ROGERS. I would be loath to ask to have the bill read; but

in view of the fact that we do not know what is coming up until it comes, I think we had better have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed to read the bill.

The Clerk began to read.

Mr. LANSING (interrupting the reading). I wish to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs can point out the items that have what might be called new legislation in the bill. It is the ordinary appropriation bill as passed last year with a great many of the items just as they were last year, and the chairman of the committee can point out any changes made and would point them out. This is a very long bill and it is a mere formal matter to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection has been made.

Mr. LANSING. I ask the gentleman to withdraw the objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I think we had better have the regular order.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CUTCHEON] that this bill has just been reported to the House—

Mr. CUTCHEON. The bill as a matter of fact has been on the Calendar since the 27th day of February—

Mr. BLOUNT. I misunderstood the gentleman, then.

Mr. CUTCHEON. And the report has been in the document-room and accessible to all gentlemen since that time. The point was made simply to save all points of order upon the bill, the objection of the gentleman being to certain provisions in regard to field batteries.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not making this objection for any improper purpose. I simply want to know what is going on; and if the gentleman wants the committee to rise and let it go over until to-morrow, so that we may have an opportunity to read the bill, I shall not ask to have it read.

Mr. LODGE. Regular order.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it not in order that general debate shall proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it not in order that general debate proceed without the reading of the bill at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made, and the reading asked for. The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not understand my friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] to object, provided that the general debate is taken up and that the bill is not to be considered by paragraphs at this time.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I ask that there may be order, so that I can hear what the gentleman is saying.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order and gentlemen cease conversation.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] has not objected to general debate proceeding with a view of understanding what the bill is; and he may not demand the reading of the bill if it does proceed. Therefore I suggest, simply with a view of facilitating matters, that perhaps, if the gentleman in charge of the bill would undertake at this time to explain its provisions, it may remove the occasion in the minds of any member to object and have the bill read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. ROGERS. I have no objection if I have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I will make a brief statement.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I object. I think we had better commence reading appropriation bills, if that is understood to be the rule.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CANNON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, it will take some time to finish the reading of this bill, and I understand that everybody is willing to consider the reading as completed and let the committee rise.

Mr. CUTCHEON. If the demand for the reading of the bill be withdrawn, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. McCREARY. If the demand for the reading of the bill has been withdrawn, I then suggest that the bill be printed in the RECORD, so that we can all read it there.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. McCREARY. Then let us go on with the reading.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CUTCHEON (before the completion of the reading). Mr. Chairman, as the hour of 5 o'clock has arrived, and as there seems to be a general disposition not to go on further with this bill to-night, I will move that the committee now rise, simply stating that in Report 529, which can be had in the document-room, will be found a full tabulated statement of all the appropriations made in this bill compared with those made in the last Army appropriation bill, showing the increases and the decreases, which gentlemen can examine at their leisure. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, from the Committee of the Whole,

reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7619) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has an amendment which he proposes to offer when this bill comes up again for consideration, and which he desires unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD; and I move that the House do now adjourn, yielding to him simply to make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not move to adjourn conditionally. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] that his amendment be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SPINOLA. I desire to have it read, reserving the right to object.

The amendment was read in part, as follows:

Page 17, line 4, after the word "dollars," insert: "Provided, That no alcoholic liquors, including beer and wine, shall be sold or supplied to the enlisted men in any canteen or in any room or building at any garrison."

Mr. SPINOLA. That is enough; I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. Let us have the amendment read through, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman can not interrupt the reading.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to object. The request was for unanimous consent, and such a request does not give the right to have the matter read in full if objection is made.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from New York asked to have it read, and now I insist that it ought to be read in full for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that when a request is made for unanimous consent, as in this case, it is necessary to read more than enough to satisfy a gentleman that he wishes to object.

