

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1914.

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

Almighty God, Thou hast set us very narrow limits of time. Thou dost require a great outcome of stewardship from our lives. Thou dost bring in immediate, striking, and startling contrast the demands of life. As the night and the day, so near together are the right and the wrong. We are in the midst of the perplexing problems of life; we feel our limitations, our weakness, our sin; we lament the strange lethargy that takes possession of our spiritual powers and holds us in bondage unto sin.

We lift our hearts to Thee, the author of life, the giver of every good and perfect gift. We pray that Thou wilt speak to us this day. May we hear the music of heaven in our hearts, and with glad wills may we turn to obey Thy will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 4019. An act to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky.; and

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4145) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 11245. An act extending to the port of Providence, R. I., the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;

H. R. 12169. An act providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C.;

H. R. 12594. An act to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across Swinomish Slough opposite the town of La Conner;

H. R. 13133. An act for the approving and payment of the drainage assessments on Indian lands in Salt Creek drainage district No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla.; and

H. R. 13771. An act extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Tarentum, and New Castle, in the State of Pennsylvania, and of sundry citizens of Struthers, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Byron, Brownsville, and South Byron, Wis., remonstrating against an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Matthew Thornton Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of Local Branch, St. Patrick's Alliance of America, of Passaic, N. J., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Rocky Mount, N. C., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fayetteville, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national park in the southern Appalachian Mountains, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Houston, Sunset Heights, Dallas, and El Paso, and of Local Union No. 750, Bartenders' League, of Houston, all in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Deu, Tex., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Riviera, Tex., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Intercoastal Canals.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of the California Wholesale Grocers' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination in prices, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made for the erection of a marine-hospital building at San Francisco, Cal., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Glasco and Maplehill, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tyro and Topeka, in the State of Kansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hugo, Elizabeth, Denver, Idaho Springs, Redcliff, Durango, Trinidad, Leadville, Las Animas, and Fort Collins, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Palisades; the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Colorado Springs; and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Arvada; and of sundry citizens of Montrose, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Grand Junction, Ignacio, Denver, Collbran, and Cedar, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of Local Union No. 498, Bartenders' Union, of Lewiston, Mont., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Lewiston, Mont., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Congregational Sunday School of Roundup, Mont., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Beaulieu, Moorhead, St. Paul, and Brainerd, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Morgenstjerner Lodge, No. 17, International Order of Good Templars, of Duluth; of Viking-olftet Lodge, No. 65, International Order of Good Templars, of Viking; and of the congregation of the Swedish Mission Church of Viking, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manu-

facture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, American Continental League, of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against intervention in Mexico on the part of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of East Rochester, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Thomas Laughlin, of Portsmouth, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oakdale, Spring Lake, Nevada, Koszta, and Iowa City, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Davenport, Lyons, Clinton, Chancey, and Council Bluffs, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., and a memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 93, of Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of the faculty and students of the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the board of directors of the Bridgeport Savings Bank, of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the proposed dismemberment of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad system, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Irish-American Societies, of Ansonia, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of Custer Post, No. 1, Department of Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, of Laramie, Wyo., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Custer Relief Corps, No. 20, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union, No. 92, of Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Middletown, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling employees in the Postal Service to work on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Leeds Council, No. 16, Order United American Mechanics, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Nathan Hale Camp, No. 1, Connecticut Division, Sons of Veterans, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against any change being made in the American flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Federated Church of Willington; of Connecticut State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Glastonbury; and of sundry citizens of Willington, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. OVERMAN (for Mr. SIMMONS):

A bill (S. 4922) for the relief of D. C. Whittington, heir of D. D. Whittington, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4923) for the relief of W. H. McFarland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4924) granting a pension to Thomas E. Sims (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4925) granting a pension to Frances M. Dumenil (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4926) granting an increase of pension to Amelia L. Love (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4927) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ogden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4928) granting a pension to Lettie Viloth; and

A bill (S. 4929) granting a pension to Sue C. Tozier; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4930) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 4931) granting an increase of pension to Simona G. de Quintana; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4932) granting a pension to Sadie Winters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4933) granting a pension to Mary J. Neary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4934) providing for an investigation of the feasibility of irrigation by the reservoir system or plan in Texas in connection with a similar investigation heretofore proposed for Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 4935) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 4936) granting an increase of pension to James J. Hasson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4937) providing for the retirement and rank of certain men formerly composing the corps of general service clerks and general service messengers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4938) granting a pension to Josephine Green; and

A bill (S. 4939) granting a pension to Jennie Farley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4940) granting a pension to Margaret Cecilia Donovan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 127) providing for an American commission for the investigation of civic problems in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to amend sections 1580 and 1581 of the Revised Statutes and the act of March 3, 1907, relating to rations in the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that hereafter no officer or enlisted man in active service in the Navy or Marine Corps who shall be incapacitated for duty on account of disease



resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors, etc., shall receive pay for the period of such incapacity, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that in case of emergency arising subsequent to and unforeseen at the time of submitting the annual estimates to Congress 10 per cent of the annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment, exclusive of the public works and increase of the Navy, shall be available, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL CO.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 304), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey or any subcommittee thereof chosen by said committee be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate, ascertain, and report by whom the stock, bonds, and obligations of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. are owned, the value thereof, so far as the value of the said securities can be ascertained; the value, income, gross and net, and expenses of said canal; by whom and in whose interest the said canal is operated, owned, and controlled, and who is chiefly benefited by the manner of its operation; with authority to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page, and to sit during the sessions of the Senate; the expense of said investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

On motion of Mr. BORAH, it was

*Ordered*, That 5,000 copies of Senate Document No. 301, Sixty-second Congress, second session, being a summary of the wages and hours of labor from the report on conditions of employment in the iron and steel industry of the United States, prepared under the direction of Charles P. Neill, Commissioner of Labor, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

#### SENATOR TILLMAN ON PHYSICAL CULTURE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have received so many letters asking for my speech on the antismoking resolution and making inquiry about what I have done to bring myself back from the grave, as it were, that I have had that speech printed for distribution to the letter writers.

I ask unanimous consent to have read an article I wrote for the Physical Culture Magazine, of New York City, some time ago, my purpose being to send this along with my speech to those who are making inquiry. I commend it to the careful and prayerful consideration of my brother Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The simultaneous deaths within the recent past of two of the most distinguished captains of industry in the South are very lamentable. Both of these men started at the bottom and worked their way to the very top of their profession—railroading. Neither ought to have died so young. One was 63 years of age, while the other was only 60. Had they known the value of self-control in eating and the use of hot water, they would have lived at least 10 years longer to serve their country and be with their families. Indeed, it may be said that just at the period when experience and study made them capable of doing their best work they were cut down. When the world loses such men the gap is not easily filled, although there are many who think they can fill it and are anxious to try.

Since I was paralyzed three years and a half ago for the second time I have learned a great deal about my own body, because during that time I have studied it more than all the balance of my life put together.

In the hope that my own personal experience may benefit others and save precious lives, I am going to recite briefly as possible how I now live and what I have done and am doing every day to restore and preserve my health. It is by no means fully restored, but my recovery is indeed marvelous to those who have watched its progress.

Most men will be skeptical and not believe what I say. The overwhelming number will not have the self-control to do what I advise, though it is neither hard nor painful. The trouble will be skepticism and the unwillingness to control their appetites.

I owe a great deal to suggestions from unknown friends, who have written me personal letters telling what they had discovered about themselves. I tried these, and have learned much in this way. The balance of my "system," if it may be called a system, has been evolved from my own study and experience. Of one thing I am sure—nothing contained in these hints will injure any normal man or woman.

Remember, I was never entirely helpless, although very nearly so, and it was only after several months of treatment at sanitariums that I grew strong enough to begin physical-culture exercises. But after I began them I steadily improved. The man who perseveres will thank me, for the result will immediately be good. The man who has mere curiosity and not will power enough to keep on had better not begin.

I passed my sixty-sixth birthday last August, and am therefore not very far from the Biblical limit of three score years and ten. But had I learned how to take care of my body in early manhood, I might have been likely to reach the age of 85 or 90, perhaps a hundred, because I inherited from my father and mother a very strong constitution.

The main idea I have had in devising this scheme to restore my health by the use of physical-culture exercises has been to increase the circulation and drive the blood to the brain and keep down rheumatism by working the joints and preventing calcareous deposits.

These calcareous deposits are like iron rust, and when allowed to accumulate they cause a great deal of pain and trouble. Hot water flushes the kidneys and washes these poisons out. Like any other machine, the human body should be kept in good order by constant exercise. Physical culture affords both the exercise and the lubricant to keep the hinges from creaking.

The following are the exercises I take on my bed each morning: Before getting up in the morning take the head off the pillow and stretch out straight. Draw in a deep breath and begin by kicking the buttock with the heel of one foot fifteen times; then exhale. Draw in the breath again and kick with the heel of the other foot fifteen times, holding the breath until the movement is finished. Then let the air out and draw in a fresh breath and kick with both feet fifteen times. Draw in a fresh breath to the limit after each movement.

Next drop the heels on the bed with the knees drawn up. Then throw the knees as far apart as they can be carried and repeat movement twenty times.

Then throw first one foot and then the other toward the headboard with vigor, keeping the knee joints as straight as you can. A different set of muscles are brought into play by doing this with the knees drawn up and the knee joints limber.

Now kick out with both feet as wide apart as possible and kick with emphasis, as though you were kicking off a vicious dog.

Next place the hands under the small of the back, using these as a lever, elevate both feet at once and the lower part of the body toward the headboard, using the abdominal muscles to pull up the lower extremities. If in an iron bed, this movement can be facilitated by grasping the railing or round above the head with the hands, pulling up the legs and feet. This and the next movement are intended to reduce the paunch by changing the fat on the abdomen to muscle.

Then fasten the feet under something and pull the trunk to a sitting posture. Young, healthy people do not need to fasten the feet, but old and fat ones must do it. One ought to go about it cautiously until the muscles have become accustomed to the strain. Repeat four or five times.

Finally throw the head back with the feet on the bed and lift the body clear so that the shoulders do not touch, forming an arch. Repeat this as often as you wish.

I then take a cold bath, beginning with the water tepid and ending with it as cold as I can stand. I rub down briskly, put on undershirt and drawers, and get a light pair of iron dumb-bells—3½ pounds. These are to give momentum to the movements and bring the muscles into better play.

First stand erect with the dumb-bells firmly clinched. Throw the arms downward and backward, passing by the thighs. Repeat fifteen times. Continuing, bend the trunk forward as nearly horizontal as you can, and let the arms swing as near the floor as they can go, straightening up between each swing and repeating until you have bent down ten times.

Then, keeping the knees stiff, try to punch the big toe of each foot with both fists. Repeat as often as desired, straightening up between punches.

Next, using the dumb-bells, drop the hands full length of the arms a little to the front. Then begin by swinging the arms in unison first to the right and then to the left. As one goes up let the other come down, swaying the body from side to side as the movements are made. Elevate the hand that goes up as high above the head as possible, and put the other as near the floor as you can. This is called the "liver squeezer," and is very fine for stimulating that organ.

Then throw both arms behind the back hard so as to bring the back of the hands as near together as possible while holding the dumb-bells clinched.

Still holding the dumb-bells, throw one to the rear and the other to the front, looking first over one shoulder and then over the other, twisting the spine as far as possible and loosening the vertebrae.

Using one hand at a time, swing the dumb-bells upward, backward, downward, and forward, forming a circle with the armpit as a center. Then reverse and swing the other way.

Standing flat-footedly, elevate the hands above the head and bend forward and try to touch the floor while the knees are held stiff. Straighten up and repeat. Continue to do this until you succeed in reaching the floor. I usually reach it the third effort. At first I could hardly get lower than my knees.

Take hold of the bed and squat as low as you can. Straighten up and bend backward as far as you can. Then squat and repeat, straightening up and bending backward. This will loosen the vertebrae of the spine and relieve the pressure on the nerves inside the trunk. This to me is my most valuable exercise, as it enables me to mount my horse from the ground without assistance.

Caution: Never do any of these movements to the point of fatigue.

I practice these exercises morning and night before and after undressing. It takes about 10 minutes, not including the bath. I have found that deep breathing adds very much to my strength and has facilitated my return to health. Many do not know what this means. So I will describe my method.

First compress the diaphragm, driving all the breath out of the body you can. This is what the doctors call dead or residual air, and it remains in the lungs all the time unless it is expelled by will power. After you have cleaned out the lungs draw in all the fresh air you can. Hold it in the lungs while you count 10.

Then exhale slowly. One can increase the quantity more than he had supposed possible at first. This is the best thing I have ever found for insomnia, as almost before I know it, as I am counting the inhalations, I am asleep. I never remember to have done it more than ten times without going to sleep.

Another great blessing to me has been hot water. I drink it as hot as I can (about 160° F. in my case), using at least 3 quarts a day. Tepid water is rejected by some stomachs as it produces nausea. But hot water becomes acceptable to most people. I have gotten so I do not want any other kind. It cleanses the stomach in readiness for food. It aids digestion, taken at the right time—shortly after eating. It assists in keeping the bowels regular, and is a specific for indigestion, acute or otherwise. Indeed I can not say too much for it.



I have learned to aid the movement of the bowels by commencing with both hands on the right side above the groin, where the colon begins, and slowly kneading with inward pressure following the colon upward and across, then downward toward the rectum. It is of vital importance to paralytics especially to have the bowels move freely once a day. Fruit, both raw and cooked, will assist materially in this matter. I have to assist nature by the use of aloe once a day.

The four things which have contributed most to my restoration to health are careful diet, deep breathing, physical-culture exercises, and drinking hot water. All these working together have brought about the result so far attained. If I were to name them in the order of importance, they would come as above given. Without the physical culture I would now be tortured by rheumatism and perhaps be bedridden. I have literally kicked it out of bed. I am constantly reminded of my rheumatic condition by twinges of sciatica.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will pardon me for a personal observation. I see many Senators smiling at what has just been read, and no doubt they think this is a fad of mine. But when they recall the fact that 23 men who worked in this Chamber with me four years ago have gone to their long account it ought to make them pause and consider things more seriously. I am afraid I will see many of you go to your graves yet before I myself am called.

#### ARECIBO RIVER BRIDGES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4145) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R., which was, in line 5, after "River," to insert "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 11245. An act extending to the port of Providence, R. I., the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 12160. An act providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 13133. An act for the approving and payment of the drainage assessments on Indian lands in Salt Creek drainage district No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 13771. An act extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before morning business is closed I wish to inquire if it will be in order to ask to take from the table Senate resolution 288, submitted by me, being a resolution calling on the President for information as to what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can move to take from the table the resolution to which he refers.

Mr. JONES. I have no desire to do so this morning, because the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is anxious to conclude his remarks; but I wish to state that I have been expecting for several days to call up the resolution to which I refer, and I shall endeavor to get it up on to-morrow at the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope to conclude my remarks to-day in from one-half to three-quarters of an hour.

#### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that Senate bill 120 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate. It will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire now to conclude my discussion of the evidence in this case. I can not close, however, without quoting the concluding remarks of Mr. J. W. Brafford, the State grain inspector, of Kansas City, Kans. In a letter Mr. Brafford says:

The markets should be compelled to take their hands off of the throat of the business, as far as manipulating the inspection of grain, regardless of what it is; and to be prevented from so manipulating it that it matters not whether the market breaks or raises if they are able to

order the grades tightened or loosened; they can make good on any feature of speculation they desire, and the balance of the trade, especially the producer and some more, are entirely at their mercy. There is no more justice, no more reason, or excuse for the great grain markets to dictate the different standards of grain and then construe the rules in grading it than there would be to permit these same markets to change the length of the yardstick, to increase or diminish the size of the standard bushel to suit their own conveniences and to make good on bad guessing of the markets.

There are some sections of our country that are not affected so much as others by the foreign demand. But that foreign demand has a great influence upon our home prices over the greater portion of the United States. If that demand is strong, if the trade is freed from contention and disappointment, if our grain grades can be relied upon, no one can deny that it will add to the value of our grain and the consequent legitimate profits of all persons interested in grain. But more important to us is the secondary effect of lack of confidence in our grades. The great effort of European buyers in the last few years has been to develop the Argentine grain trade, the grain trade from Russia and other sections and to avoid the American trade.

We have seen some result of this effort on the part of foreign dealers in grain to develop the Argentine production in the fact that their grain is being shipped as far into the interior of this country as Indianapolis itself. I am informed that Argentine corn has actually come into Indiana in competition with the home product.

For years all of our consular reports have been filled with bitter complaints made by foreign purchasers. They all sound the same note of warning, and declare that the grain trade in many sections has been declining, and that if such dissatisfaction, which is becoming general, is not overcome our export trade will be entirely destroyed at many points. The universal complaint there is that the grading is not up to the standard fixed by the rules at any of these great terminals, either in kind or quality; that the conditions are growing worse; that the purchaser there does not receive what he buys. The result is that the miller has ceased to buy American grain for his mill and the farmer for his stock, and European and other foreign grain is taking its place. It is useless to attempt to minimize or to attempt to explain away the universal dissatisfaction on the part of European buyers. So universal and so intense have these complaints grown that the whole European trade has organized a commission or association to deal with American grades, and, if possible, to secure some action on the part of our Government which will mitigate the evils which follow from fraudulent and improper certification of grain shipped abroad. Letters have been written by the head of this association to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States asking for some legislation which will remove the present incumbrance on our grain trade in Europe, due to the worse than uncertainties in our system of inspection and grading.

If there were little in these complaints, if they were imaginative only, still good business judgment would demand such change in the system as would eliminate them. If they are justified, as every report will clearly demonstrate, then a remedy is imperatively demanded. There never will be absolute confidence in our grain grading so long as the grades are established and controlled by those who are interested as purchasers only. If our grain is to be sold by grades—and no one will deny that under present conditions it must be so sold—then it follows that those grades should be established and fixed by an unbiased, independent, and competent authority.

This most forceful arraignment and condemnation of the American grades by European importers compelled the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to take cognizance of the chaotic conditions of our foreign grain trade. One of the best experts from the Agricultural Department was sent to Europe to investigate the complaints made by the European buyers and to ascertain what might be done to meet their just requirements. This agent spent a good part of a year abroad, visiting all of the European grain markets and making a most thorough and comprehensive examination of the whole subject of our grain export trade. He found that the complaints were well founded; that the whole trouble was due to improper certification of grades; that grain unfit for use was certified at a high grade; that in consequence enormous losses had been suffered by purchasers throughout Europe; and that the influence of all the exchanges was hostile to American grain. He also found that American wheat and corn, when in proper condition and measuring up to the standards certified, were considered better than the wheat and corn of any other country in the world; but by reason of the adulteration of the grades and the very considerable practice of attempting to foist damaged and inferior grain upon the European purchaser, our wheat and corn of certain grade was bought on the markets at considerably lower figures



than the same grade and character of grain from other countries. The president of the Hamburg Grain Dealers' Association informed the agent that the price of American wheat actually fell 5 per cent in that market immediately upon the arrival of the first of the season's shipment, because it did not measure up to its certification; that the delivery of this wheat on wheat contracts was condemned, and the European grain interests were warned against further purchases in a circular letter sent out by the Hamburg association, which was copied generally and freely commented upon by the press. Thus the insatiable greed of a few American exporters, who seek to work off a low grade of grain, purchased from the farmers at a low price, upon a high-grade certificate results not only in immediate diminution of the price of all our American grain and the loss of millions of dollars annually to the American producer, but also is a potent factor in diminishing and destroying our future export trade.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to some of these letters from foreign importers. I desire first to quote from a letter from Robert S. Patterson, chairman of the European International Committee on Grain Certificates. I have heretofore called attention to the fact that our grading has been done so carelessly or so unjustly that an organization has been established in Europe for the purpose of dealing with American grades. The chairman of this international committee was Mr. Robert S. Patterson, who writes:

European buyers have lost confidence in the reliability of United States certificates, and American grain consequently suffers in price, buyers giving a preference whenever possible to other grain, and only buying yours when compelled to do so or at a reduction in price sufficient, in their opinion, to compensate them for risks they run in buying certificate grain.

I now quote from a letter from Mr. Patterson to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he says:

By direction of the European international committee on American certificates I have the honor to inclose a copy of a letter I have addressed to His Excellency the President, which I think explains itself, and I have only to add that my committee, representing the European grain trade, desire me to say that they gladly welcome and warmly support such measure as that now before Congress—

The same measure which I am pressing on the attention of Congress now—

by which the grading and certificating of grain, now in the hands of a number of various authorities, partly public and partly private, or, at any rate, in some cases open to the interference of private interests, will be transferred to a Government department where we consider we may rely not only on its thorough impartiality, but on such complete uniformity of administration at all ports that European importers will get in future a thoroughly trustworthy certificate.

In this belief my committee hope that you will succeed in getting your proposals accepted and that the results will prove generally acceptable to all honest dealers in grain.

That, Mr. President, is the sentiment of the foreign purchasers. I have a letter from the Rotterdam Corn Association, signed by the president of that association, in which he says:

During many years already the American grain-inspection certificates have been very unsatisfactory, and immense losses were caused to the buyers on this side by the careless inspection of American grain shipped for export.

Many important firms in the importing centers on this side have absolutely given up importing American corn, taught by the experience of several years, when a single parcel of this article, certified No. 2 mixed, sail mixed, etc., and still showing 30 to 90 per cent damage on arrival, caused a loss greater than the small gain made on many shipments together; they preferred to buy from Argentina, Russia, and the Danube. A better inspection, however, and certificates which give sufficient guaranty that the grade has really been given in accordance with the grain's quality and condition will induce these firms to take up the import of American corn again.

We don't object to the export of inferior grain, but to the fact that the grades are not given according to the condition of the grain, so that the certificates are entirely unreliable. Perhaps some buyers on this side want the inferior grain, but those who deal in the better qualities want to be sure that when they pay a better price for the higher grade the certificate gives them the guaranty to get this grade.

Mr. President, every one of these letters is an argument in itself in favor of Federal inspection. Our consul general at Marseille, France, Robert P. Skinner, took the matter up, and I now quote from a report made by him to the Department of Commerce and Labor:

It is highly desirable that certain facts in regard to American grain-selling methods be given immediate and wide circulation and that something be done, either by action of Congress or by the concerted action of American commercial bodies, to reform or, rather, standardize the system under which the great cereal-exporting business has been created.

There is little popular knowledge in the United States in regard to the fact that wheat, corn, grease, and similar products of American origin are not now sold abroad by sample, but by nominal grade. The European buyer knows nothing of the merchandise whatever before it reaches his possession. He imports and resells various classes of merchandise the quality or grade of which is certified to him not by the merchant who has sold him the article, but by the official inspector of a board of trade or other equivalent body at the port of shipment. He pays for the goods before he receives them, and when the exporter in the United States delivers to him a certificate of inspection, declaring the goods to be of a given grade, he has no alternative but to honor

the drafts. The bargain is absolutely final upon the production to him of this certificate of inspection.

