

Also, petition of the National Council of Women, favoring passage of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of George R. Downs and 21 other citizens of Erie, Pa., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 3063, for the repair, preservation, care, and future maintenance of the restored naval brig *Niagara*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: Memorial of Bohemian (Czech) and Slovak citizens of Baltimore City, Md., declaring their loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of R. J. Caldwell Co., of New York, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, against the zone system to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of the Passaic County (N. J.) Board of Agriculture, relative to the farm-labor situation in New Jersey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Vernon County board of supervisors, National Council of Women, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin State Council of Defense, relative to Members of Congress from Wisconsin giving their support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Society of Equity, favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of various women's organizations in Marysville, Ohio, urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, favoring the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, desiring more pay for fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the National Union American Society of Equity, relative to the railroad situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, opposing the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Frank Bogard, of La Salle, Ill., for the relief of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorial of Denver Typographical Union, No. 49, urging passage of House bill 1654, granting an increase in pay to post-office clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Laura C. Hollschneider, Isis O. Mackenzie, Hallie S. Lock, Harriett T. Dougherty, Elvina A. Baker, C. H. Pettenger, Mary H. Blakely, Jennie C. McGehe, Una G. Roberts, M. D., Matilda Bowman, Mattie MacNeill, Lina Johnson, Emil Johnson, Cora E. Lind, Emma E. Smith, William S. White, Mrs. Caroline White, Walter C. Beall, Mary A. Wascha, Ida A. Hart, Melissa Ruddett, A. B. Hart, Albert E. Chase, John W. Hart, Mary E. Hughes, Mary Wascha, Terence Hughes, Martin John Suhly, William A. Grund, and Mrs. William A. Grund, all of Denver, Colo., urging the immediate adoption of the national-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to E. Dora Cutler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Alaska Fisherman's Union, urging the passage of House bill 5875, for the erection of a general hospital on or near the shores of Bristol Bay, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, Cal.; Chamber of Commerce of Santa Barbara County, Cal.; San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce; Chamber of Commerce of San Jose, Cal.; and the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, Eureka, Cal., indorsing the proposed military highway from Blaine, Wash., to San Diego, Cal., as a means of protection to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Lock Haven, Pa., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters and telegrams from 16 citizens of Baltimore, Md., asking for the submission of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, letters and telegrams from six Baltimore citizens against the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial from the Maryland Woman Suffrage Association, the Woman Suffrage League of Maryland, and of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, urging favorable vote on the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of A. R. Katz and the members of the firm of Lyon, Conklin & Co. (Inc.), urging the passage of the Chamberlain universal military training bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Madden bill, H. R. 1654; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a letter from McCormick & Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against the reduction of second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the E. E. Jackson Lumber Co., Baltimore, Md., relative to eight hours a day for all workers; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of S. Nalle Sons, Baltimore, Md., against repeal of the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Schapiro Waist Co., against the repeal of the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of 68 citizens of Hartford County, Conn., in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petitions of citizens of Manchester, Mass., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of numerous citizens of Noble County, Okla., praying for an amendment to the Constitution expressing our national acknowledgment of Almighty God; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the New York State Wholesale Bakers' Association, by Mr. F. W. Dawdy, treasurer, Elmira, N. Y., favoring congressional action to fix the price of corn, barley, rye, and oats in the same manner as has been done in fixing the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Wholesale Bakers' Association, by the Nye Baking Co., of Owego, N. Y., favoring appropriate action to fix the price of corn, barley, rye, and oats in the same manner as has been done in the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of men and women of Cecil County, Md., favoring the woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolution of the Bronx Board of Trade, New York City, N. Y., protesting against the discontinuance of the pneumatic-mail service for New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of prominent men and women of Lancaster County, S. C., desiring the immediate submission of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer H. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of rural letter carriers of Madison County, Ind., urging increase in salary, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of the eighth district of Indiana, urging passage of Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1918.

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

Almighty God, in the midst of the world's great clamor for justice and freedom we pray that Thou wilt help us first of all to be just to ourselves, that we may hold ourselves to the highest standard, that we may appear before God clear upon Thy book, that our hearts may be right in Thy sight. If we are just to ourselves we know that we can afford to be generous to others. So do Thou mold us according to Thy will and enable us to bring ourselves completely into submission to the Divine will. To this end do Thou bless us and guide us to-day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Harding	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Hardwick	Martin	Swanson
Calder	Hollis	New	Thomas
Culberson	James	Norris	Thompson
Curtis	Johnson, Cal.	Owen	Tillman
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poin Dexter	Townsend
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Fletcher	Kellogg	Shafroth	Warren
France	Kenyon	Sheppard	Watson
Frelinghuysen	King	Sherman	Williams
Gallinger	Kirby	Smith, Ariz.	
Gerry	Knox	Smith, Ga.	
Gronna	McCumber	Smith, Md.	

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] owing to illness.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on business of the Senate. I wish also to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], who are engaged in committee work.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to state that the Committee on Military Affairs is in session and there are important witnesses being heard.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] on official business.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on official business.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to announce that my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and report upon the advisability of establishing and maintaining Government fuel yard or yards in the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have here a letter from a committee of citizens of Wilkeson, Pierce County, Wash., sending me a petition urging that aliens in this country be either drafted and made to serve in the Army of the United States or else that they be deported.

I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD, and also the body of the petition, because these citizens make some very pertinent suggestions and also give illustrations where these aliens have referred slightly to American citizens and advised them not to go into the Army, and said, "We will take your jobs away and make the money."

There being no objection, the letter and petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILKESON, PIERCE COUNTY, WASH., December 15, 1917.

The Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find petition signed by 210 citizens of this town. Wilkeson, as you probably know, is the center of Pierce County's mining district. It has a population of approximately 1,500 and boasts of about 200 voters. What is true of Wilkeson is true of every mining camp in the State of Washington with few exceptions.

We request the privilege of stating a few reasons for this petition: We have a mixed population, consisting of Austrians, or people of Slavish blood in predominance, Germans, Italians, Finns, Russians, English, Swedes, and nearly every other nationality under the sun excepting Japs, Chinese, and Negroes. Some of these people have lived in the United States 10, 20, and in some cases 30 years, but in all this time they have not had enough interest in the welfare or government of our country to apply for naturalization papers. When you speak of the war they say, "Oh, you can go; I'm not a citizen." Yet when it comes to demanding higher wages and the best in the land—liberty, free speech, and still more liberty—they get it, and the American citizen pays the bill.

When the draft law was passed and the country called for men to bear arms, the best young American manhood responded; the rest claimed exemption—"I'm not a citizen of the United States; I belong to Austria, Italy, or some other country." Why not send them back to that country? The young Americans go; the others stay behind to demand higher wages and free speech, and they are not a bit afraid to tell you about it either—to hoard their money and send it back to the old country when the war is over.

Not very long ago two Austrians received their checks on pay day. They took them to the local bank to be cashed, and the banker counted it out in currency, whereupon they pushed it back and said: "We want

gold." On being told that they could not get gold they refused to cash their checks, as currency would not keep very well in cans.

The town of Wilkeson subscribed \$1,300 to the first liberty loan; the First Bank of Wilkeson took \$1,000 of that amount. On the second liberty loan drive a committee of citizens endeavored to make a better showing. They raised the magnificent sum of \$9,050, exclusive of the bank's subscription. They received the large sums of \$50 and \$100 from men earning as high as \$15 per eight-hour day.

Recently we undertook a Y.-M.-C.-A. drive for the boys in khaki. On entering a local pool hall we asked a group of Austrians to donate something to this cause. One man gave 50 cents, the others refused to give a penny. These men had just returned from a season's fishing in the straits and Alaskan waters, where they had netted from \$1,000 to \$2,000 each. They have their first papers but merely to enable them to fish. Ninety per cent of them stop right there; the other 10 per cent obtain their full citizenship.

The Government recently arrested in Seattle a man who at one time was president of the miners' local union at Wilkeson, a man who was loud in denouncing this country, a citizen of the British Empire. His arrest followed his connection with the Industrial Workers of the World. He was expelled from the boiler makers' union of Seattle and is now suing them and the Seattle Construction & Dry Dock Co. for damages and loss of work.

All the inhabitants of the town of Wilkeson send their children to our free public schools and use our free public roads, which is a good thing without a doubt, for which they pay not a cent of direct taxes nor share a bit of responsibility.

Recently while circulating the inclosed petition we asked a naturalized Slav to sign. This is what he said: "You bet I will. My countrymen make fun of me for taking out my citizenship papers. They say, 'What is the use of spending \$50 to get your papers? If this country needs soldiers of your age, you will have to go. We will stay behind and get good jobs.' You bet I will sign, and I have some friends who will sign, too. We hope it passes and the Government charges each of these countrymen of mine about \$10 a month to help win the war." You will notice on the petition how well he kept his word about his friends signing the petition.

These are some of the reasons we have for presenting you the inclosed petition. They may not be the reasons of all the signers of this petition, but we are sure they agree with a large percentage, and the petitions speak for themselves. We hope you may in some way be able to make these people appreciate the free country in which they live and their responsibilities to that country.

Very respectfully, yours,

L. G. MASTERS,
E. A. WESTFALL,
J. A. PYPER,
Committee.

WILKESON, PIERCE COUNTY,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
December 1, 1917.

To the honorable Congressmen from the
State of Washington, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, residing at Wilkeson, Pierce County, Wash., do respectfully petition the Representatives of the people of the State of Washington to use their influence at the coming session of Congress to have legislation passed compelling people of foreign birth working and residing within our country to make application for naturalization papers after five years' residence within the United States and for full citizenship within a reasonable time thereafter or be deported. And, further, that they be compelled to bear their just part of the taxes and responsibilities necessary to the successful conclusion of the war with the German Empire.

J. J. COREY
(And others).

Mr. JONES of Washington. I also have received a letter from Mr. Charles V. Powell, of Buffalo, N. Y., on the same subject, which I ask to have referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

721 LAFAYETTE AVENUE,
Buffalo, N. Y., December 23, 1917.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of the 18th instant, re my letter on "decent aliens." Will you kindly consider the following points which are directly connected with this matter. I may state that I am an accountant, a man turned 45 years, British born, thoroughly American from my "shoes up," lived away in outlying section of Rocky Mountains, Colo., also Utah, for nearly 10 years, yet my handling about as auditor prevented my obtaining "final papers." I have a year to elapse; my wife is Swedish-French American, 26 years in this country. We are westerners. I offered myself to British recruiting mission because I was over American age, yet within British age. I failed to pass medical examination and was rejected. I have letter to that effect. No man ever called me slacker and "got away with it."

I tell you all this detail so that you will understand how unfair it would be to force such men as I back to England because we had not obtained our final papers, often not our own fault.

1. Look at "Citizenship" paragraph in the new draft questionnaire. Here the alien has to answer "yes" or "no" to the question, "Is he willing to serve United States Army military service?" If "yes" he does not have to answer the following questions, or when and how he entered country, parentage, first papers?

2. Further down the page he is asked would he serve United States Army or army of his old country?

3. Now, Mr. JONES, here clearly is established a choice of service for your alien United States Army or old-country army. This means allied aliens, for nonneutral aliens affect the army question.

4. But, Mr. JONES, we are told that the reciprocal treaties are to be laid before the Senate for ratification. This means exchange of subjects between England and America in particular. Now, your questionnaire give the allied aliens choice of service clearly—"Which army do you prefer?" How do you reconcile the questionnaire choice of service with reciprocal treaties forcing Britishers to their old country's army?

Yours, for America only,

CHARLES V. POWELL,
A very "sore" old Britisher.

The British recruiting mission has established offices in most of our principal cities in anticipation of you gentlemen passing reciprocal treaties to permit Britishers declarant, 18 to 45 years, to be drafted into the British Army. One officer told me that England "would not stand for" anything else. Since when, Mr. JONES, has England acquired the right to dictate the policies of the United States of America?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have here a great number of telegrams and letters from citizens of my State, as well as the citizens of other States, urging the passage of Senate bill 3235, the Federal farm-loan bill. I ask that one of the telegrams, from Mr. A. C. Townley, president of the National Nonpartisan League, be printed in the RECORD, and also another telegram, from Mr. Frank P. Cowing, of Maddock, N. Dak., together with a letter from a New England farmer. I ask that those three be printed in the RECORD and that all be noted in the RECORD.

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

The telegrams and letter are as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., January 8, 1918.

Senator ASLE J. GRONNA,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Bill appropriating \$100,000,000 for Federal farm loan banks has passed House. Will you not use your influence to bring it to an early roll call and vote for its passage? The bill is not all it should be, but it offers some much-needed aid to the farmers, and financial aid is imperative to relieve serious situation. Congress voted huge sums to help shipbuilders, munition makers, and others. The farming industry certainly is entitled to same consideration. Unless farmers get this help the Nation's food producing capacity will be handicapped. This may jeopardize our success in war. The necessity for relief is urgent to the Nation as well as the western and southern farmer. The farmers are watching this bill. All they ask is a square deal. We respectfully request you to support this most meritorious measure.

A. C. TOWNLEY,
President National Nonpartisan League.

MADDOCK, N. DAK., December 31, 1917.

Senator A. J. GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.:

Your attention respectfully called to importance of bill to enable Federal land banks to continue business in spite of abnormal conditions due to war and private competition. Large numbers of farmers in this region have applied for loans. If unable to obtain them, will be forced to fall back on former mortgage holders. Any rural-credit work for the future would be badly discredited. It is a critical time to cause financial embarrassment to the farmers. Failure by Congress to make the Federal land banks workable will raise interest rates, discourage farmers, and lower their efficiency. Your support is expected, as usual, by the farmers in your district.