Mr. SPINOLA. I will give my friend plenty of time on this tomorrow. [Laughter.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. YARDLEY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WALLACE, of Massachusetts, until April 15, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

SALARIES, ETC., IN OFFICE OF CIVIL-SERVICE COMMISSION.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication of the Civil-Service Commission submitting a supplemental estimate for salaries, etc., in the office of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891—to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR SUPERVISING ARCHITECT OF THE TREASURY.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, calling attention to the necessity of providing additional space for the engineering and draughting division of the office of the Supervising Architect, as recommended in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1889—to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows, namely:

A bill (S. 2860) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building at Houston, Tex., and to provide a cistern, heating apparatus, etc., for said building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3025) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to gather full and authentic information as to the present condition and preservation of the fur-seal interests of the Government in the region of Alaska, as compared with its condition in 1870; also full information as to the impending extinction of the sea-otter industry, and kindred lines of inquiry, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (S. 2942) making an additional appropriation for the construction of a light-ship, with steam fog-signal, for the mouth of the Columbia—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3279) to suspend the enforcement of the act approved March 2, 1889, entitled "An act to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers—to the Committee on Commerce.

A joint resolution (S. R. 46) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to remove the naval magazine from Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, and to purchase a site and erect a naval magazine at some other point—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS AND RESOLUTIONS OF STATE LEGISLATURES.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolution was introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. McRAE: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, favoring a deep-water port on the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolution was introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. DORSEY:

Resolved, That Thursday, March 27, immediately after the final vote on the bill for the admission of Wyoming, be set apart for consideration in the House of the bill for the admission of the Territory of Idaho, and that, unless previously ordered by the House, the previous question shall be deemed ordered on the engrossment, third reading, and final passage of the bill at 6 o'clock p. m. of that day;

to the Committee on Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. DORSEY, from the Committee on the Territories, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 4562) to provide for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union.

Mr. MANSUR, in behalf of the minority of said Committee on the Territories, submitted their views in writing thereon; and it was

Ordered, That the said bill, together with the said views of the minority, be recommitted to the Committee on the Territories.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 3971) to make valid a deed to a certain tract of land in Bibb County, Georgia, made and delivered by Brig. Gen. Davis Tilson, acting assistant commissioner of the Freedman's Bureau, to Samuel L. Gustin, his heirs and assigns—to the House Calendar.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the Senate (S. 221) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hastings, Nebr.—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GIFFORD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the Senate (S. 1354) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sioux Falls, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VAN SCHAICK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the following bills of the Senate; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union:

A bill (S. 1453) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Saginaw, Mich.; and

A bill (S. 1285) to provide for the construction of a public building at Helena, Mont.

Mr. CLUNIE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the Senate (S. 590) to provide for the construction of a public building in the city of Stockton, Cal.—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on War Claims, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 3640) for the relief of the crew of the United States steamship Wyoming—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DE LANO, from the Committee on Pensions, reported favorably the following bills of the Senate; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House:

A bill (S. 252) granting a pension to John Gallagher;

A bill (S. 133) to increase the pension of Thomas Chapman;

A bill (S. 1075) granting a pension to John Watson;

A bill (S. 19) to pension Bartola Thebant, a soldier in the Florida Seminole Indian war of 1849 and 1850; and

A bill (S. 647) granting a pension to Catherine Simmonds.

Mr. KINSEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 6843) for the relief of Jacob Theby—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HERMANN, from the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 8150) to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported favorably the following bills of the Senate; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union:

A bill (S. 1984) to create the office of surveyor-general in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota; and

A bill (S. 2304) to establish two additional land districts in the State of Washington.

Mr. PAYSON also, from the Committee on the Public Lands, re-

ported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 5930) for the relief of the settlers on Northern Pacific Railroad indemnity lands—to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 2084) for the relief of J. G. Fell, Edward Hoopes, and George Burnham—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CUTCHEON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 7974) to establish and define the United States seacoast and frontier reserve—to the House Calendar.