Although no two ports in the United States may absolutely agree as to the descriptive terms to be applied to a given grade of wheat, although previous shipments may have been of obviously different quality, if the certificate delivered conforms to the grade ordered, the buyer must accept delivery. These are "American conditions." The fact that for many years we have exported nearly all our surplus agricultural products under these conditions speaks well for American business methods, and the fact that these methods are generally acceptable is of advantage to the people of the United States.

Of late years the murmurs against this system have been increasing in Europe, and whereas a short time ago they took the form of isolated private complaints that goods did not always conform to the certified grade, they now take the form of organized protests. I have before me not merely private correspondence running through a number of years, but the recent proceedings of the London Corn Trade Association and the proceedings of a delegate conference held on December 12 at the Berlin Bourse, the general tenor of which is that foreign importers are vexed with prevailing conditions in the United States and are determined to force an improvement. At these two conferences a great many harsh things were said in regard to American certificates, and specific instances of irregularities were mentioned which I need not now repeat. The vital point which it will be well to separate from so much context is this:

Then he quotes a statement from Mr. Friedberg. He says:

Mr. FRIEDBERG (Hamburg). It is perfectly clear that if an American inspector certifies, we have no right to doubt, or if we do, we are asked, "Why do you go on buying?" I may assure this meeting that a good many of us are not going on buying. We have none of this trouble in South America. For the general trade I think that there are respectable people enough in America and I am wondering why they do not stop the glaring abuses that are complained of.

Why is it necessary, Mr. President, that these complaints should all be made against the North American exporter and none of them against the South American exporter?

I shall ask to insert the balance of the report of the consul general, which I have marked, without stopping to read it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

It was the fact that not many years ago the vast bulk of our grain exportations went forward from New York and that every year standard samples of cereals were sent out to European buyers, bearing the seal of the New York commercial bodies which issued certificates of inspection. Under such circumstances, when European buyers received a certificate from New York stating that a certain cargo afloat was of X quality they could refer to their sample of this X grain, and there was at least a moral guaranty that sample and cargo would be alike. The practice of sending out standard samples is no longer followed, while grain is being shipped under certificates of inspection from Duluth, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, Galveston, and probably elsewhere. In each port or place a commercial organization assumes the right to issue certificates of grade and yet no two ports or places have agreed upon the text of the terms which they use to describe the standard grades, let alone upon the grain itself. Nor is this all. I quote from the printed rules of a great board of trade:

"The committee on grain shall have full power and authority to establish grades of grains and to alter and amend the same as may be deemed necessary or expedient."

This instability is naturally one of the conditions of American business that is least acceptable to foreign importers, and what with rivalry between ports for export business it has created not only bitter feeling abroad, but definite differences in the prices at which grain of the same nominal grade is offered for sale at the different ports of shipment. There are "easy ports" and "good ports," and sometimes the "easy ports" are penalized, as thus explained in a recent letter from an importer to an officer of an American commercial organization:

"As you know, at present exporters have great difficulty selling on certificates, but where quality is reasonably assured they are willing to pay a premium over lower inspections. Newport News and Norfolk were excluded on the London and Liverpool contracts because of last year's No. 2 corn shipments, while, as you know, your inspection maintained a premium all last season over the Atlantic."

No wheat importers desire to pay a premium here, or to exact a penalty there, based upon their appreciation of inspection methods. Wheat will fix its own price readily enough, and what the importer wishes to know and has a right to know with as much certainty as attaches to any human transaction is that No. 1 white winter wheat, for example, is the same kind of grain, whether it be inspected at Duluth or New Orleans. The importer insists that if the American Government, commercial bodies, and individual exporters have not agreed upon the qualifications of various grains necessary that they may receive specific gradings, it is the result of their own negligence, very possibly encouraged in certain quarters by those who profit by this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The remedy sought is so easy of application and the demand for its application is so entirely reasonable that to the importer protracted resistance is incomprehensible. The proper remedy may be applied either by our Government or by the cooperation of our trade bodies. The starting point of the reform would be naturally the establishment of standard descriptions by law. This done, if the Government were charged with the issuance of inspection certificates, the service would be removed from local influences, and our so-called official certificates would be rehabilitated. If this very rational proposition be objected to, the surest means of effectively combating it would be the holding of a conference of American grain-inspecting bodies for the adoption of grain standards and for the adoption of ways and means of drawing standard samples, to be deposited in American consulates at great European ports or to be issued upon demand to importers, and to provide for a board of inspectors, the members thereof to be transferred at intervals and liberated from every form of local pressure.

Mr. McCUMBER. I again call attention to a report from Consul General Thomas R. Wallace, from Crefeld, Germany. He says:

The grain dealers in northern and western Europe have been holding meetings, the principal purpose of which seems to be to take united action with regard to a change in the rules and methods of transacting



business with the United States in their line and to correct abuses now existing in the same.

The grain trade from the United States with this district has been declining for some time, and if such dissatisfaction becomes general throughout Europe the losses to the people of America in this important branch of their export trade will be enormous. To gain some idea of the causes of the complaints regarding the grain exported from the United States I have made personal inquiry among the millers and dealers in these products, and am told that the conditions complained of here are the same all over Europe.

A resolution of international committee in regard to American certificates, January 24, 1907, resolved to call upon boards of trade and commercial exchanges of United States and Canada to draw up uniform rules for the grading of grain for export; that should certifying authority refuse or neglect to issue and act upon such rules this committee shall report to the European associations with a view to exclusion of certificates of said authority.

Mr. President, I have covered much of the foreign complaint. There is a great deal more that I do not care to cite at this time.

I want to take up now, for a short time, the complaints in the different States of the Union, and cite but a few from each State. I want to show under this division that there is not a State in the Union where there are purchasers of grain from any of these terminals that do not plead for some relief from the uncertainty of the grades.

I will start in my own State by reading a resolution adopted by the Tri-State Grain Dealers' Association, whose members come from the three States of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. This resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the McCumber Federal grain bill meets the hearty approval of this convention. Present system of juggling with grades and excessive dockage, of mixing hard wheat with inferior grades, calls for inspection far removed from local or State interests and from political manipulation. Demand that wheat shall sell in the markets of world upon its merits and that farmer shall receive for his product its full value, less reasonable commission for handling and transportation.

This is from the grain-trade producers of three States.

The North Dakota Bankers' Association, which took up this subject for the relief of our people, passed a resolution, from which I will quote only a sentence:

Your committee is of the opinion that the reforms outlined will be of material benefit to the grain growers of the State and will be a stepping-stone to a better system of inspection, viz, Federal inspection, which would do away entirely with the many conflicting inspections established in the various States.

I take now the Independent Grain Shippers' Association of North Dakota. They passed a resolution which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That this association is in favor of passing a bill for Federal inspection of grain; that we favor the passage of a bill prohibiting the dockage of grain; that we favor a national law changing our present system of measuring grain by bushel to the hundredweight.

I take now an extract from a commission firm in Minneapolis doing business under this same system, and I especially call what they say to the attention of those Senators who claim that the people and the boards themselves are all satisfied with their own conditions. This is what they say:

They have certainly tightened up on grades here, but on account of the grades being so uneven there isn't a man living really could tell whether this sample of wheat would grade No. 3 or whether it would grade No. 4. To show you how uneven the grades are here we had a sample of wheat from one of our shippers a few days ago. We took the sample to the inspectors; one called it No. 1, another called it No. 2, and the board of appeal called it No. 3, and therefore there isn't a man living could tell what they are liable to grade your wheat when it arrives here.

And this is from a wheat-purchasing firm in the city of Minneapolis.

I now quote a letter from Charles D. Jones, of Memphis, Tenn. He says:

\* \* \* My greatest fear about this whole proposition is that too many Senators and Representatives will listen to the wall that will be raised by the big exchanges of this country, who are enjoying such great privileges under the present inspection system, and in listening to them will agree on compromise, which will not give this country relief to which we are entitled.

To my mind few things in way of legislation have been offered in our National Congress for years which would as directly benefit as many thousand people as will the administration of your proposed law. It is impossible for me to buy from any large center a No. 3 white oat and have accurate idea of what real quality I will get under that inspection. One imposition on buyer is that often they do not get a certificate of inspection, and it is an acknowledged fact that a great many shippers will quote, for instance, No. 2 white corn and have no idea of shipping anything but No. 3 white corn.

Since last letter to you I have had great deal of correspondence with dealers all over the South, and they all seem enthusiastic over your bill, and know that the Senators and Representatives from Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee have been written to regarding your bill and asked to support the measure.

I have here another from Minnesota. This is a resolution from the Minnesota Farmers' Elevator Association:

*Resolved*, That we recommend the enactment of a Federal-inspection law, as introduced in Congress by Senator McCUMBER, \* \* \* and that we specially call upon the Members of the Minnesota delegation in Congress to assist in the passage of such laws.

I quote one now from the Farmers' Cooperative Grain & Supply Co., of Minden, Nebr.:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this board that all grain should be inspected and graded by the Federal Government, and when exported should carry with it the seal and proper authority, so that it should have with it absolute confidence in every grain market of the world: *Resolved further*, That we heartily indorse Federal inspection and call upon our Representatives in Congress to do everything possible in their power to assist in passing such a bill.

I now go to the State of Illinois, and read a resolution from the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of Illinois:

*Resolved*, That we favor the inauguration of a system of Federal grain inspection and grading of grain along the lines provided for in the McCumber bill, and we call upon the Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois to bend every effort toward securing the enactment of such legislation by Congress at an early date.

I have communications from the Kansas Board of Trade, of Kansas City, Kans., and the Farmers' Terminal Grain Co., both of which favor Federal grain inspection.

We then drop down to Alabama. W. C. Agee, of Birmingham, Ala., writes that—

the present system of inspecting grain throughout this country is corrupt and crooked as it can be, and it is a notorious fact that at practically no grain centers can we find an honest inspection of grain. We are sure that all reputable grain dealers and the farmers will welcome the passage of such a bill (Federal inspection bill).

A letter from Baker & Holmes Co., in Florida, says:

We wish to state emphatically that we will do whatever we can to aid you in the passage of this bill, and if we can be of any service to you, let us know the nature of same.

We think this is a move in the right direction and it will be of great benefit to those in the grain business, and we wish to assure you that you have our sympathy in every respect.

From Mississippi, from the Gibson Grocery Co.:

We take pleasure in recommending and indorsing your bill in reference to the uniform system of grading grain, and believe it should have the encouragement of every honest buyer and seller. There is not one average buyer in ten in this section of the country but that has at some time been imposed upon in this respect and with no recourse whatever.

Another letter from Threefoot Bros., Meridian, Miss.:

We note the bill offered in regard to grain inspection and wish to commend you for this, and hope it will become a law, as the present condition of grain is very unfavorable and detrimental to the dealers, as it is only occasionally that we get justice in accepting grain shipped by present certificates of inspection.

From the Sanford Grocery Co., of Sanford, N. C.:

We feel that the passing of this bill—Federal inspection bill—would be one of the greatest improvements for the grain receivers in the various sections of the United States, and especially in Southern States, that has ever happened, and we desire to express our deep and lasting appreciation, etc. As a rule the grain received by southern dealers has fallen far short of the grade at which it was billed, and as grain receivers we are always at a loss to know how to quote our trade here until we have received the grain and inspected it ourselves. We feel that the passage of the bill would greatly relieve the present situation, for if all grain is inspected by Federal inspectors we are confident we will get what our invoices call for. Under this law there will be less partiality and fewer discriminations in favor of the shippers and fairer and better treatment to the receivers at large, and will place competition amongst shippers on a level.

Here is another one from Missouri, which I think I have already quoted. It is from the Merchants' Exchange at St. Louis, which at that time favored the enactment of this measure.

I now go down to Georgia. I have several letters from that State, but I will cite one only, from the Bainbridge Grocery Co., of Bainbridge, Ga.:

Are glad to note that you have introduced a bill requiring Federal inspection of all grain. We wish to extend to you our hearty appreciation of your interest in this matter and urge that you use every effort to get such bill passed, as it has been a great imposition on the South for the past several years. All the northern and western shippers seem to have the idea that they can dump anything they please on the South and force them to accept it.

A letter from South Carolina:

We have read with interest notice of your bill and wish to say with reference thereto that in our opinion the enactment of this bill means much to the South. We hope that you will become more and more determined to push this matter through, as you shall not only deserve our commendation but of the whole South.

I have a letter here from Kansas. It is a little longer than I desire to read, and I will ask that it may be included in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done.

The letter referred to is as follows:

#### KANSAS.

From letter of D. W. Troup, secretary of the Kansas Board of Trade, to Congressman Charles F. Scott, January 30, 1908:

\* \* \* We can readily see that the adoption of Federal inspection of grain would take away from the interests that now dominate the grain trade of our country a weapon that gives them almost absolute control of the business, and that under the present system they enjoy advantages which they would not obtain under Federal inspection of grain, and which is worth to them the difference between the value of the grain now arriving at the market centers and the value of grain after having been received at market centers by these interests of at least 3 to 5 cents per bushel. You understand that the



value of grain under the present system into a central market must be at least 3 to 5 cents per bushel higher than that required by the same inspection department when it is loaded out of terminal elevators, and after having come in possession of the aforesaid interests.

"It is the simplest matter possible to have uniform inspection of grain.

"The only influence that is fighting Federal inspection of grain to-day, so far as I can find out—and I have been going into this matter very thoroughly—is the boards of trade, who are profiting by the manipulation of the grain products of this country. That is, I mean to say, the boards of trade hereinbefore mentioned, all line-honse concerns and their adherents, and the different grain dealers' associations, such as the Kansas Grain Dealers' Association, of this State, and we sincerely hope you are not lined up and allied with these interests and will not use your influence for the defeat of one of the greatest bills that has ever been introduced in Congress for the benefit of the producer and to rehabilitate the grain trade between this country and Europe, and to raise our standard of value of Kansas No. 2 'hard' wheat abroad, where it has been discredited by manipulation to such an extent that to-day it is almost impossible to sell our wheat abroad so long as the foreigner is able to buy from South America, Russia, and other competing countries.

"It is just as important that we should have uniform inspection of grain and some guarantee from the inspection department after a car of grain is inspected that the certificate will carry in somewhere as it is that we have uniform weights, and that when we sell a bushel of wheat in Kansas we understand that we have to deliver 60 pounds, no matter whether it is in New York State, Missouri, Kentucky, or Florida."

From the Grain Dealers' Association of Kansas, E. J. Smiley, secretary, December 9, 1907:

"The writer has given Federal inspection deep study and is almost convinced that such a measure will be necessary to secure uniform grades throughout the country. He has discussed the question of Federal inspection with the official members of this association and they agree that Federal inspection must come in order to protect the producer and local grain dealer against imposition by the large elevator owners."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have read, possibly some will say at great length, quotations from the testimony taken in this matter. I have done so that I may bring together the important portions of that testimony upon a very important feature of the case. This evidence clearly established two facts, first, that all the grain producers favor this bill; second, that all the grain consumers favor it. There is therefore only the little coterie of grain dealers at the terminals who oppose it.

The present method is inefficient as well as unjust. I wish to call attention to only another little portion of the testimony, without quoting it. There is evidence in these hearings that a single inspector in the city of Chicago, at a time when there was more or less congestion, actually reported that he had inspected 250 cars in one-half of a day. That required him to travel 2½ miles down one side of the train loads of cars and 2½ miles back, open every car on the one side and on the other, and make the test. You can see that it would be a physical impossibility for him to have properly investigated and certified 25 cars in that length of time. All he could have done would have been to have made a very wild guess; and as all this grain must be sold upon his guess and upon the certificates that he would attach to each car you can see very easily the confusion that would naturally follow when the people who bought those carloads upon those certificates should open the cars.

Mr. President, we have here a new bill that is to take the place of the one introduced by me. This new bill is known as the Lever bill. Who drew the bill? That is an important question. The Agricultural Department admits that it was drawn by the trade. The trade in their statements to Senators state that they agreed upon a bill, and they had one that would be satisfactory to themselves. In other words, since 1890 we have been attempting to rid ourselves of the rules and regulations of these trades. Finally the trades themselves have drawn up a bill under which we are supposed to free ourselves from their clutches. The same power that made the rules that we are complaining of now fix a law for us. What reason have we to assume that they will be more liberal, more generous to the public and less selfish to themselves in a bill which they would draw than they would be in the rules which they established?

Mr. President, there is one good thing in the new bill, the Lever bill. It does provide for Federal standardization. That is practically all it does do. It provides for Federal supervision, but the provisions are such that the Federal supervision will be ineffective, just exactly as the board wants it to be. Then, under an ineffective Federal supervision, with the same control they have now of the individual inspectors, they can go on with the same nefarious practices that they have been indulging in for more than 30 years.

That bill, I understand, has been introduced here. I thought I had a copy of the bill with me, but I evidently have not. However, the principal feature that I note about the bill is that the Agricultural Department seems to know something of the nature of these exchanges. It has carefully guarded, in section 8, its employees by providing that the boards of exchange are prohibited from assaulting the employees who go there to make an inspection, and imposing a heavy penalty

upon them if they do. I had supposed that the State laws were sufficient to protect all alike, but the Agricultural Department seems to think that they are not sufficient.

Mr. President, in closing I want again to ask this question, because I want an honest answer from any of those who oppose Federal inspection: What objection is there to the Government doing the inspecting itself? Why do the boards of trade want to employ the inspectors? These boards admit that the Government should have supervision, they admit that they should have people who are qualified to supervise the inspection, but they do not want the Government to inspect. If you admit, as they admit, that the Government should fix the grade and should fix the standard, then what objection is there that the Government employees who are to pass upon the grades should do the grading themselves?

It is stated with some force that the Agricultural Department have now changed front, and while in the evidence of the officers of that department before the committee they not only spoke in favor of Federal supervision but also Federal inspection, that they are now supporting a proposition which will call for Federal supervision only. I was therefore compelled to write to the department to ascertain if there was any reason that department could give why they should not have also the power of Federal inspection as well as supervision, and what reason there was, if any, for a change. In answer to my inquiry I received a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture. I quote only a sentence from it:

In connection with our investigations relating to the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, it has been found that with but few exceptions the grain inspectors in the important markets are fully competent to inspect and grade grain if left free to exercise their own judgment as to the grade of the grain under normal movements.

Mr. President, I assume that, and that is the reason I assumed they were competent under Government employment.

I then wrote again to secure, if I could, any reason why the Department of Agriculture at the present time did not agree with its previous contention that we should have inspection as well as grading, and I received a reply. I will read both my letter and the reply. It was addressed to Hon. B. T. Galloway, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, on March 10:

MARCH 10, 1914.

Hon. B. T. GALLOWAY,  
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your favor of the 6th instant in answer to my inquiry concerning investigations of the department relative to the handling, transporting, and grading of grain and the fixing of definite grades, etc.

You say:  
"As a result of the investigations carried on under this project the department has arrived at the conclusion that effective Government supervision of the inspecting and grading of grain, together with the use of standard grades as fixed by the department, will solve the difficulties which are continuously arising in transactions in grain when bought and sold by grade."

I think both yourself and the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, gave testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry some few years ago in which, if I remember correctly, both of you stated in substance that you would have no difficulty in taking over the inspectors at the various points of inspection and carrying on the grading and inspection under Government control.

I agree with you entirely that "with few exceptions grain inspectors in the important markets are fully competent to inspect and grade grain if left free to exercise their own judgment as to the grade of the grain under normal movements." All these inspectors need to understand is that they can use their own judgment and not the judgment of those to whom they are beholden for their positions. Just and competent inspection can be accomplished only by actual Government inspection unless the Government has one supervisor appointed for every wheat inspector, and if the supervisor so to be appointed is capable of supervising the work he certainly must be capable of doing the work.

If, as you have previously stated, the Federal Government could do the inspecting properly and efficiently, that they could take, for instance, the same force which are inspecting to-day under the divers systems and could use them under a uniform system, why do the various boards of trade oppose it? If these boards of trade really wish supervision for the purpose of enforcing correct inspection and certifying, and if the Government could insure such just and correct inspecting and handling, why do the boards oppose it? They would be relieved of all responsibility and all the labor now necessary to get the grain on the market by grades and could proceed to confine their business to buying and selling wheat. Their reasons for opposing Federal inspection by Federal inspectors are clear to me. I should be glad, however, if you would give me what you deem to be any legitimate reason on their part.

Very truly, yours,

PORTER J. McCUMBER.

That was addressed to the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain if the department knew of any legitimate reason why these boards should object to Government inspection, and I will read the reply. He says:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, March 12, 1914.

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCUMBER: I have your favor of March 10, relating further to the inspection and grading of grain by the Federal Government, or under the supervision of the Federal Government, in which you make inquiry as to any legitimate reason why the grain exchanges



should oppose Federal inspection. In reply, I have to advise that while various objections have been raised by the grain exchanges in opposition to Federal inspection, the results of the investigations of this department do not indicate that either Federal inspection or Federal supervision would in any way be detrimental to the legitimate transactions in grain on any of the exchanges.

That is the complete answer, Mr. President, to those who are claiming that the Department of Agriculture desires to support a different character of bill. Further, he says:

It is clearly evident that there is urgent need—

I especially want to call the attention of Senators to that—

It is clearly evident that there is urgent need for some legislation which will bring about uniformity and reliability in the grading of grain in all markets, so that the producer will have some incentive to grow and market grain of better quality and that the consumer will get the grade that he buys. The investigations of this department during the past two or three years have led to the conclusion that a system of rigid Federal supervision will be equally as effective as Federal inspection, and likewise simpler in its operation. The department, however, stands ready to undertake the enforcement of whatever measure may be enacted by Congress to insure uniformity in the grading of grain entering into interstate and foreign commerce.

Very respectfully,

B. T. GALLOWAY, Acting Secretary.

"It is clearly evident that there is urgent need for some legislation." That is the key to the whole situation. The Department of Agriculture has been for years in favor of Government supervision and Government inspection. They have been in favor of it from the days of the first Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Rusk, who reported in favor of it. The power of the grain trade has been sufficient to prevent any legislation on this subject until the present time. Now the grain trade has come over sufficiently to indicate its willingness to allow a bill to go through that will provide for Federal supervision, and undoubtedly the Agricultural Department is certain that if we can proceed thus far and get a bill of that kind through, the inspection will follow in a very short time, as I am certain that it will; but it is evident the Department of Agriculture would favor this other only because it thinks that there is a greater opportunity of getting it through at the present time.

But, Mr. President, there is no reason in the world why, if we have Federal supervision, those same supervisors can not do the inspecting; and, as is stated by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, there can be no legitimate reason on the part of the boards of trade against Federal inspection.