FRANK P. COWING,
Secretary-Treasurer Maddock Farm Loan Association,
and Secretary Benson County Federation of Farm Clubs.

WESTFORD, MASS., January 1, 1918.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to send a word of thanks to you for the support of the Federal farm-loan bonds the other day in the Senate. I am an eastern farmer engaged mostly in the growing of apples. I have a letter to my Senator WEEKS, mailed this morning, wherein I expressed the hope that the limitation put upon the act by his amendment to Senator HOLLIS'S provision for the purchase of the farm-loan bonds, would be amended so that there might be an open door for us during all of 1918, 1919, and the duration of the war.

I outlined to him the peculiarly distressing conditions in which we country people find ourselves by the war and the way in which the governmental activities cripple us.

There is a profound feeling of loyalty in our New England country districts to the Government. We have given our help, our boys, and a lot of hard, unpaid toil this summer to increase food supplies. Yet there is the feeling that there ought to be relief from some of the conditions that are apprehensive to us.

We go into the raw-material markets for our fertilizers. We meet the powder makers. We and they use many of the same materials. We to grow our crops. They to make their explosives. They outbid us. No matter how high it goes, they will go above us.

They simply turn the high cost of raw material into the cost price when they settle with the Government.

We farmers can not do this. We can not get our money back in the open and unsupported market to which we must carry our food products.

In the labor market, powder men and bullet makers, constructors, and shipbuilders are all in the labor market bidding against each other, and all conjointly against the farmer. In this kind of labor competition we have no ghost of show. Not only does this competition make our entry impossible, but the bonuses that are paid to manufacturers and labor make it absolutely prohibitive.

Most all war industries have an open or implied contract with the Government for a guaranteed market, a stipulated price that includes any price for raw materials and labor, and a given bonus for accelerated production.

As farmers and produce growers, we have to do without any of these supports. The isolation of our units makes them handicaps to us in growing war essentials. Still more, lacking bonuses, we have to fight man-made penalties and the penalties nature exacts from us.

As farmers we see these things. There may be no way other just now than this crippling condition that the manufacturers of war material impose upon us. We are loyal to the core under this crippling by the city mills and manufacturers.

All we ask is for a fair chance for our working capital. This means not only our homes and what is dear to us in our domestic life but the continued supply of things to eat, and things to wear. What is more fundamental than food and clothes in this great struggle? Antecedent to bullets and battles, there must be bread. Bread, and always bread.

In the growing of these fundamental foodstuffs, why should next July find the doors of these Federal farm banks closed when we go there with the best collateral God and man ever made to get working capital—closed by the action of an arm of the Government?

It is bad enough to run up against the crippling action of the different activities of Government war work. But, why in the name of all that is intelligently patriotic, should the Senate arm of the Government make impossible for us to exist and work in the economic farm crisis that impinges?

Let me be concretely clear. I have a neighbor who keeps a herd of 38 cows. This milk is carried into Lowell, where it goes to feed a lot of families and their children and babies. He is having a very hard time in getting his fertilizer that he needs in addition to his barnyard manure. He has no help. He milks by electricity. His wife helps in the milk room, besides doing all the household cooking and work. Yesterday morning both were up at 4 o'clock. The thermometer was at 30° below. And an 8-mile drive to Lowell by truck.

This man and his family are doing this work, have their home because they have been able to rent \$2,500 at 5 per cent. Mortgage note to be renewed at the expiration of every six months.

Savings banks and private individuals are calling in their mortgage loans. This same farmer will receive notice next June that his mortgage will not be renewed next June. Not at any figure.

The capital that is out in these farm-loan mortgages is finding a greater return in the manufacturing markets and construction, where there are guaranteed markets, guaranteed prices, and heavy bonuses from the Government. From the Government to bankers, millmen, manufacturers, and laborers.

This dairyman, when he goes to the local farm-loan association under the Hollis Rural-Credits Act, will be told that the doors are closed to him. That one part of the Government foresaw these difficulties and consequent hardships and wished to buy these farm-loan bonds so that fresh capital might be furnished to continue this fundamental war work. But that the United States Senate made it impossible to go beyond the fiscal year of June, 1918.

What will he think? How will he feel to see the foreclosure of his industry that is so fundamental to the carrying on of this war for a world democracy? The collateral that lies behind these bonds is better than any mercantile paper. The Government has stood behind the mercantile interests of the country with far less security in tight-money markets. The same arm of the Treasury has gone out in helpful, hopeful ways to the purely business men of the country. Why not on much better security and necessity. The way of patriotism lies that we farmers shall not demand the marketing of our farm-loan bonds just now. The liberty bonds must have the right of way.

The logic that makes it necessary to spend some of this liberty loan money for bonuses to stimulate production without its being stipulated in appropriation details makes it more than legitimate to take up these farm-loan bonds.

The bonuses are necessary, we farmers have no doubt. But in themselves they will never return to the Treasury Department.

With the farm-loan bonds it is different. If the Treasury Department takes them up there will be an interest of 4½ per cent flowing back into the Treasury.

If they are taken for 1918, 1919, or whatever period the war may last, there will be this interest return to the Treasury.

When the war is over and liberty bonds cease to hold the market, the farm-loan bonds can be sold by the Treasury Department. It will have a better money return than other money that it has used. It will have its original sum back, with added interest.

Of no other appropriation can this be said. Of no other appropriation can it be as truly said, "Life, and life more abundantly." For many a soldier. Perhaps for the Nation.

I have gone into these details because I must believe there is no Senator in the Senate at Washington, when he sees the personal and economic difficulties in which the farmers of our country work but will be glad to keep open the doors of our Federal land banks.

The pinch is growing tighter. The threat of loss of home and farm grows more ominous as the war lengthens. The day will come when private greed in its short-sightedness will withdraw all its investments from farm mortgages. Not because they are unsafe but because they can get more in the big, bonused war industries.

If that finds the farm-loan banks closed, because we took no heed of a common obligation, in the purchase of the best underlain bonds in the world, this war will collapse. Millions will then have given their lives in vain and the reality of a democracy faded in an autocracy.

We pray God that we may be spared this calamity.

I wish to thank you again for the loyalty you have shown in this purchase of the farm-loan bonds.

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. BUCKSHORN.

Mr. GRONNA presented petitions of the Commercial Club of Bismarck; of C. H. Belknap, cashier of the First National Bank of McIntosh; of E. N. Bosworth, treasurer of the National Farm Loan Association of Raleigh; of W. A. Priess, secretary-treasurer of the National Farm Loan Association of Garrison; of T. G. Nelson, of Dunn Center; of A. A. Hoffman, president of the Federal Farm Loan Association of Courtenay; of the board of directors of the National Farm Loan Association of Ray; of the National Farm Loan Association of Lisbon; of the Limbercreek National Farm Loan Association, of Rawson; of the National Farm Loan Association of Berthold; of the National Farm Loan Association of Velva; of the National Farm Loan Association of McVillie; and of the National Farm Loan Association of Bergen, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called administration bill amending the Federal farm-loan act, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of C. J. Kindred, of Grenoble, Pa., and the petition of J. Clarence Davies, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the importation of Chinese farmers into the United States during the war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Charles C. Doten, of Plymouth, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to

pension soldiers who served less than 90 days, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of Federal Employees' Local Union No. 49, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of Government employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented a petition of sundry railway postal clerks of Columbia, Greenville, Sumter, and Walhalla, all in the State of South Carolina, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Aiken, Lancaster, and Richland Counties, all in the State of South Carolina, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FERNALD. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Maine branch of the Woman's Party, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator BERT M. FERNALD.

DEAR SIR: Resolution adopted at meeting held under auspices of Maine branch of the Woman's Party at Frye Hall on January 5:

"Resolved, That this meeting call upon President Wilson and the Democratic administration to give effective support to the national suffrage amendment by making it an administration measure and securing its passage in this session of Congress, at a time when the Government is calling upon the women of the Nation for their indispensable services to assist in bearing the burdens of the war; be it also

"Resolved, That this meeting call upon the Congress of the United States to pass at once the Federal suffrage amendment, establishing at home that democracy for which the men of this country have been called to fight abroad; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President; the Vice President; Speaker CHAMP CLARK; Senator THOMAS MARTIN, Democratic leader of the Senate; Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, Democratic leader of the House of Representatives; Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, Republican leader; and to our Senators and Representatives."

FLORENCE BROOKS WHITEHOUSE,
Chairman Maine Branch.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Fred Steele Post, No. 70, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, of San Luis Obispo, Cal., praying that pensions of veterans of the Civil War be made commensurate with the present cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Yugoslavs of Oakland, Cal., favoring the declaration of war on Austria and declaring firm allegiance to the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

OSAGE INDIAN SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3223) providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1918, and I submit a report (No. 187) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 539), is hereby amended to the extent that the moneys therein provided for support of the Osage boarding school may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the same purposes as provided in said paragraph for a further period of not exceeding 10 years from the 1st day of January, 1918: *Provided*, That said moneys may be expended without limitation, except that there shall not be expended more than \$300 for annual support and education of any one pupil: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall also apply to expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The first amendment of the committee was, on line 10, page 1, before the word "years," to strike out "ten" and insert "thirteen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the word "limitation," in line 12, page 1, to insert the words "and shall include systematic vocational instruction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 13 years from January 1, 1918."

THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 168, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

CLAIMS OF SIOUX INDIANS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 2052) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No. 188) thereon. A similar bill passed this body in the last Congress. It has the unanimous recommendation of the committee and of the department, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill first be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which the Sioux Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, which have not heretofore been determined by the Court of Claims, may be submitted to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, for determination of the amount, if any, due said tribe from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation of any of the funds of said tribe, or for the failure of the United States to pay said tribe any money or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said tribe against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

Sec. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said courts they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all the parties thereto notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said tribe or any band thereof. The claim or claims of the tribe or band or bands thereof may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment, suit to be filed within five years after the passage of this act; and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant, and any band or bands of said tribe the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by said Sioux Tribe or any bands thereof, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based, and said petition shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said tribe or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribe or bands of Indians.

Sec. 3. That upon the final determination of such suit, cause, or action the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribe or bands of Indians under contracts negotiated and approved as provided by existing law, and in no case shall the fee decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amounts stipulated in the contracts approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and no attorney shall have a right to represent the said tribe or any band thereof in any suit, cause, or action under the provisions of this act until his contract shall have been approved as herein provided. The fees decreed by the court to the attorney or attorneys of record shall be paid out of any sum or sums recovered in such suits or actions, and no part of such fees shall be taken from any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to such tribe or bands of Indians in whose behalf the suit is brought unless specifically authorized in the contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment of the committee was, in section 2, page 2, line 21, after the word "tribe," to insert "or any other tribe or band of Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes."

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. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 3452) granting an increase of pension to S. S. Hubbell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3453) for the relief of Volney M. Curry; and

A bill (S. 3454) for the relief of Calvin S. James; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3455) granting a pension to William Washington Poor;

A bill (S. 3456) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stephens; and

A bill (S. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3458) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3459) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 3460) granting a pension to Amy E. Wingreen, now Macomber (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 3461) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Presley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry under bond of certain shipments of distilled spirits; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and report upon the advisability of establishing and maintaining Government fuel yard or yards in the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONSIDERATION OF TREATIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, concurrent and other resolutions are in order. If there be no resolutions, the morning business is closed, and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is on the table a resolution coming over from yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order is that when called for such resolutions shall be handed down, which the Chair does at the request of the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and the same is hereby, directed to prepare a revision of the rules of the Senate relating to the consideration of treaties so as to provide that all treaties hereafter shall be considered in the open executive sessions of the Senate, and, when such revision is so prepared, to report the same to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] desires to address the Senate this morning, and I ask that the resolution may go over without prejudice to its present position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be taken.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FARM-LOAN ACT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, may I not ask, before the Senator from Iowa begins his address, to have the conference report on the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, first disposed of? If it will not take any great length of time, I should be glad to have that action taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma calls up the conference report heretofore submitted by him on Senate bill 3235, which will be read.

The Secretary read the report (S. Doc. No. 160), as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, having met, after full and free conference have

agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

ROBERT L. OWEN,
HENRY F. HOLLIS,
A. J. GRONNA,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARTER GLASS,
MICHAEL F. PHELAN,
EVERIS A. HAYES,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not had time to examine this conference report in detail, but I take it from the report as submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] that the only change made in the bill as it passed the Senate has been to increase the appropriation from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma if I am correct in that statement?

Mr. OWEN. The provision is that this amount shall extend to July 1, 1919, giving 18 months in which this legislation shall operate instead of six months. The system could hardly get into good running order in so short a time as six months. The language is:

Such purchases shall not exceed the sum of \$100,000,000 in either of such fiscal years.

The words "such fiscal years" referring to the fiscal years 1918 and 1919.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, Mr. President, it is proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase farm-loan mortgage bonds to the amount of \$200,000,000.

When the bill was before the Senate, I called attention to the fact that it was simply a beginning of the requests that would be made upon the Treasury of the United States for the purchase of farm-loan mortgage bonds. From information which I have received from different parts of the United States, I am quite sure that the statement I then made was correct. Only yesterday, Mr. President, before the Public Lands Committee, we listened to a plea that as to all homestead entries on public lands of the United States which had been made one year before the passage of an act, which was to be introduced in the Congress yesterday, patents should be granted immediately to the locator. It was specifically stated that the object of the legislation was to secure title to the land, so that their owners could secure money from the Federal Farm Loan Board. Asked as to what amount they expected to receive, the question was not answered, nor do I believe that it could be answered. If it is to be, Mr. President, a universal custom that one class of citizens are to receive patents to the lands which they have homesteaded, all citizens should receive the same consideration.