Mr. KINSEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 4566) granting right of way to the Junction City and Fort Riley Street Railway Company into and upon the Fort Riley military reservation, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes—to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONGER, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 5381) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND, in behalf of the minority of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, submitted their views in writing thereon; which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1086.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 6518) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion against Mark F. Jones, of Roseburgh, Oregon, and late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, and that a certificate of discharge be issued—to the Committee of the Whole House.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 8628) for the erection of a public building at Richmond, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 8629) providing for a public building in Brazil, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALLACE, of New York: A bill (H. R. 8630) to provide for the organization and rate of pay of a veterinary corps of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 8631) to create a port of entry at Eagle Pass, Tex., in lieu of Indianola, Tex.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SIMONDS: A bill (H. R. 8632) relating to the salaries of the Patent Office officials—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 8633) to amend the act incorporating the Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOCKBRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 8634) for the transmission of two guns to the national cemetery at Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 8635) for the Oklahoma Agricultural College and United States experimental station, and to secure land for same—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWS: A bill (H. R. 8636) providing that notice of the sale of real estate sold under the order, judgment, or decree of a United States court shall be published in the county and State where the property is located and that the property after notice be there sold, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8637) to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8638) to provide for a more efficient veterinary service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8673) for the relief of West Virginia troops acting under authority of the governor of said State during the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McADOO: A bill (H. R. 8674) to impose a discriminating duty on tea imported from this side of the Cape of Good Hope, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKENNA: A bill (H. R. 8675) to encourage silk-culture in the State of California—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BREWER (by request): A bill (H. R. 8676) for the better administration of justice in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: A bill (H. R. 8677) to amend section 10 of an act approved on the 2d day of March, 1889, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,'" approved February 4, 1887—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8678) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the muster and pay of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces," approved June 3, 1884, and further amended February 3, 1887—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8679) providing for the appointment of an official indexer of public documents—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8680) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Samuel Meredith, at Belmont Manor, Wayne County, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANDALL, of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8681) to secure the safety of freight cars employed in interstate commerce by the use of proper couplers, freight-car brakes, and other appliances, prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HOUK (by request): A bill (H. R. 8682) to equalize the pay of messengers in the Government service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RIFE: A bill (H. R. 8683) to provide for the construction of a public building at Lebanon, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 8639) for the relief of Robert Potts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JASON B. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 8640) granting a pension to Elizabeth Abell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) granting a pension to Pauline Burkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8642) granting a pension to Rebeckah H. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8643) granting a pension to James Gilmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to Lucy C. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8645) granting a pension to John M. Kesselmark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Elizabeth Louster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8647) granting a pension to Andrew M. Luke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8648) granting a pension to Elijah W. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYNUM: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting a pension to Matilda Ann Wiley, of Indianapolis, Ind., widow of the late Dr. Delano Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLTON: A bill (H. R. 8650) for the relief of Joel A. Bilups—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8651) to appropriate money to pay to Mrs. John H. Christy the salary of her deceased husband, Hon. John H. Christy, of Georgia, as a member of the Thirty-ninth Congress—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8652) for the relief of John S. Williford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHEADLE: A bill (H. R. 8653) granting a pension to Martin L. Blackledge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8654) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles William Reinhardt, of the Marine Band—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 8655) to relieve John Brundage of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: A bill (H. R. 8656) for the relief of the trustees of the African Methodist Church at Marietta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 8657) granting a pension to Peter R. Clutter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 8658) to remove charge of desertion against Hiram H. Carpenter, Second Independent Battery, Vermont Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 8659) granting arrears of pension to Job S. Goff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWLER: A bill (H. R. 8660) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Crook, widow of George Crook, late a major-general in the United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8661) granting a pension to Mary T. Crook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILES: A bill (H. R. 8662) for the relief of Edwin L. Brady, of Stamford, Conn.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 8663) for the relief of Francis M. Devine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRILL: A bill (H. R. 8664) for the relief of George W. Graham—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWELL: A bill (H. R. 8665) for the relief of James Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8666) for the relief of Rev. M. M. Travis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART, of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8667) for the relief of