#### WATERWAY FROM GREAT LAKES TO ATLANTIC OCEAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, my excuse for occupying a few minutes of the Senate's time to-day in discussing the proposition of an ocean waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic by way of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River is not alone to call attention to the theoretical value of such a project, but because it is a peculiarly live question in Canada now, and the highest interests of both countries demand a thorough knowledge of present conditions.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me on this occasion to occupy any time in demonstrating the fact and importance of transportation. The history of its development has been the history of civilization. From the time when man produced more than he consumed and desired other than what he himself created the means of transportation became necessary to commerce. Indeed, so intimately are transportation and commerce related that they can not exist separately. Commerce thrives only where transportation facilities are adequate, and transportation exists only where commerce is possible. This coordinate relation has been so inseparable that it sometimes seems as if the two were of equal primal importance. The great truth is, however, no matter how it may be involved, that commerce is the principal thing, but transportation is a necessary incident thereto. It is one of the main objects of government to promote commerce, and inasmuch as suitable and sufficient means for facilitating it are essential, transportation becomes the legitimate object of governmental concern and action.

The profits and losses of business have a direct relation to means of transportation. If these means are reasonable and adequate, there is likely to be a profit; if they are unreasonable and inadequate, there will always be unprofitable business, if there is any at all.

In what I may say I shall have in mind at all times the fact that transportation is the servant of commerce, but a necessary one, and entitled to proper compensation. The better the servant the greater compensation to which it is entitled; and, reversely, the greater the compensation the more efficient the servant should be. I shall not attempt to demonstrate at this time whether it is over or under paid. I shall briefly show what compensation it receives in comparison with other charges paid by the people whom it serves, and with the sole object of demonstrating the need of its development in the river and harbor branch. For some tables and statistical statements I

desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to a monograph issued by the River and Harbor Congress, through Mr. S. A. Thompson. Its accuracy is vouched for by that distinguished and reliable waterway authority, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], so I quote liberally and confidently from it.

In order that the figures I shall give may be understood in their application to improved transportation facilities it is well to bear in mind that the cost of transportation enters into the cost of everything that is bought and sold. Into what we eat and what we wear. Into the construction of our homes and into everything which decorates or furnishes or preserves them. Little of commercial value exists that is not enhanced in cost to the user or consumer by the element of transportation. This cost can not be accurately segregated from the cost of production and from the profits of merchant and middleman. It must be paid, and though payment is made unconsciously and involuntarily it is nevertheless made and in the aggregate the sum is stupendous. It is to the interest of the people that such cost be as small as possible consistent with the most efficient service.

According to the Thirteenth Census, compiled under its competent director, E. Dana Durand, there was collected in duties and customs upon imported merchandise by the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, \$3.84 per capita for all the people of the United States. During that same year the per capita payment for railroad transportation on merchandise alone was \$30.96. The Government receipts from all sources in 1907, save from the sale of bonds, were \$9.84 per capita. The people paid the railroads more than three times as much money for transporting merchandise as was received by the Government from all sources, less the receipts from bond sales.

During the 15 years from 1894 to 1908, both inclusive, the railroad transportation tax upon the people was \$16,711,000,000 more than the total receipts of the Government outside of bonds.

From the census report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, we learn that the total receipts of the United States and of all the States and subdivisions thereof from all sources was as follows:

National Government.....	\$684,326,280
States and Territories.....	189,163,067
Counties.....	199,110,468
Cities.....	490,980,445
All other minor subdivisions.....	219,304,262
Total.....	1,791,895,522

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the same period shows that the gross receipts of the railroads of the United States were \$130,808,374 more than all public receipts, or a total of \$1,922,703,896.

In the year of 1906-7 the railroads of the United States were paid only \$5,268,812 less than the total revenues of France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and the Netherlands combined.

I have thus far spoken only of rail transportation. The census report shows that for the calendar year of 1906 the amount paid for water transportation in the coastwise, lake, canal, and river service in the United States was \$294,854,532. This amount does not include lighterage and harbor work nor the amount paid for ocean traffic to and from foreign ports. It is estimated the latter amounts to \$300,000,000, and thus we have in round numbers a total cost of water transportation of about \$600,000,000.

It is impossible to obtain the exact cost of the transportation of the country's merchandise over wagon roads. It is known that the total tonnage handled by rail and water was, in 1907, about 1,100,000,000 tons. At least 600,000,000 tons of this traffic was hauled by wagons to rail and water, and at least 200,000,000 tons more found its way to market by wagons without passing over either rail or water. This would make a total of 800,000,000 tons of traffic handled by wagons. The average haul was 8 miles. It has been stated on seemingly good authority that the cost of wagon traffic is 25 cents per ton-mile. Applying this price, we have \$1,600,000,000 as the total transportation cost of wagon-hauled merchandise.

Tabulating this we have:

Railway transportation in United States in 1906-7.....	\$2,875,689,520
Water transportation in United States in 1906-7.....	1,600,000,000
Water transportation in United States in 1906-7.....	600,000,000
Total.....	5,075,689,520

From this I deduce that the per capita cost for supporting every form of government in the United States, from the road districts in a township to the National Government, in 1906-7 was less than \$20, while the per capita cost for transportation for that fiscal year was about \$60. So that, measured in terms of taxation, the transportation problem is by far the largest one imposed upon the people.



But perhaps the most illuminating comparison that can be made is that between the cost of transportation and the value of the things transported. Unfortunately I can not find statistics for exactly the same years. The cost of transportation which I have given is for the fiscal year 1906-7, while the merchandise value is for the census year 1909, the nearest date to 1907 for which I can obtain values. My determination of farm products sold is, I desire to admit, only an estimate, but I have given transportation the benefit of any doubt, and my figures of the actual amount of such products sold are possibly too high.

The value of all farm products sold in 1909 was	\$6,373,748,560
The value of all American manufactures	20,672,052,000
The value of all mining products	1,238,410,322
The value of all imports	1,311,920,224

Total value of all articles transported	29,596,131,106
---	----------------

We have found that the total transportation cost to the people of the United States was \$5,075,689,520. Now, it is fair to assume that this cost in 1909 was at least \$6,000,000,000. By comparison it is discovered that for every dollar's worth of merchandise marketed more than 20 cents is consumed by transportation.

I have said this much as a preface to the special plea I propose to make for the improvement of waterways, and particularly for the speedy and intelligent improvement of the natural watercourse extending from the head of the Great Lakes to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, an improvement having for its object the enlargement of that waterway to accommodate ocean-going vessels in their voyage from lake ports to foreign ports and for the benefit of transportation.

To the Great Lakes the greatest commerce of the world is tributary. The fertile fields, the exhaustless mines, the largest manufactories, and the mighty forests of the most productive regions of the United States and Canada would find their natural outlet to market over this waterway. The commerce possible to this course would exceed in one year the total commerce which the most optimistic estimator predicts will pass through the Panama Canal in 10 years. Last year there was locked through the Soo Canal more than 79,000,000 tons of freight. Much of that tonnage was destined for foreign shipment and much for consumption on or near the Atlantic seaboard. This had to be loaded onto the lake boats and carried to Buffalo or other Lake Erie ports and there transferred through elevators to rail cars or to the Erie Canal boats, and hauled to New York or other seaports where it was again transferred either for shipment abroad or to vehicles engaged in the domestic trade. The cost of handling in these transshipments was either destructive of reasonable profits to production or, what is more likely in many cases, both consumption and production were unwisely burdened.

It does not require a professional economist or an expert traffic man to show the economy which would result to the stupendous industry of the Middle West of the United States and Canada if the burdens of reshipment were removed and cargoes could be loaded at lake ports and unloaded at the ultimate point of destination, and this benefit would be increased by the similar advantages resulting to inbound freight from the near Atlantic coast and from foreign ports.

We are about to open the Panama Canal, and by it we have shortened the distance between our two seaboard by 8,000 miles. With the Welland-St. Lawrence oceanway completed, the center of population and production of the United States and Canada will have easy and favorable water communication not only with the far West, which will have been dissolved into the Far East, but with the Pacific States and Provinces as well, and those States and Provinces, which even now are looking for greater markets and wider opportunities, will load their cargoes for ports on the Great Lakes, whence their cargoes will be distributed throughout the Central West.

But these benefits, coming directly from the actual use of the ocean waterway, would not be the only ones enjoyed by industry. Such a waterway would produce the result which has always flowed and which always will flow from the creation of water transportation, viz, it will cause a reduction of rail rates and an improvement of rail facilities from all points on even remotely competitive rail lines.

One of the great benefits which will be derived from the Panama Canal and which would flow from the project I propose would be a proper distribution of freight between rail and water. The railroads are hauling freight which can and ought to be carried by water. It can be more economically handled by boat, and by hauling such freight over the railroads much tonnage which can be profitably handled by rail is retarded and an economic waste is entailed upon industry. A natural division of

freight will occur; better results not only to business but to the carriers will ensue.

In order to impress with practical effect the financial benefit to Lake and coast-bound shipping flowing from such an ocean waterway—for this would be making ocean ports of Lake ports—let us see what are the actual Lake and rail rates today. The Lake rates on freight passing through the Soo locks in 1907 was eight-tenths of 1 mill per ton-mile, while the average rail rate of the United States in that year was 7.82 mills per ton-mile. In other words, the rail rate was more than nine times higher than the Lake rate. Think of the possibilities for saving to producers and consumers resulting from the reduction, approximately to water rates, of the freight on the vast tonnage now charged with the rail rate. That this amount of saving would grow no one acquainted with the industrial and commercial possibilities of the United States and Canada would dispute. Not only would rail rates be reduced, but water rates on such a waterway would also be lowered. Many Lake boats which now run half the year and then tie up for the closed-navigation season would go down to sea and engage in the coastwise trade, and thus benefit the coast and intercoast shipping. Some of the present Lake boats are not fitted for ocean traffic, but every boat built after the waterway is decided upon would be constructed for ocean service. Thus not only will Lake carriers be benefited, but the carrying charge will be reduced through competition. But these benefits are not all that would come from this project.

The Middle West has fuel, the bulk of the Nation's raw material, and it contains the center of the population of Canada and the United States. The Lakes are within an hour of that center to-day. Why should not the regions of the Lakes be the very center of manufacture and distribution? When ocean vessels dock at Lake ports those ports will become what natural conditions will compel them to become, viz, such centers of production and distribution. Economy enormous would thus be effected, and every section of the country would thereby be benefited. This is not an idle vision of an enthusiast. It is but the statement of an invariable rule, demonstrated by every community which has had the superior advantages of ocean transportation. River and lake transportation are of great value to any city, but ocean transportation is of the very greatest importance, and the plan I advocate means, of course, the conversion of the Great Lakes into the ocean so far as shipping is concerned.

If a demonstration of this fact is necessary, I invite your attention to the map of the United States. Almost without exception, the most prosperous, thriving, and growing cities and sections of our country are those on and adjacent to great waterways. Along the Erie Canal are more great cities than are found in a dozen of the inland States combined. Can I well overstate the tremendous impetus that will be given to the Middle West by the construction of this ocean way?

I believe that such ocean way would have a beneficial effect upon our merchant marine. Our reconstructed Lake fleets would naturally add to the number of ships on the ocean, and certainly every thoughtful, patriotic American desires the restoration of the Stars and Stripes upon the sea. Many of our Lake boats could readily be converted into colliers. Why, the expense for colliers in our naval program could be largely avoided and the money thus saved would go far to construct this waterway.

I have already consumed too much time in demonstrating the axiom that an ocean way for the largest ocean vessels between Duluth and Montreal would be of almost inestimable value to the industry and commerce of the United States and Canada.

I will now discuss the plan itself, its probability, and feasibility.

That such a waterway will be constructed in time, either by Canada alone or by Canada and the United States, I have no doubt. Inasmuch as it must be for the mutual use and benefit of both nations, inasmuch as the waters to be improved and used are international, I hope that this great work may be performed at the joint expense of both and under such plans as will result in the greatest good to both.

Canada and the United States, with only an imaginary dividing line for 4,000 miles between them, inhabited by people from the same race, possessed of the same ideals for the general good, the habitable portions of both lying in the same zone and bounded on the east and west by the same oceans, these two great nations are equally interested in the extension of the Atlantic to the Lakes. At a time when the cost of living is so high these nations are alike interested in reducing to the minimum the expense of transferring products from the producer to



the consumer. Canada and the United States are or should be vitally interested in connecting their most abundant resources with their best possible markets.

So believing I introduced into the Senate at its last session a resolution authorizing the President to enter into treaty relations with Great Britain or the Dominion for the purpose of converting the boundary waters between the United States and Canada into ocean waterways. The resolution passed the Senate unanimously and went to the President. He referred it to the Secretary of State, who, under the act of January 11, 1909, creating the International Joint Commission, submitted certain questions relating to the proposed project to the Canadian Government, and if that Government approves these questions, either as they are or as they may be amended by the two Governments, they will be given to the said commission for investigation and report. If such report is favorable I shall hope and believe that this great enterprise will be undertaken and completed. I trust that the matter will be given the attention its importance deserves.

The Dominion of Canada is alive to the needs of ocean connection with the Lakes, and several projects are under consideration, and whether the United States acts in the matter or not, Canada probably will construct such a connection.

One Canadian project is from the Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River and thence to the St. Lawrence. Another is by canal from the lower end of Lake Huron to Lake Erie, and thence through the enlarged Welland Canal to Lake Ontario, and thence through locks and dams down the St. Lawrence to Montreal. I am not an engineer, but my investigation and study of reports of distinguished engineers who have reported on these projects compels me to believe that these two routes taken each in its entirety are unwise and the former route is also impracticable. The cost to construct the Georgian Bay project would be not less than \$200,000,000 and if, after construction, its operation should prove impracticable the injury to Canada would be almost irreparable, and the ocean way would be postponed indefinitely. I am clear that this project would prove unwise. Almost the whole distance from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence the course of this proposed way would be restricted.

According to a Canadian Government report on this project made in 1908 it would require three days for a boat to go from Georgian Bay to Montreal. According to such report this course would contain 116 curves, 77 of which would be of a 1-mile radius, while the route following the natural flow of the water from the head of the Lakes to Montreal would contain but one short curve, and that is at Neebish, in the Soo River. Sharp curves are a menace to navigation, and when they occur in narrow channels they are prohibitive. Furthermore, the water supply available for the summit of this route as proposed is inadequate, and probably no expert will be heard to claim that sufficient of such water can be obtained to meet the demands of the commerce which the people of Canada have a right to expect would seek this way to market. It at best would be but a limited course and could not be made to meet the great possible demands of the Dominion's commerce, let alone the needs of the United States, and its open season would be much shorter than that of the natural course.

I know of no man who has given more intelligent study to this great question than Mr. D. B. Detweiler, a gentleman of great experience and ability at Berlin, Ontario. He has been instrumental in securing for its consideration the most eminent engineers of Canada and the consensus of his and their opinion is adverse to the Georgian Bay project.

It appears that this route is advocated principally by promoters of private enterprise, and yet this improvement is one that private interests should not make nor control. It is not even small enough for national control. It is of international importance, and ambitious speculators should not be permitted to traffic in a matter so vital to the interests of a continent.

A canal from Lake Huron across to Lake Erie would be unwise. Already a 22-foot channel exists from Lake Huron to Lake Erie, and for the greater part of its course the sailing is open water and without sharp curves. This course could be enlarged into a 35-foot channel for less expense than the Huron-Erie Canal could be constructed, and the time required to travel the natural course improved would be less than that which would be required to make the all-canal route. Furthermore, Detroit and Toledo are of sufficient importance commercially to retain their positions on the chartered ocean route.

I have criticized these two projects not because I am improperly prejudiced against them or for any other reason than the belief that they are impracticable and that a practicable and feasible route can be established. The Great Lakes, as I have stated, constitute the basin into which the commerce of the great middle Northwest can naturally be drained. Any ocean water-

way should include every one of these Lakes. To every one of them vast possibilities of commerce are tributary. They all have a common outlet to the sea. That outlet is the St. Lawrence River, with its actual source in Lakes Michigan and Superior. At various places in it there are shoals and rapids and falls. All of these obstructions have been overcome for the passage of boats drawing not to exceed 14 feet of water; some for the passage of 22-foot-draft boats and some for 25-foot boats. What has been done for boats of small draft can be done for the largest ships. The water is there and money back of engineering ability can convert that outlet into an ocean waterway without disturbing the lake levels. It is highly important, as I have suggested, that the level of the Lakes should not be disturbed. With proper compensating works this proposed plan would not affect that level. A deepening of the outlet of Lake Huron into Lake Erie to 35 feet would, in my judgment, reduce slightly the waters in Lakes Michigan and Huron, but this effect could easily be overcome by compensation sills constructed at reasonable cost in the upper St. Clair River and at the head of the rapids in the Niagara River above the Falls. The water now going to waste can be utilized to float a greater commerce than enters and clears at our entire seaboard to-day; greater than all that will lock through the Panama Canal plus all that passes in and out of Suez. That this project is possible, that it is more practicable than any other proposed plan, no properly informed man will deny. Then what stands in the way of its completion?

There are four great possible obstacles to overcome: The railroads, international complications, the cost, and sentiment. I will discuss these briefly in their order.

It is a strange fact that certain railroad interests seem to have opposed practically every great proposition to improve water transportation facilities. I say "strange," for history has demonstrated over and over again that improved waterways have increased traffic not only on the water improved but also on the competing railroads. Improved transportation facilities have created traffic. Have railroads suffered from the improvement of our rivers and harbors? On the contrary they have profited by such improvements. Even the electric lines which have paralleled our steam roads have not as a whole had a bad effect upon the income of the latter. The Panama Canal, if it shall carry all the tonnage which its advocates claim, will not, in my judgment, lessen the legitimate rail profits. And yet it is my honest opinion that the railroads oppose river improvements; they gave no aid to the Panama Canal project; they will not encourage the Welland-St. Lawrence ocean waterway. The railroad-owned boats on the Lakes will not ask that this course be constructed; but with no malice toward them and with no desire to injure them, I still insist that the waterway shall be constructed. It will be constructed. I hope that railroad men will recognize the inevitable, including its final benefit to them, and lend a hand.

There are international difficulties to overcome. Unfortunately, as it seems to me, there is not a universal good feeling for the United States in Canada. Political divisions among our neighbors at the north are made on the question of closer relations with us. The treaty of 1854, known as the Elgin treaty, was in force at a time when the conditions in both Canada and the United States were most abnormal. This country was in the throes of a great civil war, and Canada became the asylum for southern slaves, northern bounty jumpers, and slavery sympathizers. The bitterness engendered by the Revolutionary and 1812 Wars between England and the United States was not yet extinct. The termination of the Elgin treaty came at the close of the American rebellion and the relations between Canada and the United States were greatly strained. The feeling against the United States has been kept alive to some extent, and it is still conjured with by some politicians. When all other arguments fail a suggestion is made that the United States desires to dominate the Dominion and eventually to annex it. Of course, no sensible man believes that. Commercially the interests of the two countries are practically identical. Politically they are separate entities, and should remain so. I know there is absolutely no desire on the part of the United States or of any considerable number of its people to acquire Canadian territory or to secure any advantage over that country. It is strange that any party in any country can make political capital out of such shadows. The Great Lakes, their connecting waters, and to a great extent the St. Lawrence River are international. Their development would be equally beneficial to both countries. They can not be improved to the extent of their highest usefulness without the mutual consent and cooperation of both. That consent and cooperation should be secured and established at the beginning. Let the two nations work together as sane, intelligent, honest business men would do and the result will be of untold benefit to both.



It is probably true that the most expensive part of the construction of this project would be in territory wholly Canadian, and I would like to see some equitable arrangement made whereby the United States would materially contribute to this cost; but whether such an arrangement can and will be made, it is also true that great power-developing possibilities lie in wholly Canadian waters, and these can reduce if they can not be made entirely to cover the cost of the improvement. I shall speak of this again presently.

Whatever feeling there is antagonistic to the closest international relations between these two great English-speaking neighbors should be allayed, and, with the class of patriots on both sides of the boundary line who are working for the common good of both countries in earnest, it will be allayed, and all petty politics and unworthy prejudice will be submerged in the general demand for one of the greatest material benefits which ever has or ever can come to these sister nations.

The great practical question which will confront this project will be its cost. This will be a business proposition almost exclusively, and it is clear that the project must fail unless it can be demonstrated in advance that it will pay, measured by dollars and cents.

The United States has, by surveys and exact estimates, shown that to improve all the waters of the Great Lakes, from their heads to Buffalo, so as to accommodate boats drawing 25 feet of water, would cost \$25,938,367. Increase this amount threefold and we would have more than the cost of a 35-foot channel. Of this estimated amount eleven and one-half millions were to be spent in improving the Detroit River, and since such estimate was reported that improvement has been made.

Already the Canadian Government has provided by way of appropriation or authorization for \$50,000,000 to be expended in enlarging the Welland Canal locks to accommodate vessels of 30-foot draft, and I trust the report is true that it has wisely provided such improvement shall be made with a view to ultimate enlargement to a 35-foot depth.

What the improvement of the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario to Montreal will cost I have no means of telling. An accurate survey should be made to determine that question. I do know, however, that a conservative estimate of the potential energy which could be developed by improving this stream is 4,000,000 horsepower. This power could be sold for at least \$15,000,000 a year, and this would mean a 5 per cent return on a \$300,000,000 investment. The St. Lawrence improvement will not cost \$300,000,000. I do not believe it will cost two-thirds of that amount, but whatever the cost is it can be largely recouped in power value.

A few years ago a private corporation came to the American Congress for a permit to construct a power dam at the long Sault Rapids, and proposed not only to construct this dam in the interest of ocean navigation by building and operating adequate locks but was even willing to pay something for each horsepower of energy developed. The construction of these power dams would create deep pools or lakes over the shoals and rapids which would permit free open sailing for deep-water boats and all without expense to the Government, and the locks of such dams would be fewer and less expensive than those of any other route.

I have stated that these waters proposed to be improved are subject to the joint control of Canada and the United States. No change in them by either nation detrimental to the other can be permitted. The effect on lake levels, on power possibilities, on navigation, on the comity of the nations themselves must be observed and scrupulously regarded. Is it not clear, therefore, that the first great step to be taken is in the direction of closer and better relations between these two countries? With united harmonious action on this great plan all opposition of any importance would disappear and the greatest industrial and commercial project of the world would be consummated.

In the meanwhile, and until such joint action is secured, every improvement along this waterway should be made having in view the ultimate construction of a 35-foot channel from Duluth and Chicago to Montreal. The construction of great public works without due regard to inevitable future development is the folly of nations. It is certainly so in the United States, as witness our ordinary river and harbor improvements and our public-building construction. We scarcely complete a project before the needs for which it was built demand an enlargement, and this is secured at unreasonable expense. It will be economy to build for the future, for that future contains an unobstructed waterway for ocean leviathans from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic over nature's natural course.

Finally the element of sentiment exists, and it is by no means the least obstacle to overcome. Fortunately for highest civilization the sense of beauty, natural and artificial, exists in man.

Throughout the civilized world there are found societies organized for the preservation and improvement of natural objects of beauty. In many places these objects have been capitalized by business genius and made the source of personal and corporate income. The marvelously beautiful scenery of the St. Lawrence River has attracted annually thousands of people, and steamboat companies have found the intricate navigation of that stream most profitable. These companies will not favor any project to utilize the St. Lawrence for commercial purposes, lest their profits should be disturbed. Many tourists who have been thrilled with the wonderful rapids and falls of that great river will see in this improvement only the desecration of nature's handiwork for financial gain.