Instead of this legislation involving an expenditure of \$200,000,000, we shall find ourselves in such a position that we shall have to advance a billion dollars for this purpose. Evidently there is a majority of Congress that feels that this policy should be adopted.

Mr. President, if the Government of the United States were in a prosperous financial condition at the present time and its obligations were not growing by leaps and bounds, by billions upon billions of dollars every year, there is no class of legislation, paternal in its nature, that I should prefer to this; but what I am fearful of, Senators, is that our system is going to break down. The demands that are going to be made upon the Treasury of the United States will be such that, even with the immense resources of the United States, our financial system will be loaded beyond all reason and power to meet. I am fearful, Mr. President, that when the people understand this, when they begin to realize what will be required of them by way of direct taxation and also by way of bonded obligations, they will lose confidence in the judgment of the men whom they have sent here to represent them.

I notice that the bill to which I have referred was introduced yesterday in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and I have little doubt that it will pass. I know that all of those who are affected by the proposed legislation have just as much right to expect advances from the Federal Farm Loan Board as those who already have the title to their lands. I was told by one person interested in this legislation that it ought to pass, because while billions are being spent for other purposes, we also can add billions for this purpose just as well as not, and that those desiring the money are entitled to it. It may be, Mr. President, that they are entitled to it just as much as those who are to be beneficiaries of the appropriations covered by the pending legislation; but I know that the day is

coming when a halt will have to be called. I know that we can not go on appropriating and authorizing the expenditure of money as recklessly as has been done in the last 12 months. I am fearful of the result, and I felt that it was my duty to say this much on this occasion. However, in saying it, Mr. President, I do not think that anything will come of it in the way of defeating this conference report. I do it because I think it is a duty I owe to my country.

I am not going to say anything more about the report; I presume it will be adopted; but I do hope and trust that Congress will at least stop and consider where we are drifting and what the result of these appropriations covering untold millions of dollars will be.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I agree with the general idea that we ought to be careful in our expenditures. In this particular case the farm-loan associations have applied altogether for about \$200,000,000 in loans. The Farm Loan Board has been able to let out something between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 of loans. After this system was inaugurated the United States entered into this world war and has had occasion, of course, to call for very large amounts of credits from the country, so that the demands of the Federal Government have made it much more difficult and awkward easily to market farm-loan bonds, although they comprise a very excellent security.

In this case, however, the proposed legislation only authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, upon the request of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to purchase at par and accrued interest certain portions of the bonds, not to exceed \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year. It is not believed that quite so much will be required, but it is necessary when men desire to have the loans made to have available somewhere funds from which these loans can be supplied; otherwise the need of the individual for the loan will be satisfied elsewhere, and the system itself will not operate or function as Congress intended that it should.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I was under the impression that this bill merely authorized the purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of not to exceed \$100,000,000 in all of the bonds.

Mr. OWEN. Well, that was drawn for the current fiscal year, and it was amended so as to provide for the next fiscal year, because the current fiscal year will terminate on June 30 next.

Mr. KING. Do I understand the Senator to mean that this may go on indefinitely?

Mr. OWEN. No; not at all; only for the present fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. KING. I want to say to the Senator, with his permission, that I have received a large number of letters from various parts of the country objecting to and, indeed, protesting against this legislation. The letters, in the main, are to the effect that the writers and the corporations with which they are identified have loaned and are ready to loan whatever money the farmers may require; that they are being taxed very heavily by the Government in the prosecution of the war, and they think that it is very unfair for the Government to tax them, to take their money, and then to loan their money out to individuals, thus entering into competition with the corporations in loaning money to the farmers of the United States.

If this were to be a permanent policy it seems to me that it would be not only unwise but exceedingly dangerous and would be committing the Government to a line of policy that is not consistent with its functions, and, indeed, is in contravention of the functions of the Federal Government.

I shall vote for the conference report, but I shall do so very reluctantly; and I hope we may have the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that no more legislation of this character will emanate from his committee, at least for some time.

Mr. OWEN. This request, of course, comes from the Farm Loan Board, who have been met with the difficulties which I have pointed out. I do not think it will embarrass the Government in the least, and it will afford a means by which to increase the output of raw materials—cotton, flax, and foodstuffs of all sorts—which are essential, of course, to carrying on this war. It is regarded as essential to stimulate the production of these materials and to carry out the policy which was laid down by the Congress of the United States in adopting the farm-loan banking system.

Of course, I appreciate that the banks and the mortgage companies that have heretofore loaned money to the farmers regard this system with some aversion. That is not unnatural, because lending money to farmers was a profitable business, especially in some parts of the West, where the farmers, because of the difficulty in getting credits, had to pay a very high rate, a rate so high that it really obstructed in a serious way the development of agriculture in the western parts of the country.

Those are the reasons which justify this amendment to the Federal farm-loan act, and I trust the Senate will give it its approval.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when this matter was first before the Senate I expressed my dissent from the proposed legislation. Perhaps I was influenced to some extent by the fact that the savings banks of my State are loaning money to farmers at 5 per cent, and want to continue to loan money at that rate. Not a single bond has been taken in the State of New Hampshire, so that our people have no interest whatever in the matter; but it is evident that the Congress feel differently than I do. The House originally passed the bill granting \$100,000,000 for two years consecutively. The Senate amended it by making it \$100,000,000 for one year. I voted for that, and I regret that the conferees on the part of the Senate have yielded to the House in this matter; but they have done so, and all I can do is to vote against the conference report, which I shall do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word more.

I learn from the Federal Farm Loan Board that 80 per cent of the applications for loans are for the purpose of paying loans that are already carried by other institutions or private parties. The object is, of course, to get a lower rate of interest than the farmers now are paying. I should like to see the farmers get as low a rate of interest as possible. That being the case, Mr. President, there is no necessity of trying to deceive ourselves by claiming that the advance of this money is going to increase the production of farm products in the country. At least 80 per cent of it is not going to increase production, because all the farmer will do is to receive the money and pay the obligations held against him to-day by some corporation or some individual.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Utah, I suppose the theory is that the Government will never collect either principal or interest. Is not that it?

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the theory of the legislation.

Mr. LODGE. No; not of the legislation, but that is the theory of the farmers?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I would not say that.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I must enter my protest against that suggestion, because, of course, that is not the theory of anybody.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that these loans are going to be paid, principal and interest?

Mr. OWEN. Absolutely. The Government could not have a better security than this—not only the individual land, but—

Mr. LODGE. Like the irrigation bonds; they are going to be paid in that way, I suppose.

Mr. OWEN. No; not like the irrigation bonds; very different even from the irrigation bonds. The bond is secured by the individual land; it is secured by a group who have a common interest, and besides that it is secured by the common credit of all of the land banks.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if they are careful in making the loans, and the property is worth what the mortgage calls for, it is possible that every dollar of it will be collected, if enforced.

Mr. LODGE. If enforced; yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows, however, that an appeal has been made to Congress to let up on the collection of the indebtedness to the Government on the part of parties who have taken advantage of the irrigation law, for which I voted. Does not the Senator think there will be an appeal from the poor farmer, after a while, in this matter?

Mr. SMOOT. All that the Congress has done in that regard has been to make the payments extend over a period of 20 years instead of 10.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, at the end of 20 years I can not say what may happen; but I know that under the irrigation projects the advance of the Government is absolutely secure, because it covers irrigated lands, and those lands never will be worth less than they are to-day, and undoubtedly they will increase in value in the future.

Mr. GALLINGER. But does the Senator think that the Government will ever enforce its claim?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I rather think it will.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am glad the Senator has faith.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator any doubt that the Government is going to get its money back on these irrigation bonds?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it will, as I expressed myself.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so, too; but the Senator answered as though he thought there might be some doubt about it. Can anybody question that those bonds are going to be paid?

Mr. SMOOT. I know what the Senator from New Hampshire had in mind when he asked the question. I know that some of the organizations have petitioned to be relieved of the obligation.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has been done.

Mr. SMOOT. That has been done.

Mr. NORRIS. But there has not been any relief from any obligation. Nobody has been relieved from the payment of any of those irrigation bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. No one at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think anybody has asked for relief. I have not heard of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator there have been petitions asking that they be relieved, but Congress has not acted favorably upon those petitions.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. As far as the security is concerned—

Mr. SMOOT. It is unquestionable.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that we could not conceive of better security than those irrigation bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the security back of the Farm Loan Board bonds were as good as the security back of the irrigation bonds.

Mr. OWEN. If the Senator will permit me there, it is quite as good.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I have received reports in some cases already to the effect that the loans are not amply secured.

Mr. OWEN. The reports, I am satisfied, can not be true, because out of \$200,000,000 of applications they have only granted about 10 per cent. and the board is very scrupulously careful about it. Besides that, if there were an individual case where by some accident of administration the lands were not quite worth the amount of the loan the mortgage is secured by the combined credit of all the land banks.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I hail with great satisfaction the announcement as well as the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska and others that all of the irrigation bonds are good. I have a number of constituents holding irrigation bonds in the Southwest that will be greatly pleased with that announcement. They can be had by the Government at much less than par, and I can get hold of them within 48 hours. We paid par for them, but we can not get it.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean the Government reclamation projects, not the irrigation projects that have been started by innumerable companies with the view of selling lands, knowing very well when they began the project that it would not be successful. I will admit that there are a number of those.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator, then, is confining himself entirely to the Government reclamation areas?

Mr. SMOOT. Entirely so, and entirely to the \$30,000,000 that the Government has advanced for the purpose of building these reclamation projects.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will permit me, I have had a great deal of correspondence from former residents of the Mississippi Valley who have gone to these reclamation areas, and the conditions are far from ideal on the part of many of the farmers; and either amendments of the law or some changes will be required, or there will be great unrest, to say the least of it.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Utah yield, if to anyone?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from North Dakota rose first. I yield to him, and then I will gladly yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I simply want to say to the Senator from Illinois that I trust he will not have it understood that the bonds to which he refers are Government bonds or any-

thing that the Government has anything to do with. The bonds to which the Senator from Illinois refers are private bonds, bonds of corporations or individuals, and I do not think that has anything to do with this legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I would rather have a farm in the irrigated country covered by some of these private bonds than in anything I have seen that the Government has undertaken to develop.

Mr. GRONNA. I could tell the Senator from Illinois something about these bonds. They are issued—

Mr. SHERMAN. I could tell the Senator from North Dakota a great deal about them, too. I have traveled in that country, and some of my clients have investments there. They would like to have their money back, but it is a glimmering hope. I have chased a great many of those rainbows in my time.

Mr. GRONNA. With the permission of the Senator from Utah, may I ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Are the bonds to which the Senator has reference bonds issued by corporations?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; but they cover projects in the same territory in which the Government is endeavoring to lift itself over its financial fence by its own bootstraps, and it will meet with the same failure that individual effort does. The Government has no supernatural power of finance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me now—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is perfectly evident that the Senator from Illinois, if he has ever seen a Government reclamation project, must have passed through it in a very hurried manner, and that he knows nothing whatever about the general condition of affairs on those projects.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I know far too much—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I decline to yield, Mr. President, until I get through.

Mr. SHERMAN. All right; I shall be happy to have the Senator yield after the proper interval.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator speaks about the possibility of there being a condition of unrest on some of these projects. I have never seen any place where there was not more or less unrest. There has been a good deal of unrest in the city of Chicago. There has been a good deal of unrest in East St. Louis.

Mr. SHERMAN. And in Seattle.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There has been unrest in a great many parts of the State of Illinois, but we would not necessarily condemn such great States because some of the people are dissatisfied. No more ought you to condemn this great system of reclamation of arid lands, which is a demonstrated success, because some people to whom the Senator has talked have not found conditions to be ideal.

The same circumstances confronted the settlers of the entire West. All the pioneer country of the United States had its periods of hardships and difficulties to contend with; but they have gone on until they have added a good many prosperous and wealthy States to the Union, and wealth and prosperity will undoubtedly flow from the great majority of the Government reclamation projects.

There is just one other word I want to say in connection with my remarks, and that is that in my opinion there is nothing unreasonable in the application of these settlers for the extension of the time of payment of the expenses of the reclamation from 10 years to 20 years. My opinion is that it would be more reasonable, it would be better security, it would be juster to the settlers if the period were 40 years rather than 20 years, with a system of partial payments each year, which in that period of time would enable them to retire the principal as well as pay the interest without hardship.

That has been the experience of other governments which have had reclamation problems to deal with. They have discovered that men going into a new and entirely wild country can not begin making money the first year after they have put water on the land; that a considerable period of time must elapse before they can begin to get returns.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. The proverbial effort to extract blood out of a turnip is a profoundly profitable occupation compared with the Government effort to get crops out of a large part of the arid Southwest. The trouble is that where individual initiative and industry will not get anything out of the soil, a Government fiat will be equally a failure.

The most of the profitable territory has been occupied by private capital. The Government is now engaged, in the territory named, in an effort to attract, and it will attract, the same character of loans that the rural-credit system will attract. It will be loans that nobody else wants and nobody else will take. That is the kind of loans you are getting now. You can not deceive me on the farm-loan business. I know the territory covered by the applications for farm loans in considerable volume over the whole West and Southwest country; and the margin between cost and investment is so narrow that no conservative investor or bond house would loan the money of any client upon that particular security. The Government, though, being possessed of the endless resources of the taxpayer's pocketbook, can take chances where no sane investment house would do so. Outside of that it is business of that kind that this \$100,000,000 is required to finance.