the legal representatives of John Carleton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8668) for the relief of George T. Reeves—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN SCHAICK: A bill (H. R. 8669) for the relief of George Isenstein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8670) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Mastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WIKE: A bill (H. R. 8671) to pension Reason R. Nichols and grant him a pension of \$25 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YODER: A bill (H. R. 8672) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Neill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8684) granting a pension to Martha A. Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting a pension to John E. Bing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting a pension to Richard Crutcher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting a pension to Joseph W. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) for the relief of William Dillon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Jerry S. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8690) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Jefferson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) granting an increase of pension to General J. A. J. Lightburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8692) granting a pension to Reuben Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8693) granting a pension to Harriet Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Robert S. Northcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) granting a pension to W. M. Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8696) granting a pension to Mrs. J. P. Thatcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8697) granting a pension to George Waddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 8698) for the relief of Mrs. Selina Bestor, Orson H. Bestor, and E. Francis Riggs—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8699) for the relief of James Soffell and the executors of John Witherspoon, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 8700) granting a pension to Mira Baldwin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8701) to remove the charge of desertion from the service record of Charles E. Dodge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8702) granting a pension to John McKearnan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting a pension to Aaron Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLICK: A bill (H. R. 8704) granting a pension to Wilhelmina M. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 8705) to increase the pension of Lyman E. Bullock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8706) granting a pension to Isaac Maines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 8707) to increase the pension of Elijah Herring—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8708) granting a pension to Samuel W. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) granting a pension to Samuel Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANSING: A bill (H. R. 8710) for the relief of Robert Tillson and Maitland Boon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 8711) granting a pension to Margaret Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 8712) to amend and correct the military record of Barnett C. Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: A bill (H. R. 8713) granting a pension to Rhoda Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8714) granting a pension to Julius E. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 8715) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hershberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8716) pensioning Maria Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIFE: A bill (H. R. 8717) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Connelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to Lawrence Gross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 8719) for the relief of the estate of Odon Deucatte—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 8720) for the relief of Gustav Hubert Schmidt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMYSER: A bill (H. R. 8721) to place Sarah Croft on the pension-rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STIVERS: A bill (H. R. 8722) for the relief of Edgar Brodhead—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8723) for the relief of John W. Bradburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A bill (H. R. 8724) for the relief of Cornelius Boyle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania (by request): A bill (H. R. 8725) granting a pension to Margaret Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 8726) for the relief of Louisa Burnham, widow of Lewis W. Burnham, late of Company H, Fifty-seventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8727) for the relief of Mary Laughinghouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8728) to correct the military record of James McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8729) for the relief of the heirs of Anderson Seale—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8730) granting a pension to T. G. Metcalf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8731) restoring to the pension-roll Mrs. Martha A. Beerbower, widow of Dr. Jesse Beerbower, late assistant surgeon, Third Regiment, Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