No man to the extent of his ability has a higher appreciation or greater admiration for natural beauty than I have. I would not lay mercenary hands on any object of great natural beauty which is within the reach of the people if that object is the only one of its kind or if the reasonable ethical benefits which can be derived from it equal or outweigh the good which can come from its practical commercial use.

I want to preserve the Niagara Falls because there is but one Niagara. I voted to preserve the Hetch-Hetchy Valley because I thought that San Francisco could get a sufficient supply of equally pure water elsewhere; but, sir, when I measure the good that would come to the millions of the people in the United States and Canada through the development of an ocean way down the St. Lawrence and contrast that with the pleasure which would come to the comparatively few who are financially able to purchase a ticket on a St. Lawrence steamer; when I realize that reasonable prosperity is the prerequisite to the highest ethical enjoyment; when I understand also that this proposed improvement can be made and still preserve the most beautiful natural scenery in this river, as witness the fact that the Sault scenery was undisturbed by the construction of the Sault Canal and locks; when I realize that with this constructed improvement tourists can travel the river both ways, up as well as down; when, in fact, I consider the project as it really will be, I unhesitatingly commend it.

Throughout the United States and Canada are found as beautiful falls and rapids as those of the St. Lawrence, and they are not necessarily related to mighty possibilities for real practical industrial and commercial good.

Let nature lovers view this matter in all of its phases, and it seems to me that but one conclusion can be reached, and that is the one which recognizes an improvement that promises a degree of comfort and prosperity to the people unequalled by any other proposition of the times.

Mr. President, I have called the attention of the Senate to this great project because it is great. Greater than the Panama Canal, which, however, will supplement it; as great as the improvement of all the navigable rivers of the United States and Canada combined, because it furnishes a necessary, cheap, and efficient highway to and from the greatest center of natural resources of the world. It removes to a great extent the barriers between production and consumption and makes it possible for productive genius and constructive enterprise to enrich and bless the people of these two great countries. If by calling the attention of the Congress and the country to this matter I shall have induced thought and discussion, I shall be content, for it seems to me that an intelligent understanding will compel the improvement and use of a facility which for a century has been neglected for lesser things but which has greater possibilities for trade and commerce than all others.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANSDELL in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate joint resolution No. 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN].

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Chamberlain	James	Oliver
Borah	Chilton	Jones	Overman
Bradley	Clapp	Kern	Page
Brady	Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Perkins
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman
Bristow	Gallinger	Lee, Md.	Poinceter
Bryan	Gronna	McCumber	Ransdell
Burton	Hollis	Myers	Reed
Catron	Hughes	Norris	Robinson



Shafroth	Smith, S. C.	Thomas	Vardaman
Sheppard	Smoot	Thompson	West
Shields	Stephenson	Thornton	Williams
Smith, Ariz.	Sutherland	Tillman	
Smith, Ga.	Swanson	Townsend	

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. REED. I announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE] on account of illness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULLESON], and will state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEST in the chair). Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to have the Secretary read the letter I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE NATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1914.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of the fact that a number of telegrams have been sent to various Senators with reference to the time of taking a vote on joint resolution No. 1, will you permit me to say it has not been the policy of my committee, representing an organization of approximately half a million women, to ask these half a million individuals to wire you their ideas with reference to your method of procedure? We feel that it would be unfair to ask women in distant States who are not closely in touch with the situation here to decide when the Senate should vote. We feel such requests would be manifestly unfair to you.

We are legally authorized by our organization to represent that organization at Washington, and the matter of advising with you upon the management of the pending resolution is entirely in our hands, and, with the exception of having asked a few of the State presidents whom we have fully advised from day to day to communicate with their Senators, we have sent out no request that you be deluged with telegrams or letters.

Will you permit me to say to you again that I believe it is my duty to urge that our measure be voted upon at the conclusion of the speeches, for if it should happen that we should pass this opportunity and a vote should not be taken at this session the cause of suffrage would suffer an irrevocable setback, and we do not feel that this chance should be taken when the only gain would be added publicity for suffrage demonstrations to be given in May. Those demonstrations will be given throughout the United States under the direction of our own State organizations, but they will serve their purpose without the sacrifice of one jot of advantage gained here at Washington.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration of the views of my committee upon this matter, I am,

Yours, most sincerely,

RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK,  
Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram I have received from the president of the Texas Woman Suffrage Association, and I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senator SHEPPARD,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

We wish a vote on suffrage question promptly.

ELEANOR BRECKENRIDGE,  
President Texas Woman Suffrage Association.

Mr. LANE. The joint resolution is now before the Senate and open to discussion, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LANE. I wish to make a few remarks. In what I am going to advance I will not state anything which I have not often said before. The State in which I live has already adopted woman suffrage, and women vote there now on full equality with men. We have learned to have no fear of their participation in matters of public concern. In fact, we find that the women are as intelligent as are the men in their consideration of public affairs. We find that their interest is as great as that of the men, and that it arises from the same motives. I do not see, as a matter of fact, how anyone can make any question concerning the right of women to vote or their ability to do so if they care to exercise the franchise.

I have jotted down a few remarks, that they might be consecutive and in order that they might not consume too much time. They are principles in which I fully believe, and of which

I myself have no doubt. I do not blame anyone, nor do I question his right to differ with me; and there are problems in certain portions of this country with which I am not familiar and upon which I make no criticism and acknowledge the superior information of those who have had a greater experience than mine. Yet I can not see, in the large way as I view it, that the same right given there to women would not inure to the general benefit the same as in every other section of the country; but, as I said, that is a matter upon which I do not make any criticism, nor do I wish to offer any advice. I shall refrain from doing so.

I believe that woman is man's full and equal partner in life and by right is justly entitled to a full and free participation with him in all of its affairs. By her we come into this world, and for aught I know, again dependent upon her willingness to undergo suffering for us, the measure of our gratitude for what she has already done for us may in part lie our best hope for future happiness. Having nourished us into being by parting with the very blood of her blood and bone of her bone, and having done so lovingly and with the prayer in her heart that we profit thereby to the fullest extent, what manner of creatures would we be or what hope of reward ought we to expect in the hereafter if we deny her the enjoyment of every privilege of which we avail ourselves? I have not the slightest fear that in rendering unto her the right to a voice in the conduct of public affairs that we incur any risk whatever. Nor would I be afraid, for that matter, to trust all legislative business to her. In some respects she is even better fitted for the work than we are. She possesses by Divine dispensation, for instance, the first and greatest requisite which would qualify her for a seat in the Senate, which is the use of the tongue and vocal cords, and I believe she could hold her own with the most verbose Member of this body, although I am willing to concede that her physical endurance might not be equal to the strain. I do not believe that the affairs of the people would suffer from any lack of judgment on her part, nor do I believe that she would make any more mistakes in legislation than we do, for the reason that it can not be done; it is not possible.

If after having secured the right to vote, however, it should prove that woman does not use it as wisely as we, I would be willing to assist in taking it away from her.

I do not consider that we, in granting her this franchise, confer any favor upon her at all, it being my opinion that she is now and always has been as much entitled to it as man ever was. Her interest in the management of Government affairs is as great as any man's can possibly be. In many ways, from her very nature, it is even greater.

A woman's love for and her interest in the welfare of her offspring exceeds that of man; for that reason if for no other she would work to secure the best conditions possible to obtain for their benefit.

Man's interest in his offspring is not so great as woman's, nor can it be, nor will it ever be, nor has it ever been in the past.

Into the world she brings them, frequently at the cost of her happiness or even her life.

Her great mother love will be a bar to bad legislation if she is allowed a voice in passing upon it. No being who has given of her life to nourish another into existence is going to do anything or assist in doing anything which will bring harm or suffering upon it after she has created it.

For these if for no other reasons I would not fear the votes of women on any question of public concern.

Some have expressed a doubt of her ability to master the duties which would devolve upon her. In answer I would say that ever since "this old round world began" she has stood elbow to elbow with man and helped him without stint to make it habitable; in war, in peace, in famine, through drought and flood.

In the heat of the desert and in the deathly stillness of the life-extracting cold of the north she goes with him, lives with him, and fights and lives or fights and dies with him and for him.

I was reading an account in the papers yesterday that after the battles which they are having in Mexico among those found among the dead were women who had been fighting by the side of husband, brother, father, or friend, willing to die or to go anywhere with them. To dive down into hades, farther than man has the nerve to go, or ever will, a woman will go for her offspring, and the question arises whether, with that love in her bosom, that unselfishness, it does not seem to be too small an affair for men to stand here and argue against granting her every right that he obtains.

We have not outgrown the ideas of our ancestors. Along in the sixth century our forebears, the early fathers of the Chris-



lian church, debated with great gravity and much dignity as to whether or not woman had a soul. At the council held at Macon, after much discussion such as has been indulged in here, it was voted upon, and woman won out by a majority of one vote. That was a great concession for man to make, was it not? It was quite an event in the sixth century; and now here in this day we are questioning her right to participate with ourselves upon full equality in the affairs of men. Whether we will decide it by one vote or not I do not know. I rather suspect that we will not be quite up to the mark set by the old fathers at Macon.

It has been urged that contact with political affairs would degrade woman and rob her of some of her charming womanly qualities. In answer to this argument I would say that when politics are carried on in a manner which will bring a blush of shame to the cheek of a modest woman, they are to the bad, not alone for her but for the men and the country as well, and for the sake of decency they can not be changed too quickly. Anyone who questions woman's fitness to legislate as well as men should in justice be compelled to come here and "sit out" some of the debates such as those upon the tariff or currency questions or some other economic problem affecting the interest of the people. He would find one side of the Chamber engaged in prophecies dire, which seem to be founded on the fond hope that the devil will bring a blight on the prosperity of the country in punishment for its not longer following their leadership, the while upon the other side there is exhibited a confiding trust in God and good luck that measures which carefully hobble many issues of vital importance and partially relieve others less so will prove a panacea for deep-grounded economic errors of the past long endured, which they will not. He would conclude, I think, that if a suffragette convention was turned loose on the scene it would not hurt and might, at least, add interest to the proceedings, if nothing else.

When it comes to a question of cool nerve and endurance of pain, woman will be found to be the superior of man. This fact is known to every surgeon.

It is my opinion that the fear of the southern Senators of women's votes is groundless. Indeed, I believe that they can and will prove of the greatest help to the men, and I have every confidence in their intelligence, their patriotism, and their ability to help solve a vexing and momentous question.

I am not one of those who fear that women can not fill positions of public trust, for I had the honor at one time to appoint two women, one as the head of an important department and the other in a most difficult position to fill. In both cases the services rendered by them were of the highest type and successful in every respect. If the conduct of all of the other departments of that city had been equally as well conducted, the people would have been saved much money and a higher type of municipal management would have been established.

In regard to the granting of the right to vote causing an increase of divorces, I have to say that divorces are increasing all over the world and marriages and births growing fewer in countries not only where women do not vote but where men are restricted in their suffrage as well. This is recognized to be due to economic conditions to a large degree, and to some extent to the restrictions and double standard of morals and living which is applied between the sexes. Divorces will no doubt continue to increase whether women vote or not, but the cause for the condition must be sought in some other source than suffrage.

I could urge many reasons for bestowing the ballot on women, but will not do so. Recognizing her, as I do, as my full partner in life—and, I hope, in the hereafter—I am bespeaking for her an equal share in the common property, as I feel it my duty to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a number of Senators have informed me of their desire to address the Senate upon the pending resolution before a final vote shall be taken either upon the resolution or the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. Inasmuch as I observe the absence of all of those Senators from the Chamber, and as I feel it incumbent upon myself as chairman of the committee to say something upon the measure, perhaps it is as well that I should discuss it now as to reserve the right to close the debate upon it.

I may say, Mr. President, by way of preliminary, that this resolution has been made the subject of consideration through the persistent effort of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], acting in behalf of and with my full support as the chairman of the committee, and actuated by the almost universal request of those directly interested for its disposition at the earliest possible moment. Acting upon this general and continued expression, he has frequently attempted to make this joint resolution the subject matter of discussion, and finally succeeded. The fact, therefore, that it is now up for final consideration is

due both to the outside demand for it and to the persistence of the Senator heretofore having the measure in charge.

It is true, as the record abundantly discloses, that a very large and organized portion of the equal suffragists of the Nation have more recently suggested the expediency or propriety of the postponement of a final vote until some time in the ensuing spring; and, in justice to the Senator from Arizona, it should be said that his own view has to some extent recently concurred with that desire, while I, as the chairman of the committee, think otherwise. My belief is—and in saying this I voice the sentiment of the National Suffrage Association—that it is better to press the matter to an early determination, without reference to the result, inasmuch as it has been made the pending business of this body. I believe, Mr. President, in this policy because I think it is the policy which should be pursued in promoting any great question in which a large body of the people are directly interested. There never has been a change in existing conditions or an addition to a given régime which succeeded immediately or which did not succeed only after and because of its continued and persistent advocacy. I know of no other way in which to push to success any great political question, or, for that matter, any other object affecting us in any department of life.

For more than a quarter of a century, Mr. President, those who were behind the movement for the election of Senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people were constantly pressing its consideration. It was not at first successful; indeed, the initial lack of success was so conspicuous that it would not have been surprising if complete discouragement had resulted instead of those renewed efforts, which were finally crowned with success. So this movement, Mr. President, beginning more than half a century ago and growing slowly at first, but growing, nevertheless, overcoming an obstacle here, overruling a supposed argument there, marching always forward and onward to that goal of success which is ultimately to crown the movement, as it has crowned all other movements having for their purpose and object the establishment of an essential political right.

Therefore, Mr. President, so far as this joint resolution is concerned, it is my deliberate judgment that the committee has acted wisely, and that the consensus of public opinion will so determine in the near future, both in pressing in season and out of season for a consideration of the joint resolution, and in pressing it, after reaching the proper place upon the calendar, for a vote which will make some present disposition of it. When I say that I mean some disposition of the measure in its present form, not expecting that the battle will have been won or lost until other struggles shall have followed this one in swift and active succession. So believing, Mr. President, I shall for a short space of time refer to some of the statements and arguments that have here been presented by the opponents of this measure and to give some reasons which, in my judgment, are conclusive both as to the expediency and as to the justice of female suffrage.

This joint resolution is in itself a simple thing; by which I mean that it clearly, concisely, and briefly embodies the proposition in the shape of a constitutional amendment providing that hereafter sex shall not be an obstacle or an impediment to suffrage in the Nation. It has been modeled after another amendment, which years ago was the subject of as serious and bitter controversy as any amendment that has ever been or that ever will be made to the Constitution of the United States. It has been so modeled, not because of any advocacy of or opposition to that amendment, but simply because the phraseology there outlined can not very well be improved upon in the effort to accomplish a similar end.

The purpose, as I have said, of this amendment, Mr. President, is so obvious that it certainly needs no elaboration. I shall therefore proceed directly to the consideration of the question itself in connection with some of the things that have been urged here against its adoption.

It has been suggested with much force that we should not impose suffrage upon States which do not want it; that each State should be permitted within itself to determine questions of this and kindred import, and that the remaining States should not by sheer force of numbers change conditions that are not desirable or welcome to States objecting.

As a matter of abstract justice, Mr. President, we can all recognize the force of that argument; but, unfortunately, it proves too much, since, if we are to accept it in its entirety, it would be and would have been an insuperable objection to any change in our organic law; for, with the possible exception of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, I do not believe it would have been possible to have made any other, by the unanimous action of all of the States composing the Union; and the



very fact of its impossibility is doubtless the reason why we find the Constitution written as it is, the machinery of which is designed to clothe a defined majority with the power, by mutual action, of overcoming the objections of a small minority in the interest of what the majority believes to be for the general welfare and the general good.

Take the last amendment, Mr. President, to which I have already referred, and which makes a fundamental change in the method of selecting Members of this body. A number of States opposed, and doubtless at this time dissent, from the new method of selecting United States Senators; but it is a part of our organic law, nevertheless, for the simple reason that it was enacted under the forms and through the processes of the Constitution itself. If this proposed amendment is adopted, it must be adopted by the same processes, through the operation of the same machinery, working in the same direction, and unless, therefore, we depart from the scheme of the Constitution itself, we must recognize the right of three-fourths of the States of the Union to impose their will upon the other fourth whenever in the constitutionally expressed judgment of three-fourths that right is crystallized into an amendment to the organic law. So, here, when two-thirds of the Members of both branches of Congress shall say that a change should be submitted to the consideration of the States, that submission must follow, notwithstanding the opposition, however implacable, of the small minority opposing it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I rise, Mr. President, to make a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] has an important engagement this evening at Philadelphia, and is compelled to leave. He desires to be present when the vote is taken upon the joint resolution; and I rise to ask the Senator from Colorado if he will not, provided no other Senator desires to speak after he gets through, ask that the measure be laid aside until to-morrow, in order that the Senator from Arizona may be present when the vote is taken?

Mr. THOMAS. I have already given the Senator from Arizona the assurance, so far as any influence I may have goes, that the vote should not take place to-day if it could be avoided, and I will be very glad, if necessary, to follow that course.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS. I have been informed, however, by a number of Members of the Senate that they desire to discuss this proposition, among others the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who is now in his seat; and if a small proportion of the Senators who have so notified me shall respond, it is to some extent improbable that we can reach a vote to-morrow.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. I was about to ask unanimous consent for a vote on the joint resolution before 6 o'clock this evening. It was urged by friends of the measure on yesterday that on account of the absence of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] it would be unfair to take up the joint resolution and vote on it on that day, and because of his absence a request for unanimous consent for a vote was not urged. It was desired to take the vote on yesterday because several Senators were obliged to leave the city yesterday, and others, including myself, are compelled to leave to-day. It seems the friends of this measure do not desire a vote to-day, but I think it would be manifestly unfair to a number of Senators who are compelled to go away to-day, in view of what occurred on yesterday, when the vote was postponed on account of the absence of one Senator, to postpone it to a time when a number of Senators can not be present. Referring to the proposition—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KERN. In a moment. Referring to the suggestion that certain Senators desire to speak, I wish to say that there has been nothing in the world to prevent those Senators from speaking on any day for the past several days had they so desired, and I hope an arrangement can be made by which a vote may be taken on the pending amendment and on the joint resolution itself before adjournment to-day, otherwise several Senators will be deprived of the opportunity of voting thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KERN. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] first requested recognition, but I have finished and yield the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to say, Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to say that I am perfectly willing to vote to-day, and if there is any assurance that there will be a vote to-day I shall remain, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will pardon me, it is, of course, the fault of no Senator that the vote has been postponed, but I think it would be very unfair to have the vote to-day unless it were to be taken almost immediately, and even then it is now almost too late to take it. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], and several other Senators have to leave town at 3 o'clock to keep engagements for various St. Patrick's Day celebrations in New Jersey and elsewhere, where they are expected to make speeches, and some of the rest of us will be obliged to leave at 5 o'clock and some at 6. All of us are anxious for our votes to be recorded when the roll is called on the pending joint resolution, and I should like to secure unanimous consent that a vote shall not be taken to-day, so that Senators who have been compelled to leave town—and some of them have left the Chamber already to take the 3 o'clock train and others will have to leave soon—may have an opportunity to vote when the measure is disposed of.

Mr. KERN. A number of Senators will not be able to return to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of the Senators who are leaving, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] suggests, he himself amongst others, because he has to journey all the way to Indiana, will not be able to return to-morrow.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I will say that my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] has already left for Indiana; that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is compelled to leave for Nebraska; and that I am also obliged to go to Indiana.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if we could get a vote to-day, I would suspend my remarks right now and not say another word upon the subject, but I was informed this morning when trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement that it would be impossible to do so, because of the objection of some Senators who are opposed to the immediate consideration of this matter and who, I feel very sure, would have prevented a vote if an attempt had been made to take one yesterday.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I think if the Senator is in that frame of mind, if he will allow the roll to be called we can close this matter out mighty quick.

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly willing to do that, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I wanted to say something on this question, but I will not do so if we can get a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (to Mr. THOMAS). Why not ask unanimous consent for a vote now, and see if that will be agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS. Very well; I ask unanimous consent to take a vote on this matter now.

Mr. HUGHES. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. I am willing to do anything that is agreeable, but it seems to me it is impossible to please everybody.

Mr. HUGHES. Regular order, Mr. President. As I understand, the regular order is the calling of the roll on the joint resolution, if no one desires to speak. I understand the Senator from Colorado is willing to have that course pursued.

Mr. THOMAS. One or two Senators not now present expected to discuss this matter, and I am in honor bound to inform them if we are going to have a vote right off. I think that they should be present.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I hardly think, if there are Senators who wish to be heard upon this question, that it ought to be forced right now. Why can it not be agreed that no vote shall be taken to-day? Then Senators can fill their engagements and be back here to-morrow. I ask unanimous consent that no vote be taken to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, if no vote is to be taken to-day, but a vote is to be taken to-morrow, that will disfranchise a number of Senators who can not be here to-morrow.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator from Indiana know when they can be here?



Mr. KERN. If the Senator will allow me, would he object to allowing the matter to go over until there can be a full vote in the Senate?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to see the matter take that course.

Mr. KERN. I suggested yesterday that, if a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote yesterday could not be reached, a date be fixed for a vote next week, say, on Monday, so that all Senators could have ample time to return.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. THOMAS. That would be agreeable to me, but I am satisfied that it can not and will not be done.

Mr. KERN. What can not be done?

Mr. THOMAS. The entering into of a unanimous-consent agreement fixing the time for a vote.

Mr. VARDAMAN. We can test the matter by asking unanimous consent that a vote be taken at 4 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator for that purpose, with the understanding that I still have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hughes	Perkins	Stephenson
Bankhead	Johnson	Pittman	Sterling
Borah	Jones	Polindexter	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kern	Ransdell	Thomas
Bristow	Lane	Reed	Thompson
Bryan	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Thornton
Burton	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Tillman
Chamberlain	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	West
Clark, Wyo.	Nelson	Shields	Williams
Dillingham	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Works
du Pont	Oliver	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Overman	Smith, S. C.	
Gore	Page	Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] are absent on the business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, in order that there may be a full attendance of Senators when the vote is taken upon this measure, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the vote on the joint resolution and amendments be taken at 4 o'clock Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I object. It will be impossible for me to be present here on Monday, or for several days thereafter, and I want to vote on this resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will Saturday be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. CATRON. Yes, sir; any time between now and adjournment on Saturday evening.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall object to Saturday. I am ready to vote now.

Mr. SMOOT. If a unanimous-consent agreement is going to be asked, it seems to me the roll should be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll has just been called.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall object to voting at any other time than to-day during the present week.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Make it Wednesday.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will ask if next Tuesday will be satisfactory, or Wednesday or Thursday or Friday?

Mr. CATRON. No; I do not think I shall be here at any time during next week.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I see that I can not satisfy the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CATRON. You can satisfy me by voting at any time between now and Saturday night.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will Monday week be satisfactory to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CATRON. Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES. How about the 2d of May?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from New Mexico consent to vote at this time?

Mr. CATRON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest that the roll be called, and we proceed to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I had not intended or desired to speak upon this joint resolution; but the friends of the resolution are desirous that certain things shall be put into the Record.