Why, the truth is that the average irrigation system, planned and executed by private undertaking, is successful where the right kind of engineers and people who know the country and have gauged its resources in advance have accurately estimated what kind of development is possible. All of those are successful. The Government has reached a water supply and has covered territory that private capital would not take chances on, or did not have the ability to develop, and has been successful; but it is a mistake to say that all the territories to be developed are good security. What the man in the Southwest and the West wants, what they want in the Mississippi Valley, where they are producing really the meats and the breadstuffs of the world, is not Government coddling. They want you to send them somebody that can help do their work, and on top of that can give them transportation and freight cars to get to market the millions of bushels in the western country that are now rotting in the fields.

Mr. President, commissions have come here, and advices from London have told the American people to eat corn meal, and we are eating it. We know how. It is a healthful diet. We are saving our wheat and our flour for our allies that need it. In one area in my own country, by actual computation, there are more than 10,000,000 bushels of corn still standing in the fields in the shock. There is not a grain elevator in all that magnificent corn belt that can buy a bushel of corn to-day, because they can not sell a bushel of it in the market. They can not get freight cars to reach it. The result is that all this soft corn—and the most of it in the corn belt is more or less frostbitten—is standing there, a prey to inclement weather; and if there should be an early wet spring before this corn is taken out of the husk, literally millions upon millions of bushels of it can be taken to the great centers, where I suppose the criminal grain man lives, and has kilns and drying facilities of all kinds to dry corn of this kind and to put it into food form, and in that way it can be used. But if it stands where it is, with no freight cars, it will rot in the fields, and the farmer in that country next year or the coming spring will not put in the full acreage of corn. That is the natural result.

What the farmer in this country wants is freight cars and hired help. That he has not got, and no measure of this kind will give it to him.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, let us get back to the conference report.

Senators must not be deceived and think for a minute that this \$200,000,000 is not going to be used for the purchase of farm-loan bonds. There are applications now to take the whole of it.

In justice to the Federal Farm Loan Board Congress ought to express themselves at an early day by an amendment to the law creating this board specifically stating what the policy shall be hereafter, how far we want to go, and give the members of the Farm Loan Board to understand that they can go just so far and no farther.

Mr. President, in making that statement I know that I echo the sentiment of some of the members of the board. As it is, the board can not differentiate between one application and another unless after an investigation they decide that the security is not good.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I ask the Senator if they should not be permitted to decide the question as to whether the security is good or bad? Should not the board be permitted to exercise their wise discretion in determining that question?

Mr. SMOOT. They should be.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do they? Does not the Senator think that after the board employs all of its machinery for gathering information regarding the value of the land upon which the loan is made that it is safe to indulge the presumption that the security is ample to make sure the payment of the loan?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of the payment of the loan that I am discussing now, nor the question whether the security

is good. It is a question as to how far we want to go in this line of endeavor. The board do not know. They have applications now for \$200,000,000 that they can not meet. The only way to meet them is for the Government of the United States to purchase \$200,000,000 of these farm-loan bonds. I have no doubt, I will say to the Senator, that in the next six months there will be another \$100,000,000, and within a year perhaps \$500,000,000. We might just as well understand that there are about \$4,000,000,000 of farm loans in the United States, and, outside of a small district on the eastern coast of our country, the rate of interest runs from perhaps 6 per cent up. Every farmer who is paying 6 per cent for his money and can get it for 5½ per cent from the Government is going to make the application.

In this connection I wish to say, in answer to what the Senator from Oklahoma said, that as far as the banks are concerned—I mean the banks that are in commercial business or in the saving business, and therefore for banking purposes only—in many cases it will be a great advantage to them if the Government of the United States will take the loans off their hands that have been running so long. But where there is a loan agent who makes his money by loaning to farmers, who charges a commission, and secures money probably from some individual somewhere in the United States, all he is interested in is to get his commission, and he naturally objects, but the objection does not come from the regular banks of the country to any great extent.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The sooner the money sharks are put out of business the better for the farmer. The purpose of this act, as I understand it, is to encourage and assist the farmer in the development of his farm and promote the interests of agriculture generally. It is not an investment by the Government—the Government is not making the loan for the interest which it carries, but the loan is made to stimulate the farmer in producing all the things that grow in the ground—to encourage the tiller of the soil, make farm life more attractive, and in that way add to the material wealth of the country, and at the same time strengthen those moral forces which we find always among the sturdy progressive farming population.

The farmer has been the victim of the money changer for all ages and the purpose of this act is to liberate him and make him independent. The borrower is too often the servant of the lender. There is nothing more humiliating and discouraging than debt, and for that reason the Congress enacted this beneficent law that the farmers might be free to use their better judgment—work with hope and enjoy the products of their own toil. It was supposed that it would greatly enlarge his enterprise, and in that way reflect prosperity over the entire country. It seems to me that it is a very proper use of the Government function to render this assistance, if that will be the effect.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that is the claim which is made, and as far as 20 per cent of applications are concerned perhaps that will be the result; but I want to say to the Senator there are applications to borrow money upon property upon which money has already been borrowed at a higher rate of interest as far as 80 per cent of the applications are concerned. All the advantage there is in it would be to allow the farmer to borrow his money at a less rate of interest than he is paying to-day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator will pardon the further interruption, and permit me to say that the purpose of this law is to afford the farmer an opportunity to get from under the control of the shylock, who by sapping his very industrial life-blood prevents the development of his farm, denies him the comforts of home, and eats up all of his substance by demanding exorbitant interest. If the money which the farmer borrows from the Government at a low rate of interest shall be used for the payment of an outstanding debt upon the land and the improvement of the land and, in addition thereto, stocking his farm with a better breed of cattle, horses, hogs, and so forth, I can not conceive of a better use to which the money could be devoted.

As I have said heretofore that is the purpose of this legislation. As the farm is the substratum upon which all industrial prosperity rests, it is an inscrutable mystery to me how wise statesmen can afford to oppose measures of this character when they ought to know that the very class of people who object to the Government lending money to the farmer depend in the last analysis upon the products of the farm for their own material prosperity.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to say anything further in relation to the report at this time, knowing that the report is going to be adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, some observations have been made apparently with the purpose of discrediting somewhat or causing a lack of confidence in the farm-loan system as provided in the farm-loan act. I think it is wholly unjustified.

This bill is made the excuse for an argument of that kind and for intimations and claims that the system is proving unsatisfactory, and, as stated by some one, that the whole scheme is on the verge of bankruptcy. There is absolutely no foundation for that. The plan and system are working admirably. The system is a magnificent success. If it had not been for the war conditions there never would have been any need for this sort of legislation, and I do not believe now there is any real need for it. My own opinion is that these farm-loan bonds will sell throughout the country as rapidly as the people get acquainted with their merits. They will have to be somewhat pressed perhaps in order that people may be informed of their nature and their character and what they mean. I would guarantee—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. Excuse me one minute, Senator. I would undertake to take the stump in this country from one end of it to the other and let any man on this floor go with me and offer to sell Government bonds, and I will guarantee to sell five times as many farm-loan bonds as he will sell Government securities, at prevailing rates of interest and terms. Now, the situation is one that simply calls for these bonds being placed before the public in a way that the public will know what they are and to have to some extent at least their merits made known.

The first issue of these bonds at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent sold at a premium of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents without the slightest difficulty. No other bonds offered in this country except Government bonds have ever sold like these farm-loan bonds. They have sold in the district I know in which my State is located, composed of North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, as promptly as they were offered; the demand for them exceeded the supply; and the requests to-day for them are numerous. There would not be the slightest trouble about selling those bonds down there, and I do not believe there would be trouble anywhere in selling the bonds if they are known to the public and if there were not some reason for not pushing them. I can see what the reason might possibly be. The Treasury is in need of money. They have offered liberty bonds to the public, and the public has taken the liberty bonds very patriotically. They are offering now savings stamps and other governmental securities to the public.

It is possible that the officials in charge of the financial affairs of the Government think it wise not to put in competition with Government securities these farm-loan bonds, thinking that it would be better to have the money which comes in from the sale of Government securities to the extent named in this bill—\$100,000,000 for this year and the same next—come out of the Treasury and take up these bonds by the Government. I do not speak as to that with any knowledge or authority. It is just a supposition. It is an absolutely safe, sound, and wise investment of Government money in these bonds. They will draw $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, or, if they sell them at 5 per cent interest, whatever rate they draw the Government will get.

It is perfectly ridiculous to intimate here that there is any idea or possibility under this law for the farmers who borrowed money to escape the payment of principal and interest precisely as they agreed to do. It would be dishonorable in the first place; but it is utterly impossible. No borrower ever conceived of any such notion. There is not a man who has borrowed money under the farm-loan system who does not propose to pay every dollar of it as it falls due. He will be obliged to pay it, and he understands that.

The people interested in this system are just as anxious to make these securities safe as the people who buy the bonds, because they know the minute the bonds become discredited in any way, or there is the slightest lack of confidence in them, that minute the rate of interest will go up and every man who borrows will have to pay an increased interest, because the bonds can not be sold at the low rate of interest that they may be sold for when it is known that they are absolutely safe. Every man interested in the system is anxious that the bonds should be safe beyond any question and that they should be taken on that basis. The borrowers are composed of members of the National Farm Loan Associations. Each association must have 10 or more members, and the aggregate call for loans must be not less than \$20,000 from each association before it is chartered. The property is submitted with each application for a loan. It is examined by a committee appointed by the National Farm Loan Association. An appraisal committee from that association appraises the property. That is checked up by an appraiser chosen by the Farm Loan Board, recommended by the bank of the district. That appraiser passes upon the value of every particle of the security offered for loans; and the law says that no loan can be made exceeding 50 per cent of the actual value of the land and 20 per cent of the actual value of the improvements upon a farm, and the loans

must be made to persons who are engaged in agriculture and for the purposes set forth in the act.

There is no need of amending the act. There is no reason for the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] that Congress ought to outline to the Farm Loan Board to what extent they should make loans and for what purposes. The act is plain and definite upon that point. One of the purposes is to pay off existing liens; another is to improve the farm in order that production may be increased, and so forth. The act is perfectly plain. The Farm Loan Board have only to see that the money is used for the purposes named in the act, and each application before a man is eligible to secure a loan is based upon the provisions of the act and must set forth the purpose for which it is desired. So there is no need of any legislation there.

The only reason that I can see for this legislation is that those who are responsible for the financial affairs of the country feel that it is wiser that the money from Government securities may be used to this extent to purchase these bonds rather than have the bonds offered to the public in competition with Government securities. It is a perfectly safe investment. After the loan is made to an extent not exceeding 50 per cent of the value of the land and 20 per cent of the value of improvements you have the mortgage upon the land, you have the individual responsibility of the borrower, you have the guaranty of his association back of the loan, you have the guaranty of the bank and the guaranty of all the other 11 banks that the bond is safe and the security is sound. There can be nothing more secure than that.

Why, what are Senators thinking about? The capital invested in the farms of this country to-day amounts to \$50,000,000,000, according to the latest estimate. The value of the farm products in 1917 was over \$21,000,000,000. If that is not a basis for security of any sort, if that does not protect the bondholder where bonds are issued against mortgages on that kind of property, in Heaven's name where are we to find security?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize, as it were, one thing that I think the Senator from Florida has not emphasized sufficiently. I agree that he has made a very strong presentation of the safety and soundness of these securities, but there is one other factor in it that it seems to me has great strength, and that is the fact that every one of these mortgages is made by the men who form the farmers' association, and then in addition the property itself is held as a security for the bonds that are issued.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then if there is an overvaluation made upon one farm it means that all the other 9 men or 20 men in the association have got their farms hypothecated for the payment of the bonds. Consequently I can not conceive how there can be a loss. My fear at the time the original bill was presented was that the other farmers would not unite to hypothecate their own lands for the payment of every other loan that was executed in the association; but they have done it and they are willing to do it. They have confidence in their associates, and the bondholder does not take any risk whatever.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. I am glad the Senator from Colorado mentioned that. I thought it was included in the statement I was making, but it ought to be made perfectly plain that when these mortgages are sent up to the bank from the various farm-loan associations, having started from the individual borrower, each association not only sends to the farm-loan bank of the district the mortgages from that association, which have the approval not only of the local association but of the appraiser selected by the board and of the bank which has passed upon them, but all those mortgages are put together, we will say \$500,000 all told in any district, and against those mortgages these bonds are issued. Those are the bonds in which it is proposed the Treasury may invest \$100,000,000 under the bill. It is absolutely safe. They bear the interest that is specified in the bond, and beyond all question it is as sound a security as the Government could have under any circumstances for any money it may have in the Treasury.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if the bonds are not exempt from any form of taxation.

Mr. FLETCHER. They are exempt from every form, municipal, county, State, national, income tax—everything except inheritance tax.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to ask a further question. These bonds bear $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest on their face. Would not that be equal to $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think so. And more than that. The $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent bonds have sold at a premium of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, as stated, and I should say that investment is equal to at least an ordinary loan on mortgage at 6 per cent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In that case, would not the public buy these bonds instead of buying Government bonds which carry a lower rate of interest?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the very reason I stated in the outset why I could sell more farm-loan bonds than any man on this floor could sell Government securities if the effort were made in that direction. I can see how that might be pressed so far that it would interfere with the revenue coming in from the sale of war scrip and liberty bonds and all that sort of thing, and it would be to the interest of the Government to derive this revenue from other sources and then invest it in these bonds to the extent named here. It is no favor to the farmer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with the Senator from Florida. He is eminently correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no favoritism shown anywhere. There is no discrimination anywhere. This is an absolutely safe and sound proposition for the Government, and I can not see the slightest objection to it.