A bill of the Senate (S. 5) for the relief of Bessie S. Gilmore—Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill of the House (H. R. 7598) granting a pension to William H. Heister—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill of the House (H. R. 7054) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the city of Lincoln, Nebr., one-half the cost of constructing pavements in front of the public square owned by the United States Government in said city—Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill of the House (H. R. 7684) for the relief of Albert Wood—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of farmers of Monroe County, New York, in favor of higher tariff on farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from same persons, for same relief—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hough & Ford and other manufacturers residing in Rochester, N. Y., asking that no duty shall be imposed on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWER: Protest of the Society of Friends of Guilford and Randolph Counties, North Carolina, against the recommendations of the Senate Naval Committee and other measures which propose a large expenditure for Navy and coast defenses—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of G. A. Dorbloser and others, of Kansas, Ill., favoring passage of law authorizing the payment of \$2 per day to Union soldiers during confinement in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Petition of John Mussey, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER, of Indiana: Petition of George W. Hoss, professor of rhetoric and elocution of Baker University, Baldwin, Kans., and 100 others, including ministers, lawyers, teachers, and prominent business men of Topeka and Baldwin, Kans., praying for certain reforms in the spelling of the English language—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of Jacob Surratt, Tippah County, Mississippi, asking the reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a resolution of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, in favor of the increase of the salaries of judges of the United States district courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Memphis Merchants' Exchange, for same purpose—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Memphis Commercial Association, for same purpose—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. C. Sanders, of McNairy County, Tennessee, asking for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolutions of the Jackson Board of Trade, against the compound lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Farmers' Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., for same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, for same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Memphis (Tenn.) Merchants' Exchange, for same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petition of Peter R. Clutter, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Resolutions of George Graham Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Seneca, Kans., relating to service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, three petitions of Oklahoma Agricultural College and experimental station—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEST: Petition of 212 citizens of Henderson County, Illinois, for such legislation as will suppress the publication and transmission through the mails of impure literature—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of E. S. Boss and 36 others, for cold storage for butter between New York and Boston and English ports—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KERR, of Iowa: Petition of John B. Hanax Post, No. 314, Belle Plaine, Iowa, favoring the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of Baxter (Iowa) Grand Army of the Republic post, favoring a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of members of Subordinate Union No. 16, of Newark, N. J., of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union, asking that preference be given to citizens of the United States in the employment of men on Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, protest of members of the Newark Turnverein Deutsche Pioneer Society, of New York, N. Y., and others, against all measures materially changing the laws on immigration and naturalization—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAISH: Resolution of Captain Colwell Post No. 202, Grand Army of the Republic, 201, Carlisle, Pa., urging the passage of the bill for the relief of Comrade R. R. Matthews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana: Remonstrances of certain Monthly Meetings of Friends, of Grant County, Indiana, representing 1,221 persons, against proposed expenditures of public money for naval and coast defense and other warlike measures—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McADOO: Petition of citizens of Jersey City, N. J., in favor of H. R. No. 3863, in favor of increasing pay of letter-carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Papers and evidence in support of H. R. 5013, for relief of James Wilkinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers and evidence in case of Capt. William Lyne in support of H. R. No. 7239—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of citizens of Columbiana County, Ohio, favoring employment of home labor in preference to aliens—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MORRILL: Resolutions of George Graham Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Seneca, Kans., asking for a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of Grand Army of the Republic of Parish, N. Y., and Grand Army of the Republic of Lyons, N. Y., for service pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEEL: Resolutions of city council of Little Rock, Ark., asking appropriations to improve the deep-water harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions to regulate salary of House elevator conductors—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROWELL: Papers in the claim of Rev. M. M. Travis, to accompany bill for his relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH, of Illinois: Memorial from Lodge No. 267, Randolph County, Illinois, F. M. B. A., requesting legislation in the interest of farmers—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorials from Benton Lodge No. 268, F. M. B. A.; Lodge No. 280, F. M. B. A., Johnson County, Illinois; Lodge No. 34, F. M. B. A., Lick Creek, Ill., praying for same character of legislation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Knights of Labor Lodge No. 3833, Murphysborough, Ill., relative to statistics to be gathered in taking the eleventh census—to the Select Committee on the Eleventh Census.