I ask unanimous consent to print, without reading it, as a part of my remarks, an article prepared by a woman, which contains some interesting matter bearing upon one phase of this subject—the State rights question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### THE STATE RIGHTS SHIBBOLETH.

[By Mary Beard.]

Women who are asking for a Federal amendment abolishing sex discrimination in the suffrage provisions of the Constitution are informed that the determination of the qualifications for voting is purely a State matter. They are dismissed with an air of finality not unlike that which follows a mathematic demonstration. The suffrage is a matter of State, not national, interest, and that is the end of the discussion.

There are some simple-minded persons who accept this dictum as the final word on the subject, but those women who have studied even a little American history and politics know very well that the border line between national and State matters can not be settled by a mathematical process or by an ipse dixit of some interested politician. They know that neither the Republican Party, the champion of nationalism, nor the Democratic Party, the champion of State rights, has been consistent in its attitude toward national and State rights. They know that each of them has leaned toward National or State Governments exactly whenever it has suited the party and economic interests.

Did not Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, founders of the Democratic Party, rend the air with cries of State rights against Federal usurpation when the Federalists chartered the first United States bank in 1791, and when the Federalist court, under the leadership of John Marshall, rendered one ringing nationalist decision after another upholding the rights of the Nation against the claims of the States? Yet Jefferson, as President, acquired the Louisiana Territory in what was admitted by him to be open violation of the Constitution, and the same James Madison who opposed the Federalist bank in 1790 as a violation of the Constitution and State rights cheerfully signed the bill rechartering that bank when it became useful to the fiscal interests of the Democratic Party. Jefferson was ready to nullify the alien and sedition laws and the Constitution of the United States in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798; the very Federalists who fought him in that day and denounced him as a traitor and nullifier lived to proclaim and practice doctrines of nullification in behalf of State rights during the War of 1812.

In the administration of Thomas Jefferson the National Government began the construction of the great national road without any express authority from the Constitution, and notwithstanding the fact that the construction of highways was admittedly a State matter. Eighteen years later a Democratic President, James Monroe, vetoed an act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road and labored to prove that the whole venture was a violation of the Constitution and an invasion of rights reserved to the States. On August 24, 1912, the Congress of the United States, then controlled by the Democratic Party, voted \$500,000 for the construction of experimental and rural delivery routes and to aid the States in highway construction. From high in the councils of that party we now have the advocacy of national ownership of railways, telegraph, and telephone lines. In the early days of the Republic the Democratic Party protested even in armed insurrection in Pennsylvania against the inquisitorial excise tax which, to use the language of the day, "penetrated a sphere of taxation reserved to the States"; to-day the Democratic Party places upon the statute books the most inquisitorial tax ever laid in the history of our country, and a wise and just tax, too, many believe. That same party, by an act of April 9, 1912, laid a tax on white phosphorus matches, not for the purpose of raising revenues, for which the taxing power is conferred, but admittedly for the purpose of destroying an industry which it could not touch otherwise. The match industry was found to be injurious to a few hundred working people; the Democratic Party wisely and justly cast to the four winds all talk about the right of States, made the match industry a national matter, and destroyed the dangerous features of the business. Men and women all over the country rose up and pronounced this a noble achievement. Republicans joined with Democrats in claiming the honor of that great humane service. Shades of departed Democrats! A taxing power which, according to Calhoun, could not be used for the purpose of protecting industries, may be used to destroy them. Consistency, where is thy virtue, and State rights, where is thy victory?

The State had the right to nullify Federal law in 1798—so Jefferson taught and Kentucky practiced. Half a century elapses. The State of Wisconsin, rock-ribbed Republican Wisconsin, nullified the fugitive-slave law, and in its pronouncement of nullification quoted the very words which Jefferson had used in 1798. A Democratic Supreme Court at Washington, presided over by Chief Justice Taney, the arch apostle of State rights, answered Wisconsin in the very language of the Federalists of 1798, whom Jefferson despised and contemned: "The Constitution and laws of the United States are supreme, and the Supreme Court is the only and final arbiter of disputes between the State and National Governments. A few more years elapse. South Carolina declares the right of the State to nullify, and Wisconsin answers on the field of battle: 'The Constitution and laws of the National Government are supreme, so help us God.'"

At the close of that ever-to-be-regretted war the Nation wrote into the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the fundamental principle that the suffrage is a national matter. Those amendments were intended to establish forever adult male suffrage throughout the American empire. It is true that those amendments are in many respects nullified by ingenious provisions. But there they stand. You are confronted by this dilemma: Either you must openly flout and scorn them, and thus virtually say to the Nation, We will obey just as much of the Constitution as we please, which is the doctrine of the anarchist; or you must say suffrage is by the Constitution a national matter and we abide by the Constitution.

All reasonably sophisticated persons know that anything is a State matter which we think is a State matter, and anything is a national matter that we think is a national matter. The women of this country—the women of the enfranchised States and the women of the States not yet enfranchised—think suffrage a national matter. Men may turn aside those women who expect to slumber their way to the suffrage by saying, "Just one moment, please," or "Kindly step the other way,



please"; but they can not thus dismiss those who have read the long and inconsistent history of all parties.

From history women appeal to political science, and here they cite the example of the only great independent federation that deserves to be compared with the United States—the German Empire. The constitution of that confederation does not leave the determination of the qualifications for voters for the Reichstag to the merces of the States; but solemnly and emphatically prescribes that every adult male German citizen shall vote for members of the Imperial Congress, whatever may be the qualifications for voters in the several States. The German constitution was made in the full light of modern political science and suffrage was there treated as a national matter.

If we turn to the other great federations of the world—Switzerland, Canada, and Australia—we find that their constitutions treat the suffrage for Federal offices as a national matter by empowering the Federal Parliaments to make uniform regulations with regard to qualifications for voters. The constitution of the Australian Commonwealth provides that the qualifications imposed on voters by the States shall remain until the (Federal) Parliament otherwise provides; and in 1902 the Federal Parliament established uniform qualifications throughout the Commonwealth as far as Federal elections were concerned, and enfranchised women in spite of the opposition in some of the States.

A study of the constitutional law shows, therefore, that in no federation is the suffrage regarded as a purely State matter. The Constitution of the United States does not allow the States to provide any qualifications they please for voters for Members of the House of Representatives or Senators, as is the rule in the case of the choice of presidential electors, where the State legislatures may make any qualifications they see fit. The constitution of Germany established universal manhood suffrage for Reichstag elections; the constitutions of Switzerland and Canada empower the Federal Parliaments to make uniform regulations whenever they see fit; the constitution of the Australian Commonwealth authorizes the Federal Parliament to make uniform qualifications, and the Federal Parliament almost immediately after the adoption of the constitution swept away sex discriminations in Federal elections.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, we are slaves to custom. We boast of freedom, and yet are bound on every side by superstitions which have survived from the Dark Ages. We think we are free, and yet we are such intellectual bondsmen that the term "free thinker" is looked on with opprobrium. Nearly every action of our lives is governed by precedent and convention. Our age-old forms of law are, many of them, mere mummery; our civilized regalia, the pomp and heraldry of state, as absurd and childish as the trappings of a Zulu tribe. Habit is the most powerful factor governing the actions of men. The mind as well as the body is plastic and turns in sympathy to its familiars, and to those things to which it has been trained. For every man who has the initiative to leave the habitual path to seek a higher and a better way of life, a million insist on planting their feet exactly in the track of the myriads who have gone before. The old road seems easier, and, to most, it seems best. Not only do most of us, as a race, content ourselves with established forms and customs, but will resist to the utmost any change.

So it is that mankind has required a hundred thousand years to attain its present improved condition. Every step of the way has been a war against precedent. Every intellectual advance has had its martyrs to the cause of progress. Every man who dared to oppose the established order has been marked as a despised thing apart. The imprisonment of a Galileo, the excommunication of a Luther, the chains of a Columbus, the rebel's price upon the head of Washington, are but the protests of privilege against the enfranchisement of the human mind. In the suffering of heroes blooms the flower of progress.

Many are against the political emancipation of women solely because they do not want to change custom and the established order. If some among their ancestors had not the initiative to break away from the fixed routine, in generation upon generation, these opponents of change would have been savages in the forests of Europe, clad in the skins of wild beasts and feeding on raw meat. Because some dared and some aspired they are the heirs of genius and citizens of the American Republic. But why does convention, precedent, and custom deny to women the most precious privilege of citizenship? We have set in the law the tests of fitness of a man to participate in this primary and fundamental function of self-government. He shall be 21 years of age. A woman may hesitate to say so, but she can be 21 years of age. In some States it is required that he shall be able to read and write. Women in larger percentage than men can read and write. It is said that men are required to support the family. That is often true; but without woman he would not have any family to support; and many times the woman not only supplies the family, but supports it and the man as well. And in every home which affords a haven of peace and rest to those who enter its sacred door a woman's tolling hands or a woman's loving heart makes it so. Can he who is opposed to this resolution turn away for a moment from the heartlessness and the busy affairs of this forum and rest his mind's eyes upon the blessed features of his mother? What has she been to you? She gave you being. She gave you sustenance, and in your puny helplessness nurtured you with that unspeakable tenderness, the holy mystery of God's love upon this earth. She gave you instruction, and with love and sym-

pathy guided your feeble and erring steps. She dreamed dreams for you, prayed for you, it may be, toiled for you. Her hopes and pride were the best incentive of your ambition. Now, in the seats of power, can you deny to her and to other mothers of a great people the right of franchise which the Constitution guarantees to every race and color of men? I have looked upon the heroic and noble face of my mother when the hand of God had smoothed from it all the cares and sufferings of this mortal life. I thought in grief too deep and intimate for any confidant of her labors and love for her children, of that rich legacy of loving instruction which she gave. I know how truly her heart and mind would have guided her in all the duties of citizenship, and rather that I should never announce another vote from this high place than that I should use its power to deny political freedom to such as she.

And to those other women who opened the gates of Paradise to you in the young morning of manhood and taught you the way of tenderness in the gardens of the Hesperides, can you deny the rights of citizens to them?

Qualifications for the franchise should be moral, spiritual, and intellectual fitness. Our own observation and the experience of history prove that in all these respects woman can meet any test men can satisfy. In literature, as in art, the inspiration of women has lightened the burdens of the world. The antisuffragists themselves have compiled data showing the good works of women. In this useful public service can the added power and influence of the ballot in any way lessen her efficiency? Some women say they do not want the ballot. They have organized against it as though anyone sought to force it upon them. No such proposition has ever been made. It is true the use of the ballot is a civic duty as well as a political right, but this resolution is intended for those women who appreciate that duty and who desire that right. Others will be left free to keep away from the contaminating touch of the voting precinct, if they so desire, just as millions of male citizens now do. It is said polling places are not suitable for women. There is no higher function of men than voting, and the polling place can be made as respectable as a school and, if need be, as holy as a church.

In view of her ability to comply with every test, why has custom, tradition, the law denied political equality to woman? For the same reason that she was formerly and still is, in many places, denied social and civil equality. It is only a few generations since woman had no individual status in this our society. She was a feme covert, a mere appanage of the man who owned her. He was in very truth her lord and master, and held over her the power of life and death. There was no law for her but the will of her lord. There are still some Tories, and strange to say, some women, who regret the departure of those good old times. And what was the reason for this personal chattel slavery of women? Physical force! All the institutions of society were then based on the law of force. A man was entitled to what he could take and hold. That was why it was necessary to build so many castles. Feudalism may have been a fine thing for the physically strong, but it was a hard and cruel law for the weak. It is always so, because the possessors of material power are often cruel, lustful, ignorant, and brutal. A state based upon such principles is in a stage of barbarism. With the Renaissance, the birth and progress of learning in the West, enlightened States have slowly evolved new and better principles of government. The growth of religious liberty, the consequent spread of the knowledge of the real teachings of Jesus Christ, have been most potent in this amelioration of the world. The discovery of America, doubling the opportunities, resources, and multiplying the comforts of mankind, has accelerated this advance. We have freed woman from personal bondage and given her an equal place of dignity and honor in the home. We have stricken from her the shackles of civil slavery, and have given her a standing in the courts as to all personal and property rights. No one can be heard nowadays to complain openly of this. On the contrary, we look upon this evolution of the status of woman as a wise, benign, and just policy.

Yet she remains in political slavery. This can only be explained as in geology the presence of certain rocks, apparently out of place, is the work of a glacial age, long disappeared, or as a rudimentary organ in the body whose functions have long since ceased. The difference is that this survival of feudalism in the twentieth century is positively injurious not only to women but to the entire State.

But it is said that this physical test is correct, because war requires physical prowess and women can not go to war. Men seem to be afraid that women, if vested with political power, would send men to war too freely. We can picture, in the vision of the mind, this future state controlled by women sending the



men to war, all the women remaining at home to hold carnival and revel. Wars are fought by boys. Can we imagine the mothers of the land too prone to send their smooth-faced sons to feed the hungry god of war, or wives and sweethearts careless of war because they themselves may not be soldiers? As a matter of fact, increased political power for women would afford the greatest force for peace that statesmanship can devise. But how as to war itself? All the army is not on the firing line. In hospitals and even on the field the ministering care of women comforts the wounded and blesses the dying. Where does war get its support but from the homes of the land, and upon whom does it levy a greater tribute, both of wealth and suffering, than upon the women of these homes? Women can not go to war, it is said. And yet this Nation now proposes to erect in this Capital a mighty monument to the sacrifices and devotion of the women of the North and South in the greatest war of our history. But for the courage, patriotism, and fortitude of women in war our independence could never have been won; and in every crisis of our history the high marks of daring and fame were reached through the encouragement, the love, and inspiration of heroic women. And can not women go to war? When at rare intervals the Divine Spirit incarnates itself in mortal flesh, it does not always choose a man as its medium. Women have been inspired—and it was a woman, a chaste maiden of less than 20 years of age, who came from her simple country life and gave hope, if she could not give courage, to her craven king. Joan of Arc, as pure and noble a figure as time has seen, led where there was no man to lead. She broke the power of the invader and led victorious armies for her country's freedom. She shed her blood in battle at the gates of Paris and made men of laggards and cowards. And yet she died the cruel death of fire—neglected by an ingrate king, the victim of ignorant and brutal men. Years after her body had been destroyed the same forces which urged her execution attempted to capitalize her sainted memory.

Free government means self-government. That selfishness which is a predominant trait of human nature can not be trusted, unrestrained, to use benevolently exclusive power. The only possible agency by which any class can secure justice from the Government is the vesting in that class a part in the control of the Government. If women have no voice in the Government, they are political slaves, and it is within the unrestricted power of another class to make them social and personal slaves. If their interests are to be protected, the only guaranty is to give them the means by which to protect themselves. It is upon this axiom that all the new agencies of popular government have been found necessary—that the people can not have just laws, justly enforced, unless the people themselves have political power. Free government means a free party, and so the movement has grown to put the party under the direct control of the people.

But it is not for women alone that their political liberation is sought. It is for the good of all. It is not a question of sex. It is a question of virtue. It is a wise philosophy that in this humane and enlightened age the humane impulses and the intelligent minds of women should have free play in solving the human problems of society. Some say woman's enfranchisement should be left to the States. But why? We have deemed it of sufficient importance to provide in the Federal Constitution that race or color should not stand in the way of the ballot. Why not write into this clause one other word and prevent the far more unwise and cruel discrimination against sex alone?

It is pertinent to observe, sir, that we are not seeking to take anything away from anybody, but to give the highest privilege of citizenship to a class which has been denied it. No man can oppose this resolution on the ground that anyone will lose a privilege they now enjoy. It is perfectly proper for the Democratic Party to oppose this resolution if the administration or the party see fit to do so. They are laboring under no compulsion. But it is likewise necessary and proper that both party and administration shall be held accountable before the country for their attitude. The President has declined to support it. Other agencies in the control of that party have acted adversely upon it. It is our contention that in doing so they are opposing the extension of free institutions and the political liberation of one-half of our people. The time to stand for woman suffrage is whenever the opportunity is offered, and the means to be used are whatever lawful means are available. This resolution affords such an opportunity and such a means. The men of our land will be better men if they are born of mothers who are politically free.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I represent in part in this body a State which has enjoyed equal suffrage for a period of nearly 20 years. We have had an opportunity to observe its effect upon society and upon the politics of the State, and we are

satisfied with the effect of woman suffrage. We have not observed that there is any neglect of the home by reason of it. If there are indications of that kind, or if there are to be, they have not yet in any outward sense developed. We do not believe any such thing will result from woman suffrage. We have never discovered any tendency toward what some people think will be the result of woman suffrage, and that is of masculinity, as it were, women departing from the avenues and walks of life for which they are particularly fitted and entering into other walks of life and engaging in a mode of life not in harmony with the highest ideals of womanhood. That condition has not yet developed in our State under woman suffrage. We do not believe it ever will develop.

We have never discovered either that there is any tendency on the part of women to abandon their particular sphere and engage exclusively in political duties, such as office holding, and so forth. The fact is that there is very little disposition upon the part of the women of my State apparently to hold office. They take an interest in politics; they take an interest in public questions; they are interested in public discussions; and I think the figures, if they could be gathered, would show that the percentage of votes upon the part of the women is practically as large as that upon the part of the men; but they have shown a keener interest in the things which have to do with molding public opinion than in enjoying the spoils of office. My own judgment is, from observations which I have made, that upon some questions, what might be called quasi-moral questions, the vote is larger and the interest greater upon the part of women than upon the part of men. In many of the most important questions which now concern the welfare of society their influence is controlling and always for the good.

Women do vote. They continue to vote, year by year and election after election. It is not a fad, it is not a fancy satisfied by an experience of one or two occasions, but they continue to take an interest in political affairs.

There is a great object lesson to everyone who has had the experience of campaigning where women vote and in a State where they do not. You will seldom speak to an audience in my State which is not composed of as many women as men, and perhaps more. You will find them active in all the different phases of political life, so far as those phases which go to make up public opinion and control and direct and shape and mold public opinion are concerned.

I say candidly and earnestly that after an observation of nearly 20 years, I am thoroughly in favor of equal suffrage. I believe it is to the benefit of society; I believe it is to the benefit of the body politic; I do not believe it is to the detriment of womankind; and therefore I have been and am an advocate of it. I began its advocacy 22 years ago and have never had cause to regret the humble part I had in securing the right of women to vote in my State.

There is one feature of woman's presence in politics which is not sufficiently accentuated, and that is what might be called her potential influence. Even if the women seldom went to the polls, even if they seldom took part in the more active phases of political activity, I would still be in favor of woman suffrage, for the reason that her presence in the political forum, the possibility of her taking part in political matters, the possibility that she may take an interest in a question or a candidate, has a potential and beneficial influence in politics which, to my mind, is even as great as that of her actual influence. I would not disparage my sex, but man is prone to be more careful when he knows his acts are to come under the surveillance of mother, wife, sister, or daughter.

Those who have attended political conventions and political gatherings before and after the advent of woman suffrage in a State will testify to the fact that no platform is ever written and no question advocated, no candidate's nomination sought, without some regard, more or less, as to how the women will view the candidate or the platform. I recall one instance in particular in my State, where there were only two women in the convention. It was during the old convention days, when the things were agreed upon mostly before the convention met. A platform and the candidates, or what was called a slate in "prehistoric times," had been agreed upon. There were not sufficient women in the convention or in touch with the convention to control the situation, but it was made known that a particular feature of the program of that convention would in all probability incur the displeasure and the opposition of the women vote of the State, and the slate was changed as promptly as if the votes had been in the convention to break it. This is the potential influence of woman, because no man knows what a woman will do when she is offended.

So I say, Mr. President, that the potential influence of woman, the knowledge that she has the power to enforce her



view of a particular question and that it can be made effective, is a powerful instrument and quality for good in political affairs.

I am, therefore, not particularly concerned with that argument which says that woman does not or should not attend political conventions or political gatherings, and so forth, for I repeat that if she exercise no other influence than the fact that she might become an effective censor of the action of a political party it would be a sufficient justification for giving her the vote.

We have had during all time certain arguments in favor of woman suffrage and arguments against woman suffrage. I am not going to undertake to review them to-day. They have been discussed here pro and con. I can only say that after nearly 20 years of observation and experience in the State of Idaho the arguments, so far as they are arguments, against woman suffrage have, in my judgment, been met. They have been met by actual experience, by actual fact, by the effect which it has had for the betterment of politics and political conditions.

I am not one of those, Mr. President, however, who claim that woman suffrage is a panacea for all the evils which afflict the body politic. Like all other reforms, those who advocate it expect too much of it, and those who oppose it attribute entirely too much to it in the way of fault. It is simply one of the important steps toward better politics and a better condition of affairs in political concerns. In my judgment, its entire tendency is for the good. Whether it is great or small, less than some might expect or more than others, the tendency of the presence of women in the political arena is for the good. Of that I entertain no doubt.

Mr. President, I have at different times throughout the East advocated equal suffrage, and I am going to insert in the RECORD some views which I have heretofore expressed. They may be of possible interest to those engaged in the cause of woman suffrage in the different States. At Newark, N. J., last October, at a woman-suffrage gathering, I said:

There are no doubt those who truly believe that if woman is to vote, that if she is to consider of those questions which underlie and support the whole moral fabric of life, and, having considered of them, is to record her convictions, that she is to lose some of that charm which is exclusively hers. Let us be fair with ourselves and look with our eyes and not with our prejudices. I do not know of a nobler, more effectual, a more respected and refined power in the whole arena of social forces, and a more womanly woman, than the woman of to-day who is giving of her thought and her purpose, her invincible moral courage, in dealing with the social problems and social reforms with which we now have to deal, with which in the future we must contend more and more. Is she less respected by father, husband, and brother than the woman whose tastes lead her along other lines? And why withhold from this woman engaged in so noble an enterprise the instrumentality by which she can effectuate what her brain and purpose have planned and outlined? No woman can ever become less womanly from thinking and acting upon and in regard to those things which would protect the home, which would protect the child, which would protect society, and which would ameliorate and soften the harsh struggles of the countless thousands who are in earnest contest with adversity, but whose children must finally assume the duties and obligations which rest upon all the citizens of our blessed Republic.

Speaking later at Baltimore, I made this observation:

I informed your committee when asked to speak upon this occasion that I would be glad to take part in this meeting, provided it did not commit me to the proposition of the proposed amendment to the Constitution now pending before Congress. I am an earnest advocate of woman suffrage, but I believe it to be both inexpedient and unwise to attempt to secure it otherwise than through the respective States.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to observe woman suffrage in actual practice through the course of years believe in it. We do not believe in it as a fad or a fancy, nor as an exigency in a national campaign, nor yet as a thing about which women should forfeit their poise and judgment, their sense of order, and their regard for law—we believe in it because we think it founded both in political justice and economic expediency, we think its tendency is all for the good, for cleaner and higher politics.