As I said at the outset, I do not really see the necessity for it. If proper effort were made to sell these bonds, I believe they would be sold. I can fully understand how the applications now mount up to a considerable sum, but I rather commend the Farm Loan Board for taking time to see that every borrower lives up to and complies with the law. In making the system absolutely safe, let them take enough time to do that. There is no need to hurry so fast that chances are taken or risks unnecessarily run. For that reason, up to this time, the amount of actual loans does not perhaps equal what was anticipated; but, in my judgment, that is simply an evidence of the caution and care of the board. Perhaps sometimes there have been unnecessary delays, but it is all the more commendable, so far as they are concerned, that they are exercising such care and caution. I think the conferees on the part of the Senate acted wisely when they receded from the action taken by the Senate and in yielding to the House.

I shall, of course, support the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. KENYON obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I know there are several friends of rural credits who would like to speak on this conference report, but I am sure they will forego that pleasure if the Senator from Iowa will merely let us vote on the matter now.

Mr. KENYON. I was going to make my remarks on the conference report; but, of course, if there can be a vote now taken upon it, I shall not do so.

Mr. HOLLIS. I think no other Senator will insist upon speaking on the conference report, and that we can get it out of the way. I ask that we may have a vote.

Mr. KENYON. I want to be accommodating, and if the Senator from New Hampshire will guarantee that there may be a vote I shall yield for that purpose. I am, however, compelled speedily to go to a committee meeting.

Mr. HOLLIS. I think I can guarantee that there will be an immediate vote.

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

The report was agreed to.

PEACE AND THE WORLD WAR.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of taking up much of the time of the Senate, but in view of the peace propaganda that is now spreading to some extent throughout the world I want to make a few observations about war conditions and about peace.

There has been a sort of monopoly of the Lord and His utterances by the Kaiser; but in reference to the peace which he is now attempting to bring to the world there are some things in the Holy Scriptures, familiar, of course, to all of you, but which I feel at liberty to point out, and which, it seems to me, are very applicable to his situation. The old prophet Isaiah said:

The way of peace they know not; and there is no judgment in their goings; they have made them crooked paths; whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace. (Isaiah lix, 8.)

And in Romans we find:

Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.

Their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways. And the way of peace have they not known.

There is no fear of God before their eyes. (Romans ii, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.)

Another passage in Ezekiel, which I commend to the Kaiser, who is so accustomed to quoting Scripture for his purpose, is this:

Destruction cometh; and they shall seek peace, and there shall be none. (Ezekiel vii, 25.)

We have just passed through the season of "peace on earth, good will to men." Never before in the history of the world has there been a time when there was so little peace on earth and so much hatred among men.

In the last three and a half years probably 10,000,000 men have been killed in war. Forty million, at least, are now under arms. The war is costing the world \$75,000,000 a day, and in a few years the war debts of the world will run into the trillions.

Staggering as these figures are, however, it is not a time for pessimism. Justice, somewhat delayed, is on its way to triumph; ideals are holding their place; and the world can rejoice that out of the turmoil of the past year at least one inspirational event has happened, namely, the capture of Jerusalem from the atrocity-loving Turks, and there is a firm resolve on the part of the civilized world that it shall never be returned to them.

Our Nation has loved peace and hated war. It has looked forward to the time when throughout the world "swords would be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks." It wanted no quarrel. It was willing that other nations should live and enjoy the best there was in life. It sought no territorial aggrandizement. America was content and happy itself and desired only the same for others.

The great Republic has learned, however, that it does not take two to make a quarrel. One person or one nation, determined and persistent in the determination, can always provoke a quarrel if the other individual or other nation has one spark of red blood within it.

Everyone had a right to disagree as to the wisdom of entering the war before we entered it, and to talk, work, and vote against our participation therein; but since we are in this war, and have undertaken the mightiest task the Republic has ever attempted, the right now does not exist to say or to do a single thing to make more difficult the accomplishment of the national purpose. Most of those who opposed the war, in a spirit of patriotism, I believe, now subscribe to the philosophy of DeCatur, "My country—in its dealings with foreign nations may it always be right; but right or wrong, my country!" Our people have come to better understand the great purpose of the war. Many thoughtful men who hesitated long as to the wisdom of our going into the war, who honestly believed that we might have remained out of it, are now thoroughly convinced that they were wrong, and wholeheartedly are determined that the matter shall be fought through to a peace that will make future wars impossible. The time to have kept out of the war was before we went into it. Those who are now trying to help in bringing about a patched-up peace and lend their influence in that direction are weakening the American forces, injuring the country, and interfering with the preparation we must make. We have taken hold of this tremendous job. Are we going to see it to a finish, or are we going to dilly-dally and assist in getting some kind of a peace that will amount to nothing? We had better bear in mind the words of a German statesman who a short time ago, when Germany first became anxious about the United States entering the war, said that the amount of indemnity they would ask from our country would be something like \$89,000,000,000. It will cost us more to lose this war than it will cost us to win it. They will need a better collection agency than ever yet has been devised to collect the \$89,000,000,000.

Possibly, Mr. President, we could have remained out of this war for a few years; we could have indulged in our easy, money making, and selfish life a little longer; but eventually we would have been presented with the alternative of either going into war or submitting to a vassalage of Germany. Were we ready to give up the Monroe doctrine? If Germany conquered France and England and took a part of Canada, what would we do about the proposition? Were we ready to give up the freedom of the seas? Are the people of this Nation willing to give it up now, to acknowledge the right of Germany to say to us that we could send one boat a week on certain parts of the sea, provided it was painted like a barber's pole? Were we willing to recognize that "while the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof," the sea is the Kaiser's? We would sink below a second-rate power were we to give up the freedom of the seas. What would become of our merchants, our manufacturers, our farmers, if one nation were to be permitted to dictate the markets of the world by controlling the seas? And pray, from whom did Germany secure the right to control the sea?

Thank God—and I have thanked Him more since I have witnessed some of the butchery of the conflict—we came with clean hands into this war. We did not bring on this war. We saw American citizens, women and children, go down in the *Lusitania* to a watery grave without a chance; we saw broken the promises of Germany made as to the future; we beheld the *Sussex* sinking beneath the waters wounded by a villainous

torpedo; plot upon plot was conceived in the office of Bernstorff, the German ambassador; spies invaded our land; Von Zimmermann plotted against us in Mexico and tried to arouse the Mexicans by promises of giving them portions of our country. How much longer could we have stood this reign of intrigue and trickery? Yes; we could have kept out of the war on the same theory that a man can keep out of a quarrel when another comes into his house and slaps and insults his wife. He can run out into the kitchen, crawl through the window and out into the fields, like a craven coward; but that is not the American spirit. We had one alternative presented to us, "fight or run." The American Nation found itself. It was not too proud to fight for righteousness, just as now it is too wise, or ought to be, to make peace until the menace of Prussian militarism is ended.

We did not start the angel of death fiddling over the world, but we are going to have something to say about how and when the war is going to end. We had a distinct American issue, the issue that has been presented so many times, the murdering of our people, the closing to us of the seas. We had the opportunity to fight with the allies helping us or fight the battle alone. So it was a wise choice to fight with the allies. Who can deny this now? I believe the President's course was wise, although he was subjected to such severe criticism for waiting. He kept us out of war as long as he could, but when at last we were compelled to go in he had practically a united Nation behind him.

Out of this war, incidentally, there is going to be a greater respect for American citizenship. You remember the incident of Paul. When they bound Paul he said unto the centurion that stood by him, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?" The centurion then went to the chief captain saying, "Take heed what thou doest, for this man is a Roman." And the chief captain was afraid after he knew he was a Roman, because he had bound him. So in the future when any nation attempts to injure an American citizen, wherever he has a right to be, that nation is going to hesitate, for it will be said, "Take heed what thou doest; this man is an American citizen, protected by all the power of the mightiest Nation of the earth."

There is a greater issue, however, than what might be termed merely the American issue. There is a world issue, and we can not divorce ourselves from it. We must be a part of the great world's work whether we will it or not. Destiny places us there. There are to-day, as has been pointed out, two great systems in the world struggling for the mastery—autocracy and democracy. One of these two systems must triumph. Both can not live and flourish. To make the world safe for democracy is only half. We must make the world safe for humanity. And in order to make the world safe for democracy we must do our part to see that the Anglo-Saxon race does not go down. Autocracy has been preparing for this contest for 40 years, while democracy has been sleeping. It takes some time to awaken democracy, but it is now thoroughly awake.

The German people have been taught that Germany is to rule every nation; that the voice of Germany is the voice of God; that God is a German God; that German institutions and the German system must spread over and conquer the world. I saw a poor Belgian, who had been a professor in a college, now a porter around a hotel in London, who said, "We pray to God and the Germans pray to God; and it looks as if God was a German God." The writers and thinkers of Germany have not hesitated to declare with becoming modesty that German rule is essential for the world. This self-constituted partnership, however, between the Kaiser as Emperor of Germany and the Almighty is going to be dissolved, and we are going to help do it.

I have some choice thoughts from German philosophers and writers, which I will not take the time to read, but I will refer to one from Pastor Lehmann. He says:

[Gems of German Thought.]

95. If God is for us, who can be against us? It is enough for us to be a part of God. (On the German God, by Pastor W. Lehmann, quoted in H. A. H., p. 77.)

Another great writer of Germany says:

[Gems of German Thought.]

116. There lurks in our people something of the God consciousness which inspired the Old Testament prophets. Very childlike, indeed, but of far deeper meaning than he could guess was the saying of a little boy to his playmate at the outbreak of the war, "I am not in the least afraid. The good God will help us, for he is German." (K. Engelbrecht, D. D. D. K., p. 45.)

I will ask, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD other extracts to which I have referred, without taking the time to read them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

[Gems of German Thought.]

We thank our German Army that it has kept spotless the shield of humanity and chivalry. It is true we believe that every bone of a German soldier, with his heroic heart and immortal soul, is worth more than a cathedral. (Prof. W. Kahl, D. R. S. Z., No. 6, p. 5.)

96. We have become a nation of wrath; we think only of the war. We execute God's almighty will and the edicts of his justice we will fulfill, imbued with holy rage, in vengeance upon the ungodly. God calls us to murderous battles, even if worlds should thereby fall to ruins. We are woven together like the chastening lash of war; we flame aloft like the lightning; like gardens of roses our wounds blossom at the gates of heaven. (F. Philippi, quoted in H. A. H., p. 52.)

101. The German soul is the world's soul. God and Germany belong to one another. (On the German God, by Pastor W. Lehmann, quoted in H. A. H., p. 83.)

142. I look upon it as absolutely the deepest feature of the German character, this passionate love of right, of justice, of morality. This is something which the other nations have not got. (On the German God, by Pastor W. Lehmann, quoted in H. A. H., p. 79.)

185. The German must conquer; and when once he has conquered—to-day or in a hundred years—no duty is more urgent than that of forcing the German language upon the world. (H. S. Chamberlain, K. A., p. 33.)

Mr. KENYON. I stood one evening a little way below San Quentin, near the third line of trenches. It was a Sunday evening. I stood outside in the utter blackness of the night, just about church time in our own country. As far as you could see, the flashes of the great guns were visible, some of them 20 miles away, that you could not hear, others nearer. Rockets were going up from No Man's Land. I had read a book going over on the boat, called "Where Is God?" and as that scene unfolded before me in the blackness of the night, hell-fire literally on black cloth, I could not help repeating that question, "Where is God, that lets a thing like this go on?"

Germany, in her opinion, is in partnership with the Almighty. This system that she has developed is not one of advanced civilization, as we have been taught in the past; it is merely a system of the beast.

Germany is attempting to terrorize the world. She does not understand the spirit of the British or the American people. They know a "bluff" when they see it, because each one has tried it on the other so many times, and they are not frightened by bluff. Terrorism does not dismay them, especially when their cause is just. Can it be possible that the thinking people of Germany, if there are any thinking people left, believe that their conduct can bring about peace? Do they believe that the wild vaporings of the Kaiser as to the mailed fist are going to frighten anybody? They have left a reign of terror through Belgium and northern France; but Belgium, with only a little territory left, amounting to two or three counties, is not dismayed, nor is France.

A leading Frenchman said to me when we were talking about the Germans and their victory in Italy, "Better give up Venice"—it looked then as if they would take it—"better give up Rome, give up Venice; better give up everything but liberty." You can not conquer such a people.

I am glad, Mr. President, that in this great contest to make this whole world a safe place for ordinary individuals to live in we can help France. All of us, I think, feel pretty deeply on that subject. We go back to the time when France looked upon us as a little struggling Nation in the great family of nations, trying to struggle into the light. We needed help. They came. People stood at the old Liberty Hall at Philadelphia and watched Rochambeau as he went by with his troops to Yorktown. Lafayette came, willing to give up his life for this country. France cast its bread upon the waters a hundred years ago. Now, almost wrecked, bleeding at every pore, the great Republic comes none too soon.

The Rainbow Regiment happened to land in France—portions of it—at ports that can not be mentioned because of the censorship. I happened to see, a day or two afterwards, a gentleman who saw the landing. He said: "These boats waited for a day or so at the harbor; then they drew up to the dock, lined with boys in the American uniform," and that is a great sight. I saw myself three transports come in loaded down with those boys in the American uniform. "The people had assembled in this town. They all knew Americans were coming, and as the boats came up, one after the other," he said, "a band somewhere started playing the Marseillaise." He noticed a little girl with her mother on the dock trying to talk and her mother trying to explain, and he heard the words "Americaner, Americaner." Finally the little girl comprehended it, and she turned and put her arms around her mother, and, in French, uttered these English words: "Oh, Mother, they have come to save us!"

It is a great thing, Mr. President, to have part in saving a nation like France. I do not mean by that to have any part in getting back any territory to France. I do not believe we are carrying on war for that purpose; but, as a part of saving

civilization, we are saving those poor people of France, and they look up to us as a poor, weak sister to a great, strong brother coming to save her. When this war is over, I have said before and I reiterate it, I hope this great, rich Nation will say to poor, bleeding France: "Keep all of the money we have loaned you. We ask not for the return of a single dollar."