Also, memorial of F. M. B. A. organization, Perry County, Illinois, asking for free coinage of silver, etc.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial from Brush Prairie Lodge No. 322, F. M. B. A., Perry County, Illinois, asking for the establishment of loan agencies in each county and the loaning of money by the Government to farmers at a low rate of interest on real-estate security, etc.—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of Simpson Post No. 683, Grand Army of the Republic, Johnson County, Illinois, asking speedy pension legislation, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Lodge No. 329, F. M. B. A., Perry County, Illinois, asking for the free coinage of silver, etc.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial F. M. B. A., Perry County, Illinois, petitioning not to withdraw legal-tender notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of Post No. 221, Grand Army of the Republic, of Illinois, praying for action and aid toward passage of "service-pension bill" and repeal of limitation clause in arrears act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART, of Texas: Petition of sundry citizens of Val Verde County, Texas, asking for establishment of military post at Del Rio, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS: Petition of Subordinate Union No. 5, city of Newburgh, N. Y., of the Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, praying Congress will amend the laws so that on all Government works, whether let by contract or otherwise, none but citizens of the United States shall be employed, and that proper penalties for the enforcement of the same be imposed, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WALLACE, of Massachusetts: Petition of Subordinate Union No. 19, city of Fitchburgh, Mass., of the Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, praying for such an amendment to the laws as will secure to citizens of the United States preference of work on the construction of public buildings and other Government structures—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: Petition of Hon. James E. Saunders, praying that Congress will not enact a bill taxing lard which contains cotton-seed oil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Memphis Merchants' Exchange and Henry C. Butcher, president of Southern Cotton Oil Company, for same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON, of Washington: Memorial from the Legislature of Washington, praying for defensive works on Puget Sound—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan: Petition of Frank Bartholomew, Company H, Fourteenth Ohio Infantry Volunteers, for special-act pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of Subordinate Union No. 8, city of Boston, Mass., of the Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, for the amendment of the laws of the United States so as to prevent the employment of any other than citizens of the United States upon Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BELDEN: Petition of the farmers of Onondaga County, New York, requesting that the duties on the products of the farm be increased—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas: Petition of 26 citizens of Clarendon, Ark., against the passage of the Conger or Butterworth lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petition and papers to accompany H. R. 8629, providing for a public building in Brazil, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of Bricklayers and Masons' Union, of Galveston, Tex., for amendment of laws governing employment of labor on public buildings and other Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania: Petition of physicians of Pennsylvania, for repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law which classes druggists as liquor-dealers—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, in favor of laws for protection of American against alien labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition from members of Drury Post, No. 128, Grand Army of the Republic, asking that pension be granted to Aaron Toumy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Protest of the Canned Goods Association, against any increase of the tariff upon tin-plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the Southern Cotton Oil Company, of Philadelphia, against the passage of House bill No. 283, relating to compound lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HATCH: Petition and affidavits to accompany House bill granting a pension to Samuel Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to accompany House bill to increase the pension of

Elijah Herring, a soldier of the Black Hawk war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition to accompany House bill granting a pension to Samuel W. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Philip Deitz and 34 others, citizens of Scott County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of any law changing present naturalization and immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYNES: Petition of H. J. Webb & Co. and 250 other owners of vessels, of Cleveland, Ohio, for the early completion of Toledo Harbor improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of John Nelson and 28 others, owners and masters of vessels of same city, for same purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition from citizens of New Mexico, asking Congress to pay Indian depredation claims filed in the office of Indian Affairs—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. LAWLER: Protest of the Thompson-Houston Electric Company, against placing heavy duties on mica—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of Elijah N. Hoffman, Adam K. Bollinger, David Conover, and W. N. Flaherty, praying for the removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles P. Keble, late sergeant Company L, Cole's Maryland Cavalry, praying for the removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Petition of Subordinate Union No. 19, of Williamsport, Pa., of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, asking protection against alien labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, favoring Sunday-rest legislation—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana: Petition of Harmony Lodge, F. M. B. A., No. 1566, and of W. D. Boller, president thereof, and 25 other members, of Grant County, Indiana, for the enactment of a law for the payment of the coin obligations of the United States in equal proportions in the legal-tender gold and silver money of the country—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Harmony Lodge, F. M. B. A., No. 1566, of Grant County, Indiana, for the abolition of the national-bank system, and for full remonetization of silver, and the issue of sufficient money to meet the demands of trade, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Harmony Lodge No. 1566, of Grant County, Indiana, for legislation prohibiting the loan of the money of the United States to national banks or corporations, or for making loans of money to farmers on equally favorable terms as those granted to such corporations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Frank Ringle and others, citizens of Grant County, Indiana, for legislation prohibiting the loaning of the public moneys of the United States, from loaning its public funds to national banks or other corporations, or that farmers shall be granted loans on equally favorable terms—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORROW: Petition from the Board of Trade of Santa Cruz County, California, relative to the survey of the harbor at that point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'NEIL, of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Masons' International Union of America, in favor of a law to allow only citizens of the United States to be employed on Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PARRETT: Petition and other papers of Andrew J. Ricketts, for relief from the charge of desertion, to accompany H. R. 4486—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Alonzo Hix, for pension, signed by the clerk and officers of Perry County, Indiana, and others, with other papers to accompany H. R. 5812—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Alonzo Platt, to have the charge of desertion removed, to accompany H. R. 5337—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Frederick Stombush, for pension, to accompany H. R. 5336—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of vessel-owners and masters, for an appropriation for harbor of refuge at Port Ontario, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of sailors, lake captains, and others, residents of Port Ontario, N. Y., for same purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of manufacturers of New York, for same purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of supervisors and county officials of Oswego County, New York, for same purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, letter of superintendent of Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, upon the same subject—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, certificate of R. D. Ehle, deputy collector, upon the same subject—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of S. M. Roseberry and 88 others, residents of Winfield, Kans., and vicinity, asking for legislation provid-