I think the campaign for woman suffrage has been carried on in this country with remarkable judgment and poise. It has been carried on in the States as it should be, through argument and reason, through discussion most ably conducted. It is bound to win. The continued appeal to the conscience and minds of the American people in an orderly and lawful way will win your cause and win it far more quickly and satisfactorily than it can be won in any other way. Two things those who are conducting truly great reforms ought at all times to bear in mind: First, that this is a government of order and law; and, secondly, that the people will in the end, and when fully informed, do the wise and just thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Idaho how long woman suffrage has existed in the State of Idaho?

Mr. BORAH. My remembrance is that it is 18 years, but I may be mistaken two years either way.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know that in the New England States men who are said to reside in the so-called woman-suffrage

States on occasion say that it is working badly in those States. Now, the Senator represents a State where woman suffrage has existed for 15 years or more, and I will ask the Senator in all frankness whether or not he, from his observation and experience, is of the opinion that it is beneficial rather than otherwise?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt about the fact that it is beneficial. I may say that I have never in my observation discovered what I thought was an evil tendency of woman suffrage. I have, on the other hand, discovered many constant and persistent tendencies which I consider to be altogether for the good upon the part and by the reason of woman suffrage.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that I am for woman suffrage, I must say that I am against this joint resolution. That requires some further remarks upon my part, because I will, of course, immediately be charged with being underzealous in regard to the cause. If the proposition presented were only and alone the question of woman suffrage, if there were no other propositions inhering in this controversy, if there were no other precedents to be set and no other consequences to follow, I would unhesitatingly give my vote for the joint resolution. But there are other things necessarily associated with it which, to my mind, must be controlling, so far as my vote is concerned.

I can not permit myself to overlook the fact that while woman suffrage may be obtained through the States, a precedent which we are about to establish here would be one which would appertain and relate to other questions and be controlling in my judgment with reference to other matters, and for that among other reasons I am not satisfied to vote for the joint resolution.

When I informed one of the good women who was advocating this cause some time ago that I could not vote for the resolution she stated that they had been wondering why it was, why one who was in favor of woman suffrage was not in favor of this proposition. I answered her that the first reason why I was against this resolution and in favor of woman suffrage was because this is the most impracticable, impossible way by which to get woman suffrage in this country.

If we adopt this resolution, it will require 36 States to be carried for woman suffrage before an additional woman is permitted to vote so far as her right to vote depends upon this amendment. You may carry 20 States, you may carry 25 States, you may carry 30 States, you may carry 35 States, and the energy and the time and the effort and the money which you put forth in trying to carry those 35 States will have been wholly lost unless you are able to carry one other State. In my judgment you will never carry for woman suffrage in this country 36 States in the Union until you repeal the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution. You have taken on the suffrage cause the heavy burden of race prejudice.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. For my personal enlightenment, if the resolution as it stands before us to-day is agreed to—I do not expect it is going to be agreed to, but if it should be agreed to—would it not still be a fact that the individual State could confer suffrage upon the women?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suppose the Senator's idea is that they would rest on their oars if this should prevail. Is that the idea?

Mr. BORAH. No; not exactly that; but you must take into consideration that you can not conduct a campaign for the legislature in 36 States of the Union without a vast amount of additional expenditure, a vast amount of additional time and energy, at the same time that you are conducting a campaign for the submission of a constitutional amendment in your own State or in a particular State. For instance, if you could have all the 36 States of the Union submit the proposition of woman suffrage in the State at the same time that you were fighting for the legislature to ratify this amendment you might conduct the campaign with some degree of success from the same headquarters and with the same amount of energy, time, and money, but while conducting a campaign in a certain State for woman suffrage, like Michigan, direct by the vote of the people, if you are making any headway at all you must be carrying on a campaign in 35 other States of the Union for the purpose of ratification, and in my judgment dividing your forces and dissipating your power. I think it requisite to success that all effort and power should be concentrated and directed along lines where ultimate results can be finally had.

The thing which confronts me as a practical proposition in regard to this method is the insurmountable and impassable



barrier which stands between the women and suffrage so long as the negro vote in this country is as it is. There are 16 States in the Union that will never ratify this amendment so long as the fifteenth amendment is in the Constitution of the United States. We had just as well be candid and fair and open about this proposition. The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a dead letter. It is not enforced in a single State of the Union by reason of the fact that it is the fifteenth amendment. Wherever the negro votes he would vote without the amendment and by reason of the action of the State. Fifty years ago we extended to the negroes of this country the right of suffrage and to-day they are as completely disfranchised as if the fifteenth amendment was out of the Constitution. There it is in the fundamental law ignored and defied and evaded, not by the action of the South alone but by consent of a whole Nation.

Now do we suppose that those people, feeling as they do the necessity of acting upon that premise, will enfranchise 2,000,000 additional voters of the same class? Are we to suppose that they will add to and accentuate the strength of Federal control over elections until that question in some way is settled, so that they are relieved of their fear of negro domination? Those States against such a proposition will stand as solid as a Macedonian phalanx.

Permit me to say to the women of this country that the moment they leave the campaign in the individual States for the enfranchisement of woman and take on the campaign from a national standpoint they load down the woman-suffrage question with the race question, which is far more difficult to handle and goes up against more insurmountable barriers and more uncontrollable passion by far than the question of woman suffrage. I have never been able to understand why they should court such a contest.

Why should the women in this country who want to vote take upon their shoulders the race question in their fight for enfranchisement? The energy, the money, the time, and the ability which would be spent in undertaking to carry those 16 States would put 10 States of the North into the Union for woman suffrage.

Therefore, Mr. President, as one who believes that in time women will vote, except in those cases where the insurmountable barrier of race prejudice prevents it, and should be permitted to vote, I would be opposed to this proposition as a practical.

Let me say without challenging the good faith or the courage of any Senator who sits here with me I do not think there is a Senator in this Chamber who believes that 15 or 16 States of the Union will ever ratify this amendment so long as the fifteenth amendment is unrepealed. Therefore that will happen which happened the other day when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi rose in his place and, as an amendment to this constitutional provision, proposed a repeal of the fifteenth amendment. Whenever this constitutional amendment, if it is adopted by the Congress, passes a certain border line of States that amendment will not be attached to it by the Congress of the United States, but it will be attached to it by every State in which the vote is being sought; that is to say, it will never receive the approval of those States until you make this a white amendment. I can not encourage the women of this country to enter that fight. I would be insincere and hypocritical to them and false to the cause to encourage such a course.

There is another reason, Mr. President, kindred to that proposition, which is a strong and controlling reason with me. It may be a sentimental proposition, but I do not look at it that way. I am opposed, even if we could secure ratification, to putting into the Constitution of the United States a provision of the Constitution which is going to be violated 365 days out of the year. A great fundamental law, the incarnation and the crystallization of the public sentiment and the moral force of 90,000,000 people should be a law which is in force and to be in force in its every line and letter so long as it remains the law. The violation of law is bad of itself. It is demoralizing to the community, the State, and the Nation. For a people to live in open defiance of their fundamental law, for a whole nation to witness day after day and year after year and decade after decade the flagrant evasion of their charter of government is to breed that contempt for order, that disregard for authority, that defiance of law, that indifference to the rights of others which now curses with a withering, consuming curse some of the so-called Republics to the south. We of the North are quick to vote these things upon the South, to vex and complicate their tremendous burden more and more. But we neither offer to the South a remedy nor offer to the negro anything more than lip service for the realization of its constitutional right.

I do not stand here to-day to criticize those of the South who have to deal with this question, but I do say that it can not be otherwise than demoralizing to be constantly placing in the Constitution of the United States provisions which every Senator knows will not be enforced or be made protective to the entire people of the United States.

What must the other race of which we are not members think as they look up to the Constitution of the United States and hear it eulogized here year by year, as they look up to the flag under which they live, supposing that it represents the highest form of civilization and the perfection of human justice? What must they think when day after day, year after year, they know that in violation of that supreme law they are deprived of the privilege of casting their vote according to the guaranty of the Constitution? The Constitution may not be a sacred thing, but the duty, the obligation, and good faith of a superior and dominant race toward an inferior and dependent race are sacred things. No promise should be made that is not to be kept.

I am one of those, Mr. President, who has never hesitated to say that the writing into the Constitution of the United States of the fifteenth amendment at the time it was written there was a mistake. It was a serious mistake. It came before the hot passions of the Civil War had cooled and judgment had time to resume its sway, while the engendered feelings which had been accumulating through years of strife and conflict still prevailed. It came in a large measure as a sort of retaliation and revenge. The idea of taking a people and lifting them out of a thousand years of savagery and barbarism, of 300 years of slavery, and placing them in a position where they are required to perform all the duties and obligations of citizenship of a highly civilized Republic! No race in the history of the world has ever been equal to such a thing and no race in the history of the world could do such a thing. And then, when they did not measure up to the task we either turned upon them or left them to their political fate. Men rise to the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in a great republic under years of stress and strain and under years of tutelage and education. Yet we took and placed upon those men the right and obligation of civilization, stepping immediately from the brink of savagery and slavery. It was a mistake. There is no doubt about that.

What has been the result? The result has been that after the first fever was over we of the North consented and connived at the South in violating the Constitution, and the North to-day is just as much a party to the violation of that Constitution as the South.

Mr. President, until the time shall arrive when through some mode, which is not by any means clear to my vision, we shall devise a scheme by which to protect the colored man in his vote, when the time shall arrive when we shall devise a method by which he shall exercise the right of suffrage, so far as I am concerned, let the consequences be what they may, I shall not vote to write into the Constitution another provision which is to be constantly violated for the next 50 years. I will not vote to aggravate or accentuate that condition there existing until we devise some method to relieve it and disclose sufficient courage to put the method thus devised into execution. I will not help to put another false and deluding promise into the Constitution with which to tantalize and demoralize a race, a promise which we of the North have no intention of enforcing and which those of the South have every intention, and as they believe from necessity, of evading.

No, sir; until we devise some plan, some scheme by which to carry out the letter and execute the spirit of the Constitution as it is now written, I will not consent, so far as I am concerned, to play the hypocrite any further.

Mr. President, those are what I consider the practical objections to the impossibility of securing this right through this method.

But there is another reason—and it is even a more controlling reason to me, because it goes to what I conceive the very foundation principles of the Republic—and that is the old doctrine, discarded and worn, but vital and indispensable—the doctrine of State rights for local affairs. I can not conceive of a State, or anything of sufficient dignity to be called a State, which has lost the right to say who shall vote for its State officer.

Mr. President, at the time of the organization of this Government and during the first years of its existence there lived two of the most remarkable men in the history of politics—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. Seldom, if ever, have two men of the same era exerted so marked an influence upon their own times, and never has it been the lot of two men of the same period to extend their influence side by side so far into the future. Some would compare the lives of Fox



and Pitt, of Disraeli and Gladstone, but Jefferson and Hamilton stood about the creation of a new government, and their services were not only more effective in the days they were rendered, but more profound and momentous, more lasting and far-reaching in their import. Both were among the first to be associated with the arousing of the American colonies to an open breach with the mother country; both were loyal and active agents in the success of the cause; both men of personal probity, of unusual energy, of singularly powerful intellects, and both exerted their great influence in and about the building of the Government, and each sought to build in the integrity of his own convictions.

I have never, since I have been able and sufficiently tolerant to ascertain and measure the worth of these two men, to comprehend their theories of government, to measure the influence and effect of the work of the one upon the other, doubted that it was anything else than a providential blessing that both lived and wrought in those vital, formative days of the Republic. It was most fortunate that the advocates of a strong government did not in all their fullness prevail. It was equally fortunate that the advocates of State rights did not succeed in incorporating their doctrine in all its fullness into our dual form of government. The marvel, sir, in the building of this Government was the combining of powers sufficiently strong to insure and to enforce the guaranties which it proposed to give as a nation together with those principles of local self-government and individual initiative and personal freedom without which a free government could not long endure. This was the combined work of Hamilton and Jefferson more than any two other men. Nowhere in all this mighty structure is greater wisdom disclosed than in the matter of reserving and granting powers between the local and the General Government, thus adjusting with a singular mechanism the principles of local rule and of a representative agency to carry the expression of that local power into national affairs.

The strength of the Republic arises not out of the policies of Hamilton and not out of the policies of Jefferson, but out of that combination of policies which are everywhere interwoven into our system. The maintenance of these principles of government are essential. "Any serious departure," declared the late Justice Harlan, "from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system." And if you would know the secret of the sublime strength of Lincoln, the broad and comprehensive grasp of his statecraft you will find it here—in his fidelity to these principles embodied in our theory of government.

We forget in this day, both as Hamiltonians and as Jeffersonians, that the Government was not framed by Mr. Hamilton and that the Government was not framed by Mr. Jefferson. It represents neither the full view of Mr. Hamilton nor the full view of Mr. Jefferson. It is the result, the combination, the composite work of two of the most powerful and puissant minds that have ever lived in the tide of time. It is the Government as Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton made it, one of them believing in a government strong enough to guarantee all the blessings to the individual which it proposes to give, stable enough and powerful enough to protect them, and the other believing in the principle of local self-government, in the initiative upon the part of the individual citizen, and in reserving to the State everything of a local nature; it is such a government to which I give my allegiance. I believe the composite work of these men is infinitely stronger than either would be standing alone.

It is that government with its strong central power and its local initiative which constitutes the strength and makes this Government the insuperable barrier, if we retain those principles to time, as it is our duty to do, Mr. President, and to preserve those principles just as much as it was the duty of those who began in the first days of the Republic.

Mr. President, we are not a homogeneous people yet by any means. We have the oriental question on the Pacific slope, we have the negro question in the South, and we have the countless thousands of immigrants crowding to this country from southern Europe, who are yet to become acquainted with our theory of government and the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

If I say to the State of New York what the measure of her electorate shall be, if I say to the State of Massachusetts what the measure of her electorate shall be, what argument shall I present to the State of Massachusetts and the State of New York when New York and Massachusetts say to Idaho, "We want to determine who shall own real estate in your State"? If I say to those people that we propose to take away from the States the right to control and determine the question of franchise, which has always been a question belonging to the State,

what shall I say to New York when New York says, in order to lull the disturbance with Japan, in order that this Government may have power to settle all difficulties at Washington or that California and Idaho and Washington shall not disturb the situation by reason of the Japanese question, what argument can I urge when they say to me, "We want an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which says that you shall not discriminate as to who shall own your land or enter your schools"?

Suppose, in other words, Mr. President, that instead of the provision of the Constitution which we have we had this provision, and it would only take a word or two to change it, and it would not be upon any different principles, upon any different policy or interfere with any different States rights from that which it does now; suppose we should say, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote or to acquire real property shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, sex, or nationality"; what would the men of the Pacific slope say, who justly feel nervous over the fact that there is constantly crowding to our shores an aggressive and subtle and powerful nation, tormented with fatalism, desiring to take possession of the civilization upon the Pacific slope? If we begin to tear away the most vital things of State sovereignty, first the control of the franchise, next the control of real property, who shall call a halt and when? I believe in a great Federal Union and a Federal Union can not exist without strong, powerful, and dignified States upon which to rest.

Before some men now in this Chamber leave the Senate this country will have to meet the question whether the National Government shall control such a situation as that or whether the State shall be permitted to deal with it. There are 10,000 Japanese and Chinese women in those States, and I have no particular desire to bestow suffrage upon them; I have not any desire to yield up to them a voice in deciding the question how we shall control our schools on the Pacific slope. With reference to those questions, so far as I am concerned, I would count myself derelict not only in my duty to the Pacific slope, but in my obligations to the very framework and foundation of this Government, if I should assist in establishing a precedent which could be invoked in favor of the National Government saying who should own the property of my State.

So, Mr. President, this joint resolution does not stand upon the question of woman suffrage. The minute you leave the States and thrust the campaign for equal suffrage into the national domain the women of this country take upon themselves the race question; they take upon themselves these complicated problems which arise by reason of conditions upon the Pacific slope; they take upon themselves numerous propositions wholly dissociated and divorced from the woman-suffrage question itself. Why do so?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho if the prejudice in California, where the Japanese are located, is not as intense as the race feeling which exists in the Southern States, where the negro is located?

Mr. BORAH. I think it is.

Mr. President, when the matter of the election of Senators by popular vote was before the Senate it will be recalled that there was a provision in the amendment as originally proposed by which the control of the elections of the Senators was taken from under the control of Congress. As my colleagues will remember, I advocated a change in the National Constitution so that each State might control the question of elections. The question here involved is not precisely the same as that, but it is kindred to it. I was in favor of leaving to the States the determination not only of the question as to who should vote, but I was in favor of leaving to the States the control of the election and the manner in which the vote should be cast and counted, because, say what you may and argue as you will, if the virtue has departed from the people at home, if the patriotism of those in the States has departed, or if their intelligence does not measure up, there is no salvation for the situation in Washington; in other words, if we can not trust the people in the respective States, among themselves, to settle these questions which are local, which are indigenous to their community—if they have not sufficient patriotism or breadth of mind to settle those questions, we may be assured that the representatives whom they send to Congress will not in the long run have any different or any higher capacity than the men who are at home.

In that debate I said:

Under this system, Mr. President—and I will state here now my exact opposition to and my reason for opposing the Sutherland amendment—under this system, in my judgment, Congress could of its own motion interfere with our entire election machinery, our system of registration, our primary law, our ballot, and the entire mechanism of conducting elections. When you have said that, in my judgment, you have



fixed the boundary line between what the Government may do under section 4 and the line beyond which they may do all that has been claimed that ought to be done without section 4.

I am not willing to concede for my own State that our system of holding elections or the manner of conducting them shall be prescribed by any others than those who are directly interested in the matter. I do not want a different time fixed; I do not want a different ballot; I do not want a different registration system; I do not want a different set of primary laws. These matters are matters of prime concern to the people who must elect all their officers and conduct all their elections and see that they are all clean, and they and they alone can best work out this matter in accordance with the local condition and situation which pertain to each individual State. This is a matter with which the people are familiar, which they are bound to take an interest in by reason of their State elections, and which to say they can not efficiently perform is to challenge their capacity for the discharge of the ordinary duties of civil life.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln said upon an important occasion:

To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control, under the Constitution, their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential for the preservation of the balance of power on which our institutions rest.

Mr. Lincoln passed through the terrific strain of four years of civil war. No man was ever tempted more than he to draw to himself all the power of an autocrat and dictator; no man was ever tempted more than he to doubt the efficiency and the strength of the Republic and of the Constitution of the United States. He was in the midst of a strife which involved, if successful, the dissolution of this Government. He was not only burdened with the strife at home, but most of the great civilized nations of the earth believed in and sympathized with the possibility of the downfall of the Republic.

I call upon those in this day who think it necessary to digress from the fundamental principles upon which this Republic was founded to remember that in the midst of such a strife he never for a moment lost faith either in the ultimate preservation and triumph of the Republic or the efficiency and the strength of the Constitution. I invite those who have studied his works and are familiar with his life to bring before us a word falling from the lips of the sainted martyr in all the struggle through which he passed indicating that he thought it was necessary to change the fundamental principles upon which the Republic was founded. In the very midst of that contest, at the time when it was raging most severely, he said that local affairs for the State government and national affairs for the National Government were essential to the preservation of the Union. Upon that principle he fought and won; and the people of this country owe to Abraham Lincoln a debt of gratitude commensurate with the debt of gratitude which they owe to him for his patience and his love; for the faith which he had in this old Republic and the Constitution of the United States; for the unswerving fidelity to our institutions with which he fought the fight to the end. Are we wiser than he? Is our task more tremendous or much different than the task which in the providence of God was assigned to him?

Mr. President, this is not a new subject or a new impression with me. I have thought over it much, and from my first knowledge of the Government I have felt that the distribution of power between the State and the National Governments upon the principles of the Constitution was and is indispensable to the preservation of the Government. In speaking before the Hamilton Club of Chicago in 1909 I took occasion to say:

Nowhere in their work was greater wisdom disclosed, a more searching and judicious knowledge of the great truths of history revealed than in this matter of reserving and granting powers between the local or State and the General Governments. With the utmost care and caution there was reserved for the States the control of all matters of domestic concern, of local interests, while there was granted to the General Government those great and general powers which encompass the welfare of all. We must not assume, we must not permit ourselves to believe that the reservation is of less moment or less beneficial to the American people than the grant. I am well aware that the phrase "State rights" has been discredited in our history. It is associated with unhappy days. It is a kind of intellectual tramp recognized for the last 50 years, mainly at the back door of the American statesman.

But the misuse or abuse of the term should not blind us to the great and inviolate political truth that upon the integrity of the States after all rests the integrity and permanency of the Union, that upon the principle of local self-government rests the perpetuity of republican institutions. In this way and in this way alone the people may retain those rights and keep alive that public spirit which furnishes the brain power and the moral force to run the entire machinery of government, keep alive and strong and healthy the principle of the New England town meeting, expanded and fashioned on a larger scale, a principle born of a complete faith in the integrity and judgment and self-governing capacity of the masses. God pity this Government in the hour in which we shall look to Washington for that economy in public expenditures, that comprehension of the common needs, that devotion to the general interests, the power and the willingness to correct abuses and distribute justice, all so essential to a democratic form of government, rather than to enlighten public opinion gathered up and crystallized into law through those agencies of government which reach back and down to the great body of the people, the sole sovereignty of the Republic.

The makers of the Constitution did not grant to the General Government any powers which it is dangerous to exercise to the fullest con-

stitutional limit. Moreover, I have a profound admiration for the men who would exercise these powers fully and completely in the interest of the Nation. But while extending and developing and building at the top, I would keep sound and safe and sure the foundation upon which the whole structure rests. For what shall it profit to enact laws, create commissions, and unfold the ambitious schemes of men who dream of international prestige and power unless we know what the electorate yonder in the field, factory, and mine is doing or is willing to do, unless we know the measure of its ability, the worth of its patriotism? Responsibility alone gives strength and initiative to citizenship, contact with government fosters public spirit, and local rule is the great school in which is reared and trained and equipped the kind of statesmen who take care that no harm comes to the Republic.

But, Mr. President, let me recall the words of those whose wisdom no one will question and the words of those who were and are known as the advocates of a strong government. Justice Miller, one of our greatest jurists, gave expression to the following view:

While the pendulum of public opinion has swung with force away from the extreme point of the State rights doctrine, there may be danger of its reaching an extreme point on the other side. In my opinion the just and equal observance of the rights of the States and of the General Government as defined by the Constitution is as necessary to the permanent prosperity of our country and to its existence for another century as it has been for the one whose close we are now celebrating.

Justice Harlan has represented as liberal a view toward the powers of the National Government as any man who has sat upon the bench at any time in its history. He rendered the dissenting opinion in the Civil Rights case and in the Knight case and wrote the majority opinion in the Securities case. In one of the last public utterances which he made this splendid old Roman said:

A National Government for national affairs and State governments for State affairs is the foundation rock upon which our institutions rest. Any serious departure from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system of free government.

But the fact is not as the pessimist alleges it to be. The American people are more determined than at any time in their history to maintain both National and State rights as those rights exist under the Union ordained by the Constitution. I say the people of the United States, for although the Constitution was accepted by the separate action of the people in their respective States, they moved together, in a collective capacity, as one people, in creating a Nation for certain specified objects of general concern. They will not patiently consider any suggestion or scheme that involves a Union upon any other basis. They will maintain, at whatever cost and in all their integrity, both National and State rights.