I had occasion a short time ago to go through northern France. Wreckage and ruin were everywhere—inconceivable ruin. Herculaneum and Pompeii were never more ruined than some of these cities of France. Having done this, no wonder the Kaiser is willing to move out! No wonder he is willing to have peace! Count Von Hertling's terms, if I read them right the other day, were that, as to northern France, it was to be subject to the self-determination of the people there. Let the people of northern France determine whether they want to stay with France, with their men practically killed off, with the German intrigues and the German treachery and the German money that can come in there! Any hand that ever signed a peace treaty for this country that did not demand the restoration of northern France ought to be palsied by the Almighty.

On the remaining walls of the buildings of many of these towns are written the words, "Nicht argern; nur wendern" ("Rage not; only wonder"). Cathedrals have been destroyed everywhere, and on the walls of some of them are written, "With the love of your enemies." They destroy the cathedrals and then wire to the noble troops: "On with God!"

In the case of the old cathedral at Albert, with the statue of the Madonna and the child Jesus—a beautiful cathedral before this war—even the Madonna was not sacred. It has been shelled until the figure of the Madonna reaches out at right angles, holding over the stricken town the little figure of the child Jesus. Yes; "on with God!"

I want to put in the Record another one of those choice gems of thought in that connection, by Prof. Kolb:

We thank our German Army, that has kept spotless the shield of humanity and chivalry. It is true that we believe that every bone of a German soldier, with his heroic heart and immortal soul, is worth more than a cathedral.

Count von Hertling recently said in a speech that Germany was saving Europe from America. Saving it—what mockery! I do not want to indulge in any recitation of horrors or atrocities. I think there have been brought to this country stories of atrocities that are tremendously exaggerated, but the truth is enough. Matters that are subject to absolute proof are enough. Saving Europe from America—yes!

They have placed women and children before their soldiers in charges against the French troops. That is not a matter of dispute. They have shelled the Red Cross hospitals. That is a matter I am ready to prove. They have killed the wounded after the battles. Germany has lost its soul. Could a nation that had a soul permit such things to go on? It has no honor. It has broken every treaty made and every provision of The Hague conferences. It has observed no chivalry in the freemasonry of arms. It has killed prisoners, poisoned wells, carried girls away for worse than death. It has treated women as beasts. Along the highways of France you will see the fruit trees cut down. You will see in the little peasants' yards, what there is left of them, rose bushes destroyed—pure vandalism, with no military purpose. You will be told: "We are coming to a town now; you had better get out." You get out of your automobile and inquire: "Where is the town?" "This is the town"—nothing but cellar holes; absolute wreck and ruin. All that is left of one town, Fricourt, is a little board marked "Fricourt."

Rather than have the things come to our country that have been dealt out by the Huns to Belgium and northern France, rather than have the women of our country treated as those women have been treated, we had better die, every man of us; and we will die, every one of us, if we are men, before permitting it.

One man alone is responsible. He can sit in his splendor, with his entire family around him. None of his sons have gone down in battle. True, indeed, was the response of the Belgian woman to a German soldier chiding her about their lost country when she said, "I would rather have a king who has lost his country than an emperor who has lost his soul." It is not the Germany of the old days, of Schubert's Symphony, of Liszt, of Schiller, of Beethoven, of Goethe. It is the Germany of lust and murder.

Do we wonder at any cruelty when we know that the Kaiser, through his boyhood days and young manhood, despised his own mother?

What can be expected from a man who despises his mother? It is that same spirit that has permeated Germany—the spirit

of the Kaiser addressing his troops embarking for China, when he said: "When you come in touch with the enemy, give no quarter; take no prisoners. A thousand years ago the Huns, under their king, Attila, made themselves a name which still lives in tradition. Do you likewise. Strike home, so that for a thousand years to come no Chinaman dare look askance at Germany."

This is the man who now wants peace, but wants his kind of peace. Will America nibble at his bait?

What a horrible heritage Germany is handing down to her posterity, if there be any posterity left! If one were asked to give his judgment as to the worst thing that Germany has done in the war, what could he say?

He who loved art and sculpture might answer: "The destruction of such magnificent cathedrals as Rheims, Arras, and others, shows the vandalism of the Hun."

Another would say: "Where could you find a worse atrocity than the bombing of Red Cross hospitals?"

Another would reply: "Ah, yes; that is infamous, but what do you say to the torpedoing of hospital ships, sending poor, suffering men, struggling even then for their lives, down to the depths, without a chance to escape?"

Another would say the worst thing that has been done was dropping bombs on defenseless women and children.

Others would protest that the taking of women and girls from Belgium and northern France, compelling them to work against their own country, and subjecting them to every kind of infamy, could not be exceeded in cruelty.

Another would say that the shelling of boats on which people were trying to escape from torpedoed ships reached the heights of infamy; and so the list would go on.

Among all the damning cruelties that have been inflicted by the Huns it would be difficult to pick the worst, but the all-dominating fact is that the very making and bringing about of this war is the worst fact in connection with it. It did not come spontaneously. It was not started to protect any rights. It came about through a system of intrigue practiced throughout the world, through a training of the German people that their mission was to subdue others, and that no one had a right to live without their consent. We are engaged now in teaching them that the people of the world propose to live without their aid or consent.

Germany and Austria are in a conspiracy against freedom. We have declared war against Austria, and it is well. Germany is assisting Turkey. No nation can be a partner of Turkey without being an accessory to Turkey's infamous crimes. We ought to declare war against Turkey unless there be some good reason otherwise.

America's part in this great contest can not be overestimated. The allies are counting upon us for tremendous things. The great problem of transportation is, of course, the most difficult for us, but it is a problem that we will solve. We talk of sending soldiers by the million, and we will; but we must realize the difficulties of this problem. We will solve it much sooner if all ambitions and wranglings are laid aside upon the part of those who have charge of the construction of our ships.

Ships, ships, and more ships is the cry of the hour. Our duty is to hasten. The Russian situation has added to our responsibilities. France is calling loudly to us for help. The saddest words this Nation can ever write, if it fails in this emergency by reason of delay will be the words, "too late." There are no sadder words in language. When the Savior in the Garden of Gethsemane asked His disciples to watch with Him and they went to sleep and, coming back again and again to them, the Savior said: "Sleep on now; it is too late." May no historian write those words as an epitaph for the great Republic. England was almost too late. Had it not been for the magnificent inspiration, courage, and wise statesmanship of one man she would have been too late. That man stands as the most beloved man among the continental allies, the Premier of England, Lloyd-George.

Peculiarly are the various forces correlated in this war. Infantry can do nothing without artillery, artillery but little without airships, airships do nothing unless they are transported across the sea. The peculiar relationship of artillery and airships is illustrated by an incident near Vimy Ridge.

Infantry can not be used without artillery. Artillery in this war is of but little use without the aeroplane. The great guns shelling day and night accomplish a purpose of course. The continual hammering destroys the morale of the opposition troops. The allies are putting over into the Boches, as they call them, at least five shells to one the other way. This would indicate that the allies are superior in artillery. But there is the aeroplane. When I heard this discussion about aeroplanes blinding Germany I did not attach the same im-

portance to them that I did when I saw them floating above trenches, going over and making sketches of enemy positions and wireless back to the gunners. I might relate a little incident as illustrating that. At a certain place a great gun was under the hill and had to shoot up the hill and over to a German battery, possibly 4 miles away. The aeroplane hovered high. At the first shot of this great gun under the hill where they could not see the enemy the airship wireless back "100 kilometers too far." At the next shot "50 kilometers short." The next shot landed squarely on the battery. That would not have been accomplished possibly in hundreds of shots without the aeroplane. So I come back from witnessing some of those performances firm in my belief that with the artillery and the aeroplane we must win this war. The more aeroplanes we get the better, and the sooner we get them there to blind Germany the better. Ten thousand aeroplanes starting from behind the lines on a trip to Berlin would come mighty near nailing the Stars and Stripes on the flagpole of the Kaiser.

When you travel the ocean nowadays you realize that tremendous problem regarding ships. That includes destroyers, and I pause to say that we have done marvelous work with our destroyers. The captain of one of the great ocean liners told me that within three days after the American destroyers arrived it was noticeable in the submarine campaign.

Nobody can say we have not done anything in this war, because the record of our destroyers is a proud record. They are beautiful little instruments of the sea. They especially appear beautiful when you have been five or six days wondering what the submarine zone is going to look like, and you find them aside your boat some morning four or five hundred miles out from the Irish coast. They bob up and down, with the waves going over them. Those boys never sit down. At a meal they eat out of their hands. They are some of the unnamed and unknown heroes of this war, and they seem to have a new way of doing this. Instead of circling around as the British destroyers and the French destroyers, when they see a submarine they go right straight for it. There are chances in that; oh, yes; but they are swift enough and skillful enough almost to dodge the submarine, and the submarine has learned it. The American boys on these destroyers have put the fear of God into the commanders of the submarines. Let us increase the destroyers until wherever there is a submarine the destroyers will be after them and the sea will be rid of the most hellish of satanic devices pressed to completion by the devil's chief of staff, commonly known as the Kaiser.

In this era of criticism I pause here to remark that no criticism has been made of our Navy. Lloyd-George a few days ago congratulated our Nation on the splendid work of our Navy. Let no one say we have done nothing in this war. We helped to destroy the submarine. Our Navy is doing some of the most essential work of the war. All honor to the boys of the American Navy, to the work of Admiral Sims, and to the splendidly efficient Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels.

Our boys over there are doing splendid work. If we can not go over and fight, let us insist that they shall have everything reasonably necessary to their comfort. Heroes, all of them! Let it never be said that the great Republic does not care for the wives and children left behind, and may it never be that those boys over there when they shall come home, as most of them will, will ever be in want.

Now, I want to say something about this. It will not suit some of my friends. I have observed in the papers criticism of the drunkenness of the American soldiers and comment as to certain diseases. As to those diseases I want to say that they are less than a fraction of 1 per cent—less than the statistics would show of any large city in this country. As to the drunkenness, I am as good a prohibitionist, I claim, as anybody in this country. I am commonly and usually denounced as a crank on that subject. I hate the liquor business. I will hit it every time I get a chance. But I want to say to my prohibitionist friends, "Don't father the stories of drunkenness among our boys across the sea." I have seen church publications for which I have great respect setting this matter forth. It is not so. You may find here and there a drunken man in the Army, just as you might a number of years ago in the Senate. That does not condemn the whole institution.

I want to say to you, my prohibition friends, we prohibitionists have a job on our hands. It is the important job of getting constitutional prohibition in this country, getting the amendment ratified by the States. That is job enough for us. That is going to keep us busy. When we do that we have done a tremendous work along the lines of ending the liquor business. But for this war let us not make it harder for the men in command over there by accusing our American boys of drunken-

ness. There is a man over there, the head of affairs, who is a temperate man, a God-fearing, a clean man, a fighter from the word "go," no blower, no grandstander, just an ordinary, thrifty fighter—Gen. Pershing. He can look after that question better than you and I can here in comfortable chairs. Gen. Pershing does not want a drunken army. Gen. Pershing does not want a diseased army. Gen. Pershing is just as much interested in the cause of our Army and in the great fight we are in as you and I. Now, let us quit this and leave that matter to Pershing. I hope that is not treason to the prohibition cause, but if it is they will have to make the best of it.

These boys are there for serious fighting purposes. Up Vimy Ridge the Canadians went and took it in two hours of tremendous fighting. It is interesting to know that 9,000 American boys went up the hill with them, storming the German lines, and one of the first flags to be planted on Vimy Ridge was the Stars and Stripes, carried by a lean, lank Texan.

While the Russian situation is not to our wish, let us be charitable with the Russian people. They have done great work in the past. They saved the west line. Let us be thankful for what Russia has done and prepare all the more to take her place in this contest. We must bring to the western front 2,000,000 men and have a million in reserve. We must do it as quickly as possible. We must cut the red tape, stop quarreling over the kind of guns and like things, and carry this thing through on business principles. Is it not possible for each individual in this country to quit thinking about what some one else should do and resolve to do everything he can do? It is not enough to do our bit. We must do our best. Is it not possible for each individual in this country to think about his Nation and get rid of every element of selfishness? There is too much grandstanding and limelighting; too much telling what everyone else should do; too much patriotic posing, and not enough of sacrifice.

There is no reason for gloom. It took Great Britain two years to get on a firm war basis. We need not be discouraged. The British and French will hold the line until we can come; but come we must with all reasonable speed that we can summon. If our men are not there, properly armed, they will be a liability instead of an asset. Never again will this Nation be found in such condition of unpreparedness, and one of the best preparations for future trouble will be universal military training.

They are sacrificing over there. What are we doing over here? The people of Great Britain and France have gone to the limit of sacrifice. Have we even reached the point of feeling it? We need not worry about the spirit of our people. It is right.

The women in England and France are in the munitions factories, they are in every kind of factory, hundreds of thousands of them also car conductors, truck drivers, motor-bus drivers. They have earned, it is conceded over there by their conduct during the war, the right to participate fully in the franchise, and I hope that right is coming to them here.

We need not worry, however, about the spirit of our people. We must think of what they are doing and the condition they are in. I think I rode 15 miles along the battle field of the Somme with graves on each side. Up the hill at Verdun a great cemetery was so full of graves of the French that they had to add an addition to it, and on the Marne, where the German soldier is sleeping side by side with the French soldier, there are palms over the French graves, so there is just a great sea of palms. Those people have made the supreme test.