ing for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of the Peoria (Ill.) County Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, indorsing the Post silver bill—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Memorial of 352 Friends, of Dover, Clinton County, Ohio, against warlike expenditures—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAINES: Petition of citizens of Avoca, N. Y., for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. REED, of Iowa: Petition of 200 citizens of Audubon County, Iowa, in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition for relief of G. H. Schmidt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY: Petition of Samuel D. Straw and 15 others, citizens of Elkhart, Ind., for liberal appropriations for the encouragement of fish culture—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMONDS: Petition of Subordinate Union No. 1, of the Bricklayers and Masons' International Union of America, of Hartford, Conn., against employment of aliens upon Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH, of Illinois: Memorial of Lodge No. 63, F. M. B. A., of Johnson County, Illinois, asking legislation in the interest of farmers—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of the Michigan State board of agriculture, relative to the transfer of national weather service to the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: Petition of William R. Jackson, of Jones County, Mississippi, to have a bill passed for his relief and to pay his claim for work done for the Government during the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of B. F. Robie and 29 other veteran soldiers, citizens of Cherokee County, Iowa, urging the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of A. W. Moore and 67 others, citizens of Hopedale, Ohio; of Lynn Farmers' Alliance, No. 1239, Sioux County, Iowa; of Wilson Township Alliance, No. 111, Osceola County, Iowa, and of Plymouth Farmers' Alliance, No. 1249, Plymouth County, Iowa, urging the passage of bill H. R. 5978, imposing penalties to lessen and prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TARSNEY: Petition of Cornelius Boyle, praying that his claim for property be referred to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, against alien labor on Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of 208 citizens of Beaver County, Pennsylvania, asking that needless Sabbath work, etc., be forbidden—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VANDEVER: Petition for improvement of spelling—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WATSON: Petition against alien labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan: Petition to Congress for removal of charge of desertion from R. W. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Perry Hannah and other vessel-owners and masters of Michigan, praying for an appropriation for construction of a break-water at Petoskey, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WISE: Petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Richmond, Va., relative to the regulation of the number of officers in the engineer corps of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 27, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate, a report of the Ordnance Board and an extract from the annual report of Maj. Gen. O. O. Howard to the Adjutant-General, in regard to certain tests at Sandy Hook of a new method of firing shells charged with nitro-glycerine from ordinary guns; which was read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table until the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who offered the resolution to which this is a response, comes into the Chamber.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I move that the communication and accompanying papers from the Secretary of War laid before the Senate this morning during my absence in the Committee on Appropriations be ordered to be printed and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.