The best friends of State rights, permit me to say, are not those who habitually denounce as illegal everything done by the General Government, but those who recognize the Government of the Union as possessing all the powers granted to it in the Constitution, either expressly or by necessary implication; for without a General Government possessing controlling power in relation to matters of national concern, the States would have no prestige before the world and would be in perpetual conflict with one another. With equal truth it may be said that the best friends of the Union are those who hold that the States possess all governmental powers not granted to the General Government and that are not inconsistent with their own constitutions or with the Constitution of the United States or with a republican form of government. The people of the United States cherish, and will compel adherence to, the fundamental doctrine that the States are vital parts of the American system of government; and they will insist with no less determination upon the recognition of the just powers of the States—to be exerted always in subordination to the supreme law of the land—as essential to the preservation of our liberties. The Supreme Court of the United States has again and again declared, upon full consideration, that a close and firm Union is necessary for the happiness of the American people, and that "without the States in union there could be no such political body as the United States."

If, then, the matchless Government devised by the fathers and ordained by the people of the United States is to be preserved and handed down intact to posterity, National power and State power must go hand in hand in harmony with the Constitution.

No, Mr. President, the wisest have understood that there are certain principles indispensable to a Federal Union—a representative Republic and local self-government for local affairs is one of them.

There are those in these days who are fond of teaching the people of this country that our fathers who built this Government did not trust the people. I have just finished reading a wholly misleading book by a no doubt highly educated professor, who was greatly interested in proving that our fathers were in a conspiracy against popular government. These men err and greatly err by reason of the fact that they themselves have but an inadequate and vulgar conception of the real intelligence and the true self-governing power of the people, of their capacity to deal with great problems and measure up to great tasks. They have themselves but a faint and unsteady grasp of that firm and vital belief which enables a great soul to risk all upon the proposition that that which is permanent and enduring and wise will in the end meet their approving judgment. I believe in the utmost freedom of thought; that truth should be unrestrained, but the libel of the dead, the slander of the patriots of the Republic, are just the same to me whether fumbling with a bomb or hiding under the name of an honored university the learned and solemn ignorance of anarchy.

At the time this Government was framed and submitted to the people for approval free government was looked upon as



the dream of enthusiasts. To transfer sovereignty from the rulers to the people was in itself regarded as the folly of madmen. The task, the gigantic task of building up and putting into operation against the world's prejudices and beliefs, and in the face of countless centuries of disaster and ruin, a government whose sole sovereignty was to be in the people, in whose power and glory the humblest might share and at the same time strong enough and stable enough to insure the individual citizen the fruits of the blessed guarantees which it professed to give, was the task of these men. It required something of the courage, something of the foresight, something of the wisdom which the sparing hand of Providence seldom bestows upon the children of men. What they did was so far in advance of anything which had gone before, so popular in its conception, that it met on every hand with doubt and discredit, if not with mockery and derision. And never until its seasoned timbers had withstood the deluge of civil war, until the people against whom it is said this conspiracy had been organized came from the farm and factory and mine tendering limb and life in its defense, never until the tragic figure of that fearful conflict had triumphantly foretold that this Government of the people by the people for the people should not perish from the earth did the world at large believe that the work of the fathers could endure; rather did it believe that amid dissension and discord it would pass on with the other Republics of the earth. To my way of thinking, no higher faith in the patriotism and self-governing capacity of the people was ever exhibited by any body of men than by those who calmly said this is the wisest and best that we can do, and it is submitted to you for approval; and no higher or greater proof of the self-governing capacity of the people could be given or will ever be recorded than was found in the approval which they gave.

The corner stone of that fabric, the indispensable element and principle which sheathes it with strength and bids it endure through the ages, is the right of local self-government as to affairs which are local. When you take away from the people the initiative, the right to determine for themselves such questions as are local, when you remove from their shoulders responsibility, you ultimately take from the people all interest in public questions, and you have what has been exemplified in the history of every republic that ever existed on the face of the earth, a republic in name only, governed and controlled at Washington, while the masses of the people look on and assume that they are enjoying the great fundamental rights of a republic, although the republic, in fact, has passed away. I am in favor of preserving intact every principle of local self-government. I am in favor of it, because I am in favor of popular government; I am in favor of it, because I believe that down there is the initiative and the patriotism and the intelligence to decide and settle every question. Popular government is a delusion, a pretense, without the principle of local self-government.

Let me say to the good women of this country that I believe after they have fought for 15 or 20 years for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and for its ratification, in the end they will come back and make their appeal to the individual States, to the direct vote of the people, and in all those States where it is not met with the insuperable barrier of race conditions women will be given the right to vote.

For, Mr. President, woman suffrage is to prevail, equal suffrage is yet to obtain throughout the Republic. Honest prejudices entertained by great and noble men from St. Paul to the present hour, ancient customs and settled habits of mind more difficult to change than constitutions or forms of government, together with the sinister interests which dread her presence in the political forum, will not be sufficient to stay the sometimes slow but always certain movement toward that consummation when there will be called into council upon all affairs of State all the intelligence, all the virtue, and all the patriotism of the Commonwealth.

Neither expediency nor a false view of her sphere will be able to keep woman from that council board where more and more are to be considered the interests of the child, the integrity of the home, the moral and physical well-being of the citizen; where more and more are to be discussed and determined all those movements which reach down and take hold of those things upon which her sympathy, her intuition, her vision, and, above all, her optimism are at least equal in worth to the experience and the reasoning of men.

Free and untrammelled with an unoccupied world of opportunities before him, the time was when the State had need to look little into the personal affairs of the citizen—the 8-hour day, the employers' liability law, and the workmen's compensation act would have been wholly without a condition upon which to operate. But it is different now. The State dare not

leave the child to the mercies of organized capitalism; the State dare not leave the home to contend alone against the intrusion of disease and poisoned food; the State dare not leave the laborer to contend against those powerful corporations which the State has endowed with all the powers of sovereignty; the State, in short, must meet the responsibilities of the hour and expand in scope and purposes with the expanding forces of industry. I ask you, whose judgment, whose force of character, whose miraculous power to detect the forces of right and wrong, would you prefer to have than hers who, in every great crisis of the world, has borne in full in camp, in hospital, in secret council, and in courts her due portion of the burden of the race? And why deprive her in this work of the most effective instrument for good in modern warfare—the ballot? Why withhold from her the effective instrument by which she can more surely effectuate her purposes and make permanent in the laws of her country her plans? No; equal suffrage will come. It will come through the votes of the respective States, as it should come, as the expressed will of the people. It will come like all the great reforms, not in a night, not before the people have lived up to it and seen the need of it, but through and by means of public opinion built up from year to year; it will come in harmony with the great fundamental principles upon which this Government is built, recognizing the indispensable principle of the distribution of powers between the State and the National Government. I think it was Dr. Lowell, of Harvard, who so wisely and delightfully said:

A slow progress under the gradual pressure of a growing public sentiment does more for the advancement of civilization than a rapid movement followed by reaction. \* \* \* The most valuable institution is not that which bears the earliest but that which bears the best fruit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator consider the right of suffrage a local matter that the States should govern absolutely?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the meaning of Article IV, section 1, of the Constitution? How far does that go toward interfering with the rights of the States? I will read the first clause of it to the Senator:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

What is the exact meaning of that language? I ask the Senator for his interpretation of it.

Mr. BORAH. It would be impossible for me to say in all particulars what is a republican form of government in the view of that clause, because there are a thousand things, more or less, which enter into the question; but suffice it to say that at the time the fathers put into the Constitution of the United States the provision that the National Government should guarantee a republican form of government they sought just as earnestly for the right of the States to determine the question of franchise as they did with reference to this other proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. At the time they put that into the Constitution of the United States in a great many States of the Union there was no such thing as manhood suffrage at all. In most of the States of the Union men were permitted to vote by reason of property rights or property holdings or qualifications of that kind; yet it was a matter which they conceived to be for the local authorities to settle, and they believed, as I believe, that if there is no republican form of government at home there will not be any republican form of government at Washington. That clause had reference to matters wholly separate and apart from the question of suffrage, although, of course, such a condition can be conceived of that the question of suffrage might enter into it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has stated, with his accustomed vigor, his belief in the principle of woman suffrage, and also that, in his judgment, it will ultimately prevail in the States of the Union, except in those States where the race question is imminent, and that it will not prevail there because of that fact. The Senator believes in woman suffrage, and, therefore, in the benefit of its extension everywhere. I will therefore ask the Senator whether, either for the purpose of promoting this great cause or for any other reason, he would be willing to vote for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment?



Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I say very frankly that if woman suffrage in this country depended upon the repeal of the fifteenth amendment, if there were no way to get woman suffrage except to get it through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and I believed that in order to get it the fifteenth amendment would have to be repealed, I would vote to repeal the fifteenth amendment. But no such necessity can ever arise; there is a wiser and easier way to get woman suffrage.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has stated, in substance, that suffrage is a local question and that our predecessors erred in the adoption of the fifteenth amendment in attempting to accomplish the impossible, of course interfering with the right of the States locally to control the elective suffrage. My question is whether, for the purpose of restoring prior conditions, the Senator would vote to repeal the fifteenth amendment?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not at all afraid of the logic of my position, and I want to say to the Senator that if there is to be found no way in which to enforce the fifteenth amendment I would unhesitatingly vote to repeal it. It is a certainty now that it is a delusion and a snare; it misleads one race and it imposes upon another race a condition which ought not to be imposed upon them unless some good result flows from it. Mr. President, it is 50 years since that amendment was adopted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment—50 years ago that amendment was adopted, and I have not a particle of doubt that the consensus of opinion of the country is, if it had the courage to say so, that it was a mistake at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. But 50 years have passed; the negro has made great strides in development, notwithstanding the conditions under which he has lived; and it would be a wholly different thing to put upon him the discouragement which would follow from its repeal. It would have been better for him to have passed through a probation and earned his franchise; and I conceive a repeal after 50 years a wholly different thing from its original enactment.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I think I have yielded to the Senator from Colorado. Afterwards I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS. I only desire to ask the Senator one more question. The Senator has stated that in its operation the effect of the fifteenth amendment on the colored vote has been a delusion and a snare. Is it not equally true that, so far as that vote is concerned, based upon the same logic, the amendment now proposed would be a delusion and a snare?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and I do not propose to be a party to a delusion and a snare. The Senator is quite right in his inference.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to state to the Senator from Idaho that the right of the negroes to vote in the South was not so violently antagonized by the white man in the South until it was discovered that the negro was wholly unfit for and incapable of performing properly the supreme function of citizenship and of understanding the genius of this Government. The white man endeavored honestly and sincerely to induce the negro to share with him in the government of the country. The negro declined to do so, and his domination was submitted to until the civilization of the South was simply vanishing, the public domain was squandered, the Public Treasury looted, and the civilization of the fathers passing away. Time has not, I submit to the Senator from Idaho, shown the negro's capacity for self-government, and as the negro has demonstrated no capacity for the government of himself, it follows as a logical sequence that he is incapable of governing the white man.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. While the negro has made some progress in the acquisition of property, as a matter of fact, with all the assistance that has been rendered him by the white man, by the schools, by the churches, by the colleges, and by all the other agencies and instrumentalities provided by the white man, he is to-day as incompetent and unreliable not only in the South but in the North as he was 50 years ago.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course I would have to differ from my friend from Mississippi in the ultimate conclusion which he reaches. I have been discussing this matter as a

question of fact and a question of history. I do not believe that you will find in the history of the world a race which has developed and proven itself so rapidly as the negro race has when you take into consideration—

Mr. VARDAMAN. In what respect does the Senator refer to his improvement?

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. He is more criminal to-day as a race than he was in 1861.

Mr. BORAH. That is true of the white man in this country, too.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, it is not.

Mr. BORAH. I do not mean the white man in the South, but the ratio of crime along certain lines is greater now than it has ever been in the history of this country. We are in some matters a lawless people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, the negro has increased in crime, and the records will show that as a race he is more criminal to-day than he was in 1861. That is the case in Pennsylvania and in Idaho, as it is the case in Mississippi.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have not the statistics with me with reference to the figures, and it may be that I am in error; but I have been of the opinion, and I entertain that opinion now, that the negro has advanced in many ways, not only in reference to the accumulation of property but with reference to acquiring those habits of settled vocation, of love of home and family, and so forth, which make for good citizenship; but, in my judgment, he has advanced most remarkably in his conception of government. I want to say, Mr. President, for the negro—and I say it in all sincerity—that while the negro may not understand the workings of our Government as the Senator from Mississippi and the anglo-Saxon generally understand them, there is no one who is more loyal as a matter of sentiment and as a matter of intuition to the flag which floats over him than is the black man.

Mr. VARDAMAN. On what does the Senator base that statement?

Mr. BORAH. This old Government and its flag are his religion. He may, by reason of the conditions under which he has lived for years, do many things which the white man criticizes, but when you come to talk to the negro about this Government and to ascertain what he thinks about it and what he is willing to do for it, you never hear a disloyal word from the lips of the negro; at least, I never have. The one vice, the one curse of this age—constant disparagement of government—that vice does not belong to his race. He is loyal as he understands it, and that is the basis of good citizenship.

Mr. VARDAMAN. You may not hear a disloyal word, but the Senator from Idaho very well understands that he has no idea whatever of loyalty to his obligations of citizenship. The Senator knows the negro in politics, and he knows his record in the national conventions, and he has never known one in his life whose vote could not be influenced by a very few dollars.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, my observation has been different.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will cite the Senator the example at Chicago at the last Republican convention.

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President, that argument is no compliment to the white man, because no negro ever bribed himself. It takes a white man to do it, and there are generally about 50 white men attempting to bribe 1 negro. So far as convention matters are concerned, if it were gone into it would be shown that the negro has withstood temptation with remarkable strength.

Mr. GALLINGER. And a great many white men have yielded.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. President, I have been talking about the negro with reference to his treatment under the fifteenth amendment. I am not going into the other question at this time, but, so far as concerns the views which the Senator has expressed with reference to the negro's development, and so forth, I should have to disagree with him, although I do not propose at this time to discuss the matter. The time will come when the negro will have rights according to his developments. He will enjoy rights according to the faith which is in him and which he has proven to be in him.

I had intended to discuss one other feature of this matter, but—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to that, I should like to ask him a question in order that I may understand exactly his theory of the relation of the Federal Government to the States with reference to the franchise.

The Senator from Idaho very eloquently and very accurately described the conflict of the rival views of Hamilton and Jefferson in the formation of the Constitution, and emphasized the



importance of preserving to the States their rights; and the Senator eulogized in the most eloquent way the great influence of Abraham Lincoln in preserving those rights. Am I correct in inferring from that and from the Senator's connecting that with the resolution now before the Senate, that the Senator from Idaho maintains that this resolution would involve any change in the theory or system upon which the respective powers of the State and the Federal Governments are maintained? Is it not simply a question of degree? And did not the Constitution as it was originally framed and before any of the amendments were adopted contain numerous inhibitions upon the powers of the States? The States were prevented from doing a great number of things which it might be desired by some particular States to do. Then the amendments to the Constitution, which were readily adopted almost at the first session of Congress after the Constitution was ratified, placed a number of other prohibitions upon the States. No State may issue a bill of attainder nor pass an ex post facto law. No State may pass any law which violates the obligation of contracts. No State may maintain troops or ships of war without the consent of the Federal Government.

Abraham Lincoln himself, in the great work of his life, was the leader in this country of the movement to destroy what had been one of the great central claims as to State rights, that negro slavery was a domestic State institution, with which the Federal Government had nothing to do, and the result of his efforts in that direction was that slavery in the States was prohibited by the Constitution of the United States.

If this resolution is adopted, of course it still leaves discretion in the States as to the qualification of the franchise, with the single exception, so far as this resolution is concerned, that woman shall not be prohibited from voting merely because of her sex. Does it not leave the entire framework and system which the Senator has described as being so essential to the perpetuity of our institutions the same as it was before?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, Mr. Lincoln during his entire career, until it became necessary as a war measure, always contended that the question of slavery was a domestic matter and should be left entirely to the States. He said in his debate with Mr. Douglas, and he said repeatedly, that he had no intention of interfering with the affairs of the Southern States with reference to slavery; and he was against slavery from his boyhood days. He denounced it early in his legislative career in the Legislature of Illinois. He was the man who offered in the Illinois Legislature a resolution against it; but he repeatedly stated, in his public utterances and in his debate with Douglas and in his messages, that it never was his intention to interfere with it in the respective States; that it was a matter for them to settle; and he never did so until it became necessary, in his opinion and in the opinion of his Cabinet, to make the proclamation which resulted in the freedom of the slaves as a war measure for the preservation of the Union as a whole. Had Mr. Lincoln been permitted to pursue his way without the difficulties of war, he never would have interfered with slavery in the respective States, according to his declaration.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Idaho is absolutely correct in his statement. Mr. Lincoln said, "The time has arrived when we must know whether the black man is for us or against us." It was purely a war measure; and the purpose was that the emancipation of the negro might so disorganize conditions in the South that it would bring about demoralization in the Southern Army. He thought that an insurrection among the negroes would follow the emancipation proclamation and that the Confederate soldier would be forced to lay down his arms and go back home to protect his family. It was purely a war measure. He stated in all of his addresses and in all of his campaigns that he knew he had no right to interfere with slavery in the States where it was recognized by law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment. The qualification which the Senator from Mississippi attached to his statement in the very last words he used destroys the force of the contention which he is making on this particular question. He said, "where it was recognized by law." Lincoln did not propose to abolish slavery in the States, but Lincoln proposed to change the law. I do not think it can be found in the writings of Lincoln that he was opposed to an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Washington can not find an utterance in any of Mr. Lincoln's speeches or writings where that is stated. His purpose was to prevent its being carried into new States or Territories; but he maintained in

all of his debates with Douglas that he had no right to interfere with it in the States where it was established.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why, he did interfere with it in the States. He was opposed to the Dred Scott decision. He was opposed to Douglas's idea of squatter sovereignty; and his fame and reputation as a leader of his party in the United States, which finally brought him the Presidency, was based on his proposition that the new States should not set up the domestic institution of slavery within their borders. I do not know that he intended to interfere with those States where it was already established.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is greatly in error. Mr. Lincoln never criticized the Dred Scott decision because he believed the National Government should interfere with slavery in the States, but for the reason that he believed that the effect of the decision was to take away from the State the right to determine whether or not it should have freedom for the slave or slavery for the slave. Mr. Lincoln said: Kansas has the right to say, when the negro comes within the lines of Kansas, that he shall be free, and that the National Government shall not send a slave into the State of Kansas and keep him a slave. Kansas may free him the moment he crosses the line, and then Illinois may welcome the slave from the South and give him his freedom when he crosses the line. He contended that the Dred Scott decision had the effect of saying that Illinois was deprived of her power to declare that proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What distinction does the Senator draw between this proposed amendment, from the standpoint of the principle of local self-government, and the national prohibition amendment?

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator from Texas is very anxious that no argument shall be made here against the national prohibition amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator that the national prohibition amendment might be justified upon the theory that it would be dealing with a national question—interstate traffic—and that it is not local and can not be controlled as a local question; that the States can not deal with it, as it permeates and extends throughout the Union, disregarding of State lines. And here let me say that the doctrine of local self-government does not oppose the taking over by the National Government of those things once local but which through industrial and economic changes have become national in scope. If a subject really becomes national in scope and effect, the National Government should not hesitate to take hold of it. But the right to vote can never, in the very nature of things, be other than a local question, for upon it rests the very integrity and sovereignty of the State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. By reason of our industrial development a business matter which was local 50 years ago may be interstate or national at this time, and may be national in its scope. A commercial affair which was local at the time they did business with wheelbarrows and covered wagons may not have been national in its scope, but it may become so when you build railroads, and commerce thereby broadens the proposition. The only thing I have sought to contend for is that that which is local in its nature, as I conceive this matter to be, should be permitted to remain local, and that that which is national or becomes national by reason of industrial and commercial development may properly come under control of the National Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has passed from the point about which I wanted to ask him. He said, in answer to the Senator from Texas, that the proposed amendment on the prohibition question might be justified because it dealt with interstate commerce. In the first place, let me say that I do not understand that in making an amendment to the Constitution it is necessary that any authority for it shall be found in the existing Constitution. We may adopt an entirely new thing. Passing by that point, however, how does the Senator think the manufacture of intoxicating liquors is a matter of interstate commerce? I understand the manufacture is included within this bill.

Mr. BORAH. I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the prohibition question. I do not want all problems on my hands at once. I will say, however, that I have never accepted the doctrine of the Knight case, that the manufacture of goods intended to be exported and put into commerce was purely a local concern of the State. I think that is interstate commerce,



when it is manufactured and being put into interstate commerce. I think the act of manufacturing itself is part and parcel of the conduct of the business of interstate commerce when it is manufactured with a view of being shipped in interstate trade.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the proposed amendment would prohibit the manufacture of liquor to be used wholly within a State.

Mr. BORAH. That might be a result of prohibiting its manufacture for the purpose of shipping it between States. That would be an incident, however, and not the prime design.

Mr. President, in conclusion, very briefly, I will say that I have not a doubt that woman suffrage is going to prevail in this country. I have not any doubt that when it does prevail it will prevail through the action of the respective States in voting upon the proposition. I have not any doubt that that is the way in which it ought to prevail.

I have from the beginning, from the very first agitation of this question, earnestly supported the proposition of permitting the States to pass upon it. When I first came to Congress a proposed amendment to the Constitution was brought to me. I was told at that time that it was for educational purposes; that the design was to present it before the Congress and have it discussed, in order that it might have its educational effect in many States of the Union. I had no objection to that. I was thoroughly in favor of the proposition as an educational matter which by its reflex action would assist in the States. It was a desirable thing to do.

I have no criticism to make of those who are urging this resolution for the purpose of getting the matter before the Nation and calling attention to it in order that they may have a better means of reaching the public mind, in order that they may have the views of public men more directly carried to the people as an educational proposition. When, however, you turn from the educational phase of the matter and ask me to vote for an amendment to the Constitution which, in my judgment, never will be adopted, and which, if it were adopted, would be futile and a delusion in a number of the States of the Union, I feel that I am unable to concede the proposition.

#### USE OF WATERS OF RIO GRANDE, COLO.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to renew the notice I have given for March 18, and to state that I shall address the Senate on Monday, March 23, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, upon Senate joint resolution 117.

#### PANAMA EXPOSITION (H. DOC. NO. 840).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the invitation from the Government of Panama to this Government to participate in an exposition which is to open at the city of Panama on November 3, 1914, and I join with the Secretary of State in strongly recommending the authority of Congress for the acceptance of the invitation and an appropriation of \$100,000 to enable suitable participation by the United States.