The patriotism of one section of the country is no greater than the patriotism of the other. We are united solidly for this contest. We are ready for sacrifice and will meet the test. Let us love this country as we would our mother. And what sacrifices we would make for our mother! Men of the East and of the West, of the North and the South, are brothers in patriotism.

Patriotism does not consist in attending banquets with seven or eight courses to argue the food conservation question. Nor is it particularly evidenced by rising when the orchestra plays the Star-Spangled Banner and then rushing to the telegraph office and wiring Members of Congress, "For God's sake, not to increase the taxes on those things that affect us." We must search our souls in this country. We must quit thinking about ourselves; about what our neighbor is doing. We must cease criticizing others unless we are doing more than we think they should. We must think in terms of war; marshal our industries; marshal the spirits of our people not to expect profits; nor desire to grow rich during the war.

It is not enough to do our bit. That is, I think, an unfortunate expression. It is not enough to do our bit, but to do our best.

America is responding splendidly; the great Red Cross movement glorifying the womanhood of our country, the Young Men's

Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, bring the little touch of home to the boys over there. And on the liberty loan the whole country has responded nobly and will continue so to do. Our business for the next year or two is war, and we will have to bend every energy of our being; every particle of our thought to that task. Let side issues wait. We will learn the lesson of thrift and economy. Congress should set the example.

In this same feeling of sacrifice I refer to a bill I introduced here for which I have received the usual customary denunciation of being a demagogue, a bill to reduce the salaries of Members of Congress. I do not know that it will pass. I am not here to argue that every Member of this body and the other body is not illy paid; but regardless of that, in this era of scrimping and sacrifice, what an example it would be to the people of this country if Congress would voluntarily during the war put its salary back to where it was before it was raised the last time. Oh, yes; we have lots of duties, of course, and we have children to educate, and all these things, and we can not live on our salary; that is the talk. Go across the water and see what they are living on. Members of the House of Commons receive \$2,000 a year. We could do it if we would. It would be a great thing for this country. We have our meatless days and our wheatless days and sweetless days, and I hope "porkless" days in legislation.

Patriotism is awake in the land. It may not all be of the shouting kind; but oftentimes the deep, quiet patriotism is more lasting. We have shown it in every crisis in which our country was involved.

To-day the grandsons of the men who fought with Sherman and the grandsons of the men who fought with Lee are fighting under the Stars and Stripes, side by side with the tricolors of France, for the freedom of the people of the world.

Out of this war will come great things to our people. We will have no hyphenated Americanism in this country. Those in our country enjoying the blessings of American liberty, who are continually trying to harass the Government, who seem to like some other country better than this, had better go to that country just as quickly as they possibly can. If not voluntarily, be assisted there. It is not a time for partisanship nor politics and, may I say, it is no time for inefficiency in any departments of our Government. I wish in this spirit of nonpartisanship that pervades our country to-day we could have a coalition Cabinet, made up of the strongest men of the Nation. What enthusiasm it would bring to the people of this country if we had a coalition Cabinet, with Elihu Root and Theodore Roosevelt members thereof; if in some of the missions abroad the services could be utilized of such a great American as William Howard Taft. It is not injurious to the war that we have criticism. Honest criticism is helpful; honest criticism will help in winning the war; criticism helps bring out inefficiency, and inefficiency wherever it may be—in the heads of bureaus, in Congress, or in the Cabinet—must go, and the sooner it goes the better.

There is one thought that we should get into the German skulls—and it may take a surgical operation to do it—the thought that after the war the civilized nations of the world will not trade with Germany.

I had a State senator from my State down here. He had a pencil, which he was carrying, marked "Made in Germany." He cut off that part before he went to bed that night, but said he got to thinking about it, so in the night he got up and threw the pencil out of the window. That is the way the world is going to feel if this thing keeps up.

Who will buy German goods after the war? Who wants anything in their homes made by the same hands that have shot poor little children and women of Belgium; hands that have bayoneted women and carried away as relics parts of women's breasts? Who wants any utensils made by those who have carried women and children into exile; who have blown up the homes of the people in northern France; who have sent women and children down into the seas with the hellish torpedo and submarine; who have shelled boats in which people were trying to escape from their devilish work; who have let drop the murderous bomb upon hospitals where men were already living in pain; who have blotted out from the sky, contrary to all edicts of warfare, poor men and their families. Who wants anything made by the outlaw? Let her take her products to hell. That is the only place she should find a market. She has been such an ally of the devil that he might assist her. Let Germany know that the world knows her word can not be believed; that her treaties are nothing. She knows she can have no virile national life without commerce, and the civilized world will refuse to have any dealings with her when the war is over.

There is much talk in the world about peace. Yes; everyone would want an honorable peace. We are fighting for a permanent peace. Everyone would want the slaughter to stop. The world is weary of war. But how can there be peace? Can

you sit down and work out a peace problem with a mad dog? Do you desire to sit down at a table and formulate peace plans with one who has been engaged in killing members of your family? You may say that while your family has been killed, and while death is the penalty for murder, it will cost the life of a sheriff or two to take the man. Hence it would be better to sit down and enter into peace terms. No red-blooded man would say it. When the Kaiser takes his bloody hands off of Belgium and France it will be time enough to consider peace. The Kaiser is a multimurderer and a murderer in the first degree. The punishment for murder in the first degree everywhere is death. A million deaths would not atone for what he has done, but one is all that can be administered to him.

In traveling over the sea and witnessing the deadly submarine peril a few weeks ago, I could not help wishing that the Kaiser might be compelled to traverse the sea in an unprotected boat with submarines shooting at him every now and then along his course.

In the ruined towns of France I could not help wishing that the great palaces of the Kaiser might be blown up in like fashion.

In witnessing an air raid on London I could not keep from my heart the desire that the Kaiser might be placed where the bombs from the infernal machines could drop around him.

When I saw the trenches and the brave boys in the wet and cold standing through the night, I wished the Kaiser might be compelled to stand for days and nights in those trenches with the shells and the hand grenades and the machine guns popping at him.

If there is no hell, there ought to be one. It has been suggested that the Kaiser be turned over to a jury of the civilized world under an indictment for millions of murders, rapes without number, and let the jury of the civilized world pass on his cause before talking about peace. What would be the use of any Hague conferences in the future? What would be the sense of making any treaties? Do you want to sit down with the Turkish partner of the Kaiser, their hands dripping with the blood of the Christian people of Armenia, and talk about a righteous peace? Do we want peace by neglecting duty? Far be it from us. As a Scotch second lieutenant said to me near one of the battle fields, "Of course, we do not like this. We would like to go home, but we will fight this thing through, and the Kaiser has no more chance of whipping us than a celluloid cat has to catch an asbestos rat in hell." Good spirit those boys have. Peace, yes, but not with the Hohenzollern. When they abdicate we can talk peace with the German people. This Nation must be very careful as to the great propaganda now being started by Germany throughout the world to create a sentiment in every country favorable to the peace terms promulgated by Germany, which would, in fact, be a German peace. This is another gold brick. Let us beware.

In my humble judgment, nothing could assist Germany more than this present peace talk, and the talk likewise that Germany is exhausted. Peace is alluring, of course; no one wants to stand against it; everyone wants peace; but what use is an unavailing peace, and what would it amount to now? A mere expedient, requiring going over the ground again in a few years unless Germany should submit to disarmament. There can be no lasting peace without disarmament. Will Germany submit to disarmament unless Great Britain submits to giving up its navy? Does anyone believe that Great Britain will be willing to give up its navy? But the day must come when there shall be disarmament throughout the world if we are to have peace.

Analyze the terms of the attempted treaty to be made with the Russians. If Russia falls into this trap and accepts the peace terms, Germany will be stronger than she ever has been before in her sphere of influence. Russia is learning the lesson of German duplicity. No one can talk peace with a person not on the square, nor with a nation likewise. Germany is not on the square. In dealing with tricksters, beware. Germany is the greatest trickster of all the ages. Let us not be gassed at this time with peace talk. It is an alluring but asphyxiating gas for us. This is a time for resolution; for nerve; for firmness; a time to have our eyes open and our ears open as to the tremendous propaganda with which Germany is attempting to spread peace talk throughout the world.

We started out, so we were informed by high authority, to end the Hohenzollern reign, in order that the world might have permanent peace; that is our purpose. Let us plow that furrow straight to the end and not be diverted from it; let us not become wearied before we have started. Lloyd-George defined Great Britain's terms a few days ago, and the President later, with great clearness, has declared our terms. I do not believe, speaking only for myself, that our people would be willing to wage a great war across the sea merely in order that Alsace

and Lorraine might be returned to France; but we need not cavil about that, because that is merely incidental to the main purpose. Our purpose is well defined—to end the menace of Prussian militarism. If out of that shall come Alsace and Lorraine to France, we will rejoice, but we are not fighting for that. Different allies may have different objects, and hence fight together without binding each to the particular object of the other. Our present business is clear—to help win this war; and all of these incidental questions can then be settled.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to say that we have a peace in our country. It is "that peace that passeth all understanding." It is a peace amid the roar of the cannon and the bursting of the shells. It is the peace that comes from the lasting conscience of America. It is a peace of mind, a peace of righteousness, a peace that comes to us because we know we are fighting to save worth-while civilization, for a civilization based on justice and not on greed, with that peace of mind which the military powers of Germany can not understand we war on.

America knows now why it is in this war. Our country knows that democracy can not be safe in America if autocracy succeeds in Europe. We learned in 1861 that this Nation could not be half slave and half free, and so we know to-day that the world can not be half cruelly autocratic and half humanely democratic. We know that righteousness and not ruthlessness must rule the world. There is a deep, set purpose in the hearts of our people to fulfill every obligation to the great duty that God has placed upon us. Loyalty, sacrifice, efficiency will win this war. In this contest of the allies and the United States, which the historian will regard as the most unselfish of all times on our part, to preserve the freedom of men and women throughout the universe, we rejoice to believe that there is no East, no West, no North, no South; a united people under one flag, marching on to the music of humanity; a people undecieved and unbeguiled by false peace moves born of German intrigue; a people determined that when peace comes it shall be a permanent peace; a people with vision enough to know that a peace now, without the destruction of the Prussian military machine, means simply getting ready for another terrific war. This people, devoted to peace, with the highest ideals of humanity, with the most unselfish purposes, knowing that no permanent peace can come by any arrangement with the present ruling class of Germany, fight on with determination and with their faces fully to the light.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question for information. Before doing so I wish simply to state that the Senator has made a very able, interesting, and instructive address, and one which, I am sure, has been enjoyed by his colleagues, as it will be appreciated by the country. The Senator has personally visited the front, as I understand, and in his address he has stated that in one gallant charge in a battle which I think took place before the declaration of war between this country and Germany—

Mr. KENYON. Just after that.

Mr. THOMPSON. There were 9,000 Americans who participated. Did the Senator learn, or can he tell us, without giving any confidential information, as to the number of Americans who had volunteered prior to that time for service with the allies and also the number who have gone to the front since that time?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator asks me two questions. I can not give the exact information in reply to the first question, and hence I rather dislike to answer it. The general understanding is that somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 American boys were with the troops of the allies before we declared war. The number of our troops now in France I have heard estimated by very competent authority, but would prefer that the Senator secure that information from the War Department.

During the delivery of Mr. KENYON's speech,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will suspend a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of print paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that the unfinished business be laid aside until the Senator from Iowa finishes his address, when I shall call up the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. KENYON's speech,

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the appeal of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that America should do her utmost in this war, of course, will be appreciated and responded to by every loyal man. I have myself believed—and I wish to call the attention of the Senate to it—that, as a means of coercing Germany, we ought to take concrete, direct, positive steps to organize all of the world against Germany—the financial powers of the world and the commercial powers of the world, as well as the naval and military forces of the world. It would be entirely possible for the United States, through proper representations and through proper missions sent to the Republics of South America, to bring every one of those Republics into this gigantic conflict for democracy. We ought to organize the world together, so that the combined powers of the world that are against the German militaristic policy should serve notice upon the German people, who are backing the Kaiser in this war, that the whole world are defensively and offensively organized to establish liberty and justice and to fight the Hohenzollern ambition to rule the world by force to the death. To let the German people know the truth if they can be made to see it, and, if not, to enforce the rights of nations by the material, industrial, commercial, and military powers of an organized world. The psychology of this upon the German people now, I believe, would have a substantial effect in bringing about a realization in that country what the possibilities for harm may be if the German people continue to uphold the Kaiser in the making of this wicked, unwarranted, prearranged war, which has no purpose except the glorification and extension of the powers of his own dynasty.