As the exposition will open as early as November 3 next, prompt action by Congress on the recommendation is essential to proper and adequate preparation for the participation.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1914.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914, and for prior years, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 350) thereon. I give notice that to-morrow at some convenient time I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1914.*

##### ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Charles B. Strecker, of Boston, Mass., to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Boston, Mass., in place of Charles H. Doty, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

##### JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE CANAL ZONE.

William H. Jackson, of Ancon, Canal Zone, to be judge of the district court of the Canal Zone.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William N. Spence, of Camilla, Ga., to be United States attorney, District of Alaska, division No. 3, vice George R. Walker, resigned.

##### MEMBER OF THE EXCISE BOARD.

Cotter T. Bride, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Excise Board for the District of Columbia, to fill the unexpired term of Joseph C. Sheehy, resigned. (Term expires June 30, 1914.)

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ALABAMA.

Nannie S. Coleman to be postmaster at Jasper, Ala., in place of Nannie S. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

###### ARIZONA.

Alberta M. Fulghum to be postmaster at Willcox, Ariz., in place of Kasper Hauser. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Wilson T. Wright to be postmaster at Globe, Ariz., in place of Frank P. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

###### CALIFORNIA.

Ruth E. Dempsey to be postmaster at Colusa, Cal., in place of Byron D. Beckwith, resigned.

Kathleen M. Fleming to be postmaster at Lincoln, Cal., in place of William D. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. D. McClellan to be postmaster at Lordsburg, Cal., in place of Hobart M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

Josephine Montgomery to be postmaster at Randsburg, Cal., in place of Josephine Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expires April 12, 1914.

Frank L. Powell to be postmaster at Lemoore, Cal., in place of Frank L. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

###### COLORADO.

C. C. McWilliams to be postmaster at Marble, Colo., in place of John A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

A. F. Reeves to be postmaster at Montrose, Colo., in place of G. A. Herrington, deceased.

###### FLORIDA.

Malcolm J. McMullen to be postmaster at Largo, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

###### GEORGIA.

William F. Boone to be postmaster at Baxley, Ga., in place of William F. Boone. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Robert D. Brown to be postmaster at Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of William E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1914.

William H. McMillion to be postmaster at Demorest, Ga., in place of George W. Pease. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

L. S. Peterson to be postmaster at Douglas, Ga., in place of James F. Overstreet. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

W. J. Roberts to be postmaster at Arlington, Ga., in place of W. J. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

John P. Turner to be postmaster at Columbus, Ga., in place of Charles L. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

###### ILLINOIS.

Charles A. Brandenburg to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of Robert E. Little. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Clement L. Butler to be postmaster at Sheldon, Ill., in place of Samuel W. Holloway. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

James J. Dougherty to be postmaster at Ottawa, Ill., in place of Henry Mayo. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.



Charles E. Duvall to be postmaster at Aledo, Ill., in place of Joseph H. Abercrombie. Incumbent's commission expires April 29, 1914.

Chauncey M. Gilmore to be postmaster at Colfax, Ill., in place of Zachary Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Perry F. Hathaway to be postmaster at Menard, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

John E. Maekin to be postmaster at Lockport, Ill., in place of John A. Walter. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

J. Ross Mickey to be postmaster at Macomb, Ill., in place of William H. Hainline, removed.

John A. O'Neill to be postmaster at Chatsworth, Ill., in place of Homer S. Sanford. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

James L. Parks to be postmaster at Carbondale, Ill., in place of William P. Slack. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Luther E. Robertson to be postmaster at Carterville, Ill., in place of James A. Lauder, resigned.

F. J. Schmitz to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of Jacob G. Reul. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

Charles B. Taylor to be postmaster at Tuscola, Ill., in place of Alonzo C. Sluss. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles M. Webber to be postmaster at Urbana, Ill., in place of Walter W. Lindley, removed.

#### INDIANA.

Miles Baxter to be postmaster at Auburn, Ind., in place of Isaac N. Zent. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

James H. Collins to be postmaster at Farmersburg, Ind., in place of James F. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

Vincent E. Craig to be postmaster at Darlington, Ind., in place of William C. Woody. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

George D. Gaby to be postmaster at Sigonier, Ind., in place of Henry Jeanneret. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

Cornelius Lumaree to be postmaster at Wabash, Ind., in place of Lindley A. Dawes. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Otto McMahan to be postmaster at Rochester, Ind., in place of William Wright. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Albert R. Mulkins to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ind., in place of Walter L. Neible. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

Henry F. Schaal to be postmaster at Michigan City, Ind., in place of Minard A. Schutt. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

Thomas J. Shelburn to be postmaster at Zionsville, Ind., in place of T. P. Mills. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Louis Zoercher to be postmaster at Tell City, Ind., in place of Lee Herr. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

#### IOWA.

T. D. Bellinger to be postmaster at Laurens, Iowa, in place of Benjamin E. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

J. S. Blair to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, Iowa, in place of Wayne E. Whitestone, removed.

J. M. Bricker to be postmaster at Nevada, Iowa, in place of Fred C. McCall. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

W. S. Clark to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Iowa, in place of Denison O. Blake. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

J. W. Floerchinger to be postmaster at Oxford, Iowa, in place of George W. Sies. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

A. E. Jackson to be postmaster at Tama, Iowa, in place of James H. Willett. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Samuel W. Koster to be postmaster at West Liberty, Iowa, in place of A. W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

Albert Lille to be postmaster at Lakeview, Iowa, in place of Frederick H. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

E. C. McMeel to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of John W. Donley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

R. B. McSwiggin to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of Harry E. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

A. R. Miller to be postmaster at Washington, Iowa, in place of John M. Lytle. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Kate C. Warner to be postmaster at Dayton, Iowa, in place of Kate C. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

#### KANSAS.

J. H. Burnett to be postmaster at Blue Mound, Kans., in place of Charles W. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

Emery W. Caywood to be postmaster at Clifton, Kans., in place of Nathan B. Needham. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Ida McCann to be postmaster at Macksville, Kans., in place of Edgar B. Dykes, resigned.

William Reedy to be postmaster at Yates Center, Kans., in place of William E. Hogueland. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

John I. Saunders to be postmaster at Cheney, Kans., in place of John A. Hartley. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

#### KENTUCKY.

Gilbert Adams to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of William H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expires April 12, 1914.

R. L. Brown to be postmaster at Somerset, Ky., in place of Thomas M. Scott, removed.

George R. Hughes to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ky., in place of George L. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Mark F. Kehoe to be postmaster at Maysville, Ky., in place of Clarence Mathews, removed.

E. C. K. Robertson to be postmaster at Murray, Ky., in place of Abithel Downs. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

#### LOUISIANA.

Samuel J. Gandy to be postmaster at Westlake, La., in place of Ector R. Gammage. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

#### MAINE.

Monroe V. Curtis to be postmaster at Freeport, Me., in place of Winthrop C. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

Minnie M. Holland to be postmaster at Dixfield, Me., in place of Willis W. Wait. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Percy E. Storer to be postmaster at Waldoboro, Me., in place of Walter E. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

#### MARYLAND.

Henry C. Lawder to be postmaster at Havre de Grace, Md., in place of Harry A. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

Michael J. Tighe to be postmaster at Laurel, Md., in place of G. B. Timanus. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Millard H. Weer to be postmaster at Sykesville, Md., in place of Asa Hepner. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

#### MASSACHUSETTS.

Edward F. Delaney to be postmaster at Brookfield, Mass., in place of Edwin D. Goodell. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

Thomas J. Drummey to be postmaster at East Pepperell, Mass., in place of Arthur P. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1914.

Elmer E. Landers to be postmaster at Oak Bluffs, Mass., in place of Charles L. Scranton, deceased.

Henry L. Pierce to be postmaster at Barre, Mass., in place of Benjamin F. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

#### MICHIGAN.

Edmund L. Ashworth to be postmaster at Shepherd, Mich., in place of Kenneth E. Struble. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Roy C. Blackburn to be postmaster at Cedar Springs, Mich., in place of L. M. Sellers, resigned.

John H. Brewer to be postmaster at Imlay City, Mich., in place of George W. Jones, removed.

Willis F. Bricker to be postmaster at Belding, Mich., in place of George W. Moulton. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

John Burns to be postmaster at St. Louis, Mich., in place of Aaron Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

F. S. Byrne to be postmaster at Marquette, Mich., in place of John D. Mangum. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Vincent P. Cash to be postmaster at Alma, Mich., in place of Charles F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.



George F. Catton to be postmaster at Constantine, Mich., in place of J. Mark Harvey, jr. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Matthew W. Doyle to be postmaster at Stephenson, Mich., in place of Frederick W. Woessner. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

Percy D. Edsall to be postmaster at Greenville, Mich., in place of J. C. Newbrough. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

J. H. Gallery to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of Henry C. Minnie. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Frederic M. Hall to be postmaster at Mason, Mich., in place of Charles W. Browne. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Frank P. Hilbourn to be postmaster at Hart, Mich., in place of Lewis S. Platt. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Charles E. Lown to be postmaster at Saginaw, Mich., in place of William S. Linton. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

Amon C. Sprau to be postmaster at Otsego, Mich., in place of A. Brink Tucker. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Harris E. Thomas to be postmaster at Lansing, Mich., in place of Seymour Foster. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles E. Utley to be postmaster at Stanton, Mich., in place of Elliott O. Bellows. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Prescott L. Varnum to be postmaster at Vassar, Mich., in place of James A. Trotter. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

#### MINNESOTA.

Martin J. Casey to be postmaster at Jordan, Minn., in place of Frank H. Juergens. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Christian Hunsinger to be postmaster at Wadena, Minn., in place of William Dower. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Clemens A. Lauterbach to be postmaster at Redwood Falls, Minn., in place of Almon E. King. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

William E. McEwen to be postmaster at Duluth, Minn., in place of Arthur P. Cook, removed.

Stephen M. Quigley to be postmaster at Wabasha, Minn., in place of C. O. Lund. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Harry D. Smith to be postmaster at Plainview, Minn., in place of George R. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

#### MISSISSIPPI.

Sybil Q. Stratton to be postmaster at Liberty, Miss., in place of Sybil Q. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

#### MISSOURI.

Clay Adair to be postmaster at Clinton, Mo., in place of Frank P. Kitchen. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Andrew E. Doerr to be postmaster at Perryville, Mo., in place of Samuel B. Kieflner. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Casper Ehrhard to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mo., in place of William F. Bloebaum. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

S. T. Jeffries to be postmaster at Salem, Mo., in place of William C. Askin. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Elijah E. Johnston to be postmaster at Sedalia, Mo., in place of E. E. Coddling. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

H. V. Merritt to be postmaster at Campbell, Mo., in place of Jasper L. Geer. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

J. G. Moutier to be postmaster at Union, Mo., in place of Clark Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Charles F. Newman to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mo., in place of Phil S. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

Simeon W. Ragland to be postmaster at Webb City, Mo., in place of Walter Tholborn. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

James E. Williams to be postmaster at Butler, Mo., in place of C. A. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

#### MONTANA.

John P. Bowen to be postmaster as Libby, Mont., in place of Don E. Schanck, resigned.

George R. Fisk to be postmaster at Hamilton, Mont., in place of Campbell C. Chaffin. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

E. H. McDowell to be postmaster at Terry, Mont., in place of C. V. Schwindt. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

#### NEBRASKA.

Stephen C. Lynde to be postmaster at Hartington, Nebr., in place of Fred W. Barnhart. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

Joseph E. Newsom to be postmaster at North Bend, Nebr., in place of John Cusack. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

Thomas A. Sharp to be postmaster at Stanton, Nebr., in place of James Peters. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Stephen E. Bates to be postmaster at Suncook, N. H., in place of Eugene Lane. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

William Hayes to be postmaster at Groveton, N. H., in place of Addison H. Frizzell. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Herbert A. Taylor to be postmaster at Winchester, N. H., in place of Charles E. Slate. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

Eugene M. Ware to be postmaster at Peterboro, N. H., in place of Thomas D. Winch, resigned.

#### NEW JERSEY.

William H. Cook to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. J., in place of George N. Wimer, removed.

Walter D. Finch to be postmaster at Mahwah, N. J., in place of Henry B. Hagerman. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Joseph V. D. Field to be postmaster at Boundbrook, N. J., in place of William B. R. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Charles H. Hitchner to be postmaster at Elmer, N. J., in place of Adam Kandle, deceased.

Thomas F. Watson to be postmaster at Florence, N. J., in place of James E. Jones, resigned.

#### NEW MEXICO.

J. L. Lovelace to be postmaster at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., in place of Adelina Jaramillo, removed.

#### NEW YORK.

Frank D. Ball to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of Archibald K. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1913.

William H. Barry to be postmaster at Carthage, N. Y., in place of Michael Gleason. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

L. B. Bennett to be postmaster at Schenectady, N. Y., in place of Melvin J. Esmay. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Ephraim J. Fisk to be postmaster at Fairport, N. Y., in place of John H. Stebbins. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Michael J. Flaherty to be postmaster at Corfu, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William J. McVay to be postmaster at Far Rockaway, N. Y., in place of George F. Vreeland. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1914.

F. J. Land to be postmaster at Cohocton, N. Y., in place of Henry P. Wilcox, resigned.

Clarence E. Palmer to be postmaster at Willard, N. Y., in place of John J. Mahoney. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

John G. Rose to be postmaster at Sinclairville, N. Y., in place of William Mansfield, resigned.

Wesley J. Springstead to be postmaster at Haverstraw, N. Y., in place of Stephen G. Newman. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

C. E. Thompson to be postmaster at Trumansburg, N. Y., in place of Edwin P. Bouton. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

George S. Vroman to be postmaster at Altamont, N. Y., in place of Dayton H. Whipple. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1914.

#### NORTH CAROLINA.

Kate S. Dunn to be postmaster at Scotland Neck, N. C., in place of Elizabeth H. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Redding M. Harper to be postmaster at La Grange, N. C., in place of Albert Miller. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

Wilson D. Leggett to be postmaster at Tarboro, N. C., in place of J. F. Liles. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Emma L. Vaughan to be postmaster at Whitakers, N. C., in place of Otto S. Woody. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.



## NORTH DAKOTA.

J. F. McMenamy to be postmaster at Reynolds, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Walter Priest to be postmaster at New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of William E. Biggs. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1914.

## OHIO.

J. R. Alexander to be postmaster at Zanesville, Ohio, in place of George H. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

Wilbur M. Carpenter to be postmaster at Geneva, Ohio, in place of Ansel T. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charles P. Dunn to be postmaster at Springfield, Ohio, in place of William F. Bevirt. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

George L. Higby to be postmaster at Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of Edward L. Davis, resigned.

James Martin McNamara to be postmaster at Barberton, Ohio, in place of Thomas J. Davies. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Raymond J. Neel to be postmaster at Thornville, Ohio, in place of Robert T. Whitmer, deceased.

H. J. Splitter to be postmaster at Brookville, Ohio, in place of Allen W. Somers. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

Thurman Spriggs to be postmaster at Woodfield, Ohio, in place of Frank M. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

William Zahn to be postmaster at Carey, Ohio, in place of Herbert Newhard. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

## OKLAHOMA.

L. K. Bingham to be postmaster at Minco, Okla., in place of Nelson L. Eggleston. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Walter B. Hensley to be postmaster at Checotah, Okla., in place of James D. Faulkner. Incumbent's commission expires April 19, 1914.

Ida Per Lee Pugsley to be postmaster at Morris, Okla., in place of A. L. Denton, resigned.

George P. Rollow to be postmaster at Wynne Wood, Okla., in place of Elijah E. Norvell. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

George Stone to be postmaster at Tecumseh, Okla., in place of William E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

D. G. Woodworth to be postmaster at Kingfisher, Okla., in place of John A. Banker, removed.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Llewellyn Angstadt to be postmaster at Kutztown, Pa., in place of John P. S. Fenstermacher. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

R. E. Burket to be postmaster at Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of Charles W. Zook. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1914.

Fisk Goodyear to be postmaster at Carlisle, Pa., in place of Caleb S. Brinton, resigned.

J. H. McGee to be postmaster at South Bethlehem, Pa., in place of Harry W. Thatcher. Incumbent's commission expired March 14, 1914.

Henry J. Norris to be postmaster at Hatboro, Pa., in place of Jesse N. Watson. Incumbent's commission expires April 26, 1914.

Frank Snyder to be postmaster at Minersville, Pa., in place of J. E. Laubenstein. Incumbent's commission expires April 29, 1914.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

George B. Bailey to be postmaster at Greenwood, S. C., in place of F. H. Fetzer. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Francis M. Cross to be postmaster at Westminster, S. C., in place of Ira S. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Arthur R. Garner to be postmaster at Timmonsville, S. C., in place of Arthur R. Garner. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Luther McLaurin to be postmaster at McColl, S. C., in place of Luther McLaurin. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1914.

Peter T. Sapoch to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of Rufus C. Gettys, removed.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

P. J. Donohue to be postmaster at Bonesteel, S. Dak., in place of Sherman F. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

John T. Doyle to be postmaster at Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of John E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Frank P. Gannaway to be postmaster at Chamberlain, S. Dak., in place of William H. Ochsner, removed.

Frank Junge to be postmaster at Leola, S. Dak., in place of Frank D. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

T. J. Ryan to be postmaster at Bridgewater, S. Dak., in place of Charles E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1914.

## TENNESSEE.

John S. Gilbreath to be postmaster at Pulaski, Tenn., in place of Emmett G. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

J. W. McGlathery to be postmaster at Humboldt, Tenn., in place of Robert H. McNeely, resigned.

James C. Springer to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, Tenn., in place of Daniel W. Starnes. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

## TEXAS.

S. R. Brown to be postmaster at McGregor, Tex., in place of Augustus S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joe F. Coffey to be postmaster at Eddy, Tex., in place of Henry C. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

S. H. Gardner to be postmaster at Honey Grove, Tex., in place of Thomas D. Bloys, deceased.

C. V. Gates to be postmaster at Gorman, Tex., in place of Robert F. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

George N. Gentry to be postmaster at Pecos, Tex., in place of George E. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

Reuben J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Whitesboro, Tex., in place of Frank W. Reast. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

J. F. Kunkel to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tex., in place of Robert J. King. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

William R. McAdams to be postmaster at Lorena, Tex., in place of Joe B. Ferrell. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

W. H. McCurdy to be postmaster at Moody, Tex., in place of W. James Gilmore. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joseph B. Patty to be postmaster at Brookshire, Tex., in place of Lee D. Ford, removed.

J. R. Ransone, jr., to be postmaster at Cleburne, Tex., in place of Carlton A. Dickson. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

F. J. Reese to be postmaster at Comanche, Tex., in place of George L. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

J. P. Rodgers to be postmaster at Hico, Tex., in place of Milton O. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

E. W. Sharman to be postmaster at Liberty, Tex., in place of Thomas F. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1914.

J. S. Spradley to be postmaster at Van Alstyne, Tex., in place of Gaines L. Burk, resigned.

## UTAH.

George W. Young to be postmaster at Coalville, Utah, in place of E. A. Northcott. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

## VERMONT.

Robert H. Royce to be postmaster at Johnson, Vt., in place of Max A. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1914.

## VIRGINIA.

Richard P. Barham to be postmaster at Petersburg, Va., in place of Stith Bolling. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

W. C. Lauck to be postmaster at Luray, Va., in place of Charles T. Holtzman. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

John B. Norfleet to be postmaster at Suffolk, Va., in place of Edwin M. C. Quimby. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

L. E. Stephenson to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of Emmet W. Brittle. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

John S. White to be postmaster at Charlottesville, Va., in place of William S. Humbert. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.



## WASHINGTON.

Mae O. Gray to be postmaster at Stevenson, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Anna P. Hanley to be postmaster at Enumclaw, Wash., in place of William F. Koenig. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles O. Jackson to be postmaster at Eatonville, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Charles H. Runkel to be postmaster at Arlington, Wash., in place of Charles H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Harvey Ewart to be postmaster at Hinton, W. Va., in place of Sira W. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

J. K. Kerwood to be postmaster at Ripley, W. Va., in place of Henry W. Deem. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

Buckner F. Scott to be postmaster at Terra Alta, W. Va., in place of William T. White, resigned.

Joseph F. Thompson to be postmaster at Martinsburg, W. Va., in place of E. C. Henshaw. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

A. H. Wiedebusch to be postmaster at Wheeling, W. Va., in place of Robert Hazlett, resigned.

James W. Wilson to be postmaster at Barboursville, W. Va., in place of James Brady, resigned.

## WISCONSIN.

Lyle I. Daigneau to be postmaster at Boyceville, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

## WYOMING.

C. W. Dow to be postmaster at Newcastle, Wyo., in place of Frank B. Fawcett. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1914.*

## POSTMASTERS.

## MICHIGAN.

Charles E. Adair, Utica.  
Edgar E. Bedell, Bellaire.  
George L. Belcher, Leslie.  
Samuel D. Bonner, Newaygo.  
Ernest J. Dubé, Houghton.  
Thomas G. Finucan, Charlevoix.  
Michael Hoban, St. Ignace.  
James L. Klett, Whitehall.  
Christopher Lowney, Laurium.  
Charles F. Parker, Middleville.  
Jacob C. Rough, Buchanan.  
John E. Shekell, Jackson.  
N. C. Sutherland, Romeo.

## VIRGINIA.

John S. White, Charlottesville.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Crooker, of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, infinitely fatherly, a Friend forever friendly, we honor and glorify Thy high and holy name, and we thank Thee for the blessings of life that come to us from day to day; we thank Thee for our country, its schools, and courts, and churches; we thank Thee for the American home, woman's kingdom and man's paradise; we invoke Thy blessing, we seek Thy grace, we crave Thy forgiveness, we would learn Thy truth, we would obey Thy law, we would establish Thy kingdom on earth, and now we give Thee praise from grateful hearts evermore. In the name of our common Master. Amen.

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

## CLERK PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE:

Desiring to be absent from my office for a short period of time, I hereby designate the Chief Clerk, J. C. South, Esq., to sign all papers that may require my official signature, and to do all other acts under

the rules and practice of the House required to be done by the Clerk of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,  
Clerk of the House.

MARCH 17, 1914.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing some letters I have pertaining to the proposition of the increase in the freight rates in the eastern district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing some letters on the subject of the increase in freight rates in the eastern division. Is there objection?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## PENSIONS.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider pension bills on the Private Calendar; and, pending that, I want to ask unanimous consent that H. R. 14234 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering pension bills on the Private Calendar; and, pending that, he asks unanimous consent that H. R. 14234 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman understands, of course, that provides for no general debate.

Mr. HELVERING. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I understand there is no desire for general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman if this is the only bill he has?

Mr. HELVERING. This is the only bill reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions. There is one from the Pensions Committee to be taken up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection that the bill H. R. 14234 be considered in the Committee of the Whole House? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The question now is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of pension bills.

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of hydroelectric power by printing a petition from the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on hydroelectric power. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the first bill.

## PENSIONS.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14234) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Members will bear in mind that this bill is being read for amendment, section by section.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of James Chambers, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move, page 21, lines 21 to 24, to strike out the name of "James Chambers."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, on page 21, lines 21, 22, 23, and 24.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Eastlick, late of Company G, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, page 28, line 3, by striking out "forty" and inserting "fifty."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 28, line 3, by striking out "\$40" and inserting "\$50."