SUPPLY OF PRINT PAPER.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of print paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Arizona if he will not allow the joint resolution to be laid aside to-day? There are three examinations going on now by committees of the Senate. There are two Members of the Senate who desire to speak on this measure who are in attendance on those committees. They expected to speak between the hours of 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock to-day, while the committee stood in recess, but they had to leave even before the close of the splendid address of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. Inasmuch as an executive session is desired now, I will ask the Senator if he will not allow the Senate to go into executive session? I know of no other business that is to come up to-morrow, so we can take up the Senator's measure in the morning hour, and then go on with it for the full day.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, it is almost impossible for me to resist a reasonable appeal, or any appeal, from the Senator from Utah. My desire to secure early action on this measure is, as I have heretofore suggested, largely personal. I have the joint resolution under charge. If I could leave it to other hands, I would not press it to a vote at any particular time; but I feel that it is necessary for me to get away from Washington, and I will have to get away as quickly as I possibly can.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I am safe in saying to the Senator that the joint resolution will pass before the end of the week.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If I could be certain that I could get this joint resolution through—

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I want to make a statement before the colleague of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] modifies what he has stated. If I could obtain a vote on the joint resolution, or if I could to-day obtain unanimous consent for a final disposition of the measure, I would be glad to yield for an executive session. Of course, an agreement to vote on the joint resolution would involve the adoption or the voting down of the amendments which I have suggested. The amendments, as Senators know without my telling, have been suggested very largely on my own initiative, because in many particulars I have thought the joint resolution had gone further in the direction of seizure of property or the products of property than it ought to go, and, accordingly, the amendments I have offered have been due to an effort on my part, after consultation with the one man on the Federal Trade Board who knew more about the subject than I or anybody else, to liberalize the measure to the point of making no seizure, and

probably none would be made under the amendments I have proposed.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say to the Senator that I do not think there is going to be any particular discussion upon the amendments the Senator has offered. The remarks that were to be made were to be made upon the joint resolution itself.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. On the principle of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; on the principle of the joint resolution. I do not want now to have the Senators who desire to speak called from the committees on which they are in attendance. The Senator realizes the urgent necessity of those hearings coming to a close as soon as possible.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I appreciate that very fully. I should like to ask the leader of the majority, my friend, the Senator from Virginia, if he knows of any probability of this joint resolution being displaced by any other important matters in the Senate?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very sure that there will be no attempt to displace the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I will vote with him at any time against any proposition to displace it as the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I yield for a motion for an executive session, with the understanding that the joint resolution remains the unfinished business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 11, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1918.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Louis Brownlow, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner for the District of Columbia for a term of three years. A reappointment; term expires January 21, 1918.

AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

David C. Reay, of Morgantown, W. Va., to be Auditor for the Interior Department, in place of Oscar A. Price, resigned.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John T. Cogan, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak., vice John E. Kelley, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 10, 1918.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

H. Clay Sharkey, to be receiver of public moneys at Jackson, Miss.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

William F. Cummins, to be register of the land office at Jackson, Miss.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals:

Thomas W. Kinkaid,
William S. Smith,
Spencer S. Wood,
Joseph L. Jayne,
Charles W. Dyson,
Clarence S. Williams, and
John D. McDonald.

The following-named commanders to be captains:

Clark D. Stearns,
Robert K. Crank,
Henry B. Price,
Stephen V. Graham,
William P. Scott,
Joseph M. Reeves,
Roscoe C. Moody,
Frank Lyon,
John McC. Luby,
Hutch I. Cone,
Robert W. McNeely,
George E. Gelm,
Frank H. Brumby,

James P. Morton,
George L. P. Stone,
Harris Laning,
Franklin D. Karns,
David W. Todd,
John V. Klemann,
Henry V. Butler,
Walter R. Gherardi,
James J. Raby,
William H. Standley, and
Kenneth M. Bennett.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Hilary Williams,
Fletcher L. Sheffield,
Louis Shane,
Henry C. Dinger,
Walter G. Roper,
Allen Buchanan,
Richard D. White,
Hollis T. Winston,
Frederick R. Nalle,
Emil P. Svarz,
Herbert C. Cocke,
William V. Tomb,
Bayard T. Bulmer,
Lewis Coxe,
Robert T. Menner,
Benjamin G. Barthallow,
Merlyn G. Cook,
Wallace Bertholf,
Frank McCommon,
Theodore A. Kittinger,
Guy Whitlock,
Jesse B. Gay,
Levin J. Wallace,
James O. Richardson,
James P. Murdock,
David A. Weaver,
Neil Nichols,
Otto C. Dowling,
Charles W. Early,
Wilson Brown, Jr.,
Robert Henderson,
Edward C. S. Parker,
Joseph O. Fisher,
William T. Conn, Jr.,
John H. Blackburn,
Frank B. Freyer,
Carlos Bean,
Roscoe C. Davis,
William D. Puleston,
Charles W. Densmore,
David Lyons,
Joseph F. Daniels,
Gaston DeP. Johnstone,
Frank Rorschach,
Stephen C. Rowan,
Walter S. Anderson,
Henry D. Cooke,
Samuel M. Robinson,
William W. Smyth,
Ralston S. Holmes,
Francis J. Cleary,
Fred H. Poteet,
William J. Giles,
Ralph A. Koch,
Lamar R. Leahy,
Milton S. Davis,
Charles C. Moses, and
Sam C. Loomis.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Charles C. Ross,
Howard M. Lammers,
Archer M. R. Allen, and
Francis J. Comerford.

The following-named officers to be ensigns:

Eugene L. Richardson,
Bennie C. Phillips,
James D. Rorabaugh,
Loar Mansbach,
William Pollock,
Fred J. Pope,
Louis M. Palmer,

George H. Wheeler,
Alexander S. Neilson,
George H. Cooley, and
Elias Q. Horton.

Lieut. Commander Ward K. Wortman to be a commander.

Lieut. Commander Frank D. Berrien to be a commander.

Lieut. Herbert B. Riebe to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Herman E. Welte to be a lieutenant.

The following-named medical directors to be medical directors with rank of rear admiral:

Edward R. Sitt and

George H. Barber.

Asst. Surg. William W. Hargrave to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Commander Luke McNamee to be a captain.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

William R. Sayles, jr.,

Kenneth G. Castleman,

Ward K. Wortman,

Frank D. Berrien,

Charles R. Train,

William P. Cronan,

Hugo W. Osterhaus,

Charles P. Huff, and

Byron A. Long.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

A. Beall, jr.,

William A. Hall,

Herbert B. Riebe,

John P. Miller,

Owen Bartlett,

Edward S. Moses,

John F. Connor,

William H. Booth,

Edwin B. Woodworth,

James P. Olding,

Walter W. Lorshbough,

Douglas L. Howard,

Pierre L. Wilson,

Stuart W. Cake,

Archibald G. Stirling,

John T. G. Stapler,

Lesley B. Anderson,

John S. McCain,

Matthias E. Manly,

Ronan C. Grady,

Reuben L. Walker, and

Alexander Sharp, jr.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Zachary Lansdowne,

Herbert R. A. Borchardt, and

Archibald McGlasson.

The following-named officers to be ensigns:

Howard W. Kitchin,

Walter S. Gallagher,

William W. Cole,

Karl E. F. Sorensen,

Jeremiah K. Cronin,

Allen J. Gahagan,

Bruce M. Parmenter,

Benjamin F. Schmidt,

James W. Lennon,

Frank S. Miller,

Arthur Boileau,

William A. Tattersall,

William J. Russell,

Benjamin F. Blume,

Robert J. Ford,

William J. Poland,

Haden H. Phares,

John P. Conraddi,

Thomas Fertner,

James Moran,

Ellis H. Roach,

Emil H. Petri,

Olaf J. Dahl,

Ralph F. Streitz,

Warren W. Wesley,

Stephen J. Drellishak,

August Skolasky,

Edwin F. Bilson,

Werner E. Follin,

James J. Morgan,

Frederick Bense,

Carl E. Nelson,

Carter E. Parker,

Charles M. May,

Walter H. Thomas,

Frederick G. Lemke,

Lester M. Harvey,

Edmund F. Sale,

Adolf J. Hofman,

Edward L. Moyer,

Edward Eger,

Thomas C. Ryan,

William Johnson,

Otto H. H. Strack,

John Erikson, jr.,

Dellworth Ballard,

Harlie H. Brown,

Garrison Payne,

Emmett M. Wanner,

Walter H. Stuart,

Leo E. Orvis,

Harold Bye,

Harold E. Fosdick,

Nels E. Smith,

Archie O. Mundale,

Mauritz M. Nelson,

John C. Hicks,

Orie H. Small,

Charles W. Henckler,

William B. Anderson,

Henry Quinton,

William P. Crowley,

Harvey C. Brown,

Louis M. Blier,

Joe S. Wierzbowski,

Robin Southern,

George V. Allen,

Elmer A. Posey,

Edmond T. Coon,

John F. McConalogue,

George H. Turner,

Joseph K. Konieczny,

Frederick A. Ruf,

Christian V. Pedersen,

Thomas M. Arrowsmith,

Henry Elsmann,

William R. Giddens,

Walter E. Sharon,

Ernest C. Marheineke,

Herman G. Mecklenburg,

John D. Cornell,

Earle S. Nason, and

Lawrence Crilley.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns:

Carl I. Ostrom,

Robert DeBellefeuille,

James Williams,

John H. Burke,

William H. Newman,

George E. Comstock,

George Enes,

Ralph M. Jeffries,

Fred P. Brown,

Frank L. McLellan,

Thomas E. Orr,

Frederick L. Rose,

Harry L. Thompson,

William A. Blazo,

Harry E. Adams,

John D. Lennon,

Herbert G. Haynes,

Edward V. Brown,

Harry L. Ritchie,

William M. Price,

William A. Reynolds,

Roy E. Hall,

Leslie K. Orr,

Leon W. Thomas,

Horatio S. Ford,

Frank Mogridge,

George W. Haynes,

Chub J. Smith,

Charles Braun, jr.,

John R. Rayhart,

John J. Dabbs,
Clyde Morrison,
Ira A. White,
Joseph A. Curzon,
John F. Warriss,
Elmer B. Robinson,
Emil Roeller,
Emerson B. Manlay,
Albert L. Bishop,
Edward D. Berry,
Walker P. Rodman,
Stephen W. Burton,
William Kuskey,
James S. Cuff,
John L. Wilson,
George L. H. Dolan,
Paul E. Current,
Luther Foust,
Theodore R. Raderick,
Ernest N. Varnado,
Edgard J. Thonnesen,
Alfred G. Lewis,
John E. Shaw,
George W. Pounder,
Willie L. De Camp,
Thomas O. Kirby,
Carl A. Stevens,
Elijah E. Tompkins,
Walter J. Thomas,
Svend J. Skou,
Abe Toretzky,
Harry B. Lough,
Loring McCormick,
Thomas C. Macklin,
William A. Gordon,
Oswald T. Schubert,
John W. Scanlin,
Carlton C. Tipping,
Cullie C. Manning,
Frank R. Williams,
Jacob Schnell,
Leonard E. Bray,
James D. Rodgers,
James B. O'Reilly,
Emil G. B. Wandt,
Anthony P. Sauerwein,
Ray W. Marsh,
Warren C. Carr,
Harold L. Arnold,
Clarence E. Owens,
John J. Audett,
Harold J. Gordon, and
Stanley Kazmarek.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors:

Frederick L. Benton,
Royall R. Richardson, and
Jacob Stepp.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons:

James M. Minter,
Spencer L. Higgins, and
Renier J. Straeten.

Asst. Surg. Henry C. Johnston to be an assistant surgeon.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons:

Lawrence K. McCafferty,
Stephen R. Mills,
James A. Brown,
Albert N. Champion,
Alvin L. Mills,
Millard F. Hudson,
Isaac Dellar,
Carlton L. Andrus,
Floyd G. Tindall,
Harold E. Ragle,
Lawrence T. Hopkins,
Esdras J. Lanois, and
George A. Alden.

Thomas White to be a dental surgeon.

Naval Constructor William G. DuBose to be a naval constructor with rank of captain.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors with rank of commander:

James Reed, jr., and
Edwin G. Kintner.

Lieut. William H. Booth to be a lieutenant commander.

Ensign Boleslaw L. Dombrowski to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Alexander S. Neilson to be an ensign.

Ensign Henry K. McHarg to be an ensign.

The following-named officers of the National Naval Volunteers to be ensigns:

Henry C. McIlvaine, jr.,

Henry S. Austin,

J. Walker Eaton,

James F. Cooper,

Milton M. Fisher,

Joseph C. M. Small,

Albert L. King, and

Frank J. McManamon.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors:

Charles N. Fiske,

Charles G. Smith,

Robert A. Bachmann, and

Howard F. Strine.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons:

Frank H. Stibbens,

Reynolds Hayden,

Edward V. Valz,

Montgomery A. Stuart, and

Rudolph I. Longabaugh.

Ensign David A. Smith to be an ensign.

Surg. Herbert M. Tolfree to be a medical inspector.

Passed Asst. Surg. Frank X. Koltes to be a surgeon.

Pay Clerk George W. Armstrong to be a chief pay clerk.

The following-named citizens of the United States to be assistant civil engineers:

Raymond V. Miller,

Willard A. Pollard, jr.,

John J. Manning,

William M. Angas,

Vernon R. Dunlap,

Lewis B. Combs,

Valentine J. McManus,

Arthur L. Nelson,

George W. Horsley,

Hugo C. Fischer,

Fritz C. Nyland,

Emil Praeger,

Lewis Thornburg,

Ira P. Griffen,

Lewis N. Moeller,

Harold W. Johnson,

Henry H. Overesch, jr.,

Charles R. Johnson,

Carl F. Fritch,

Frank F. Addicks,

Carl H. Cotter,

Andrew G. Bisset,

Henry Brinkmeyer, jr.,

Robert L. McLellan,

Louis B. Hyde,

John B. McTigue,

Charles D. Riddle,

Theron A. Hartung,

Herbert S. Bear, and

Arthur C. Eberhard.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1918.

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

Rev. William A. Sunday, evangelist, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee and rejoice that through faith in Thee and Thy word this Government was built upon that foundation. We thank Thee that the compact signed in the cabin of the *Mayflower* by our ancestors was for democracy, liberty, freedom, and the right to worship Thee according to the dictates of our own conscience. We thank Thee that as a Nation we have the courage to proclaim to the world our continued belief in Thee by stamping on our coins the inscription "In God we trust." We thank Thee that we are Americans and live beneath the protecting folds of the Stars and Stripes. We thank Thee that Thou canst look over the battlements of glory on our land and see that there is not one stain on any star or stripe in Old Glory. We thank Thee for our happy homes. We thank Thee for our wives and little

ones. We thank Thee for the fruitful trees and bountiful harvests. We thank Thee that as a Nation we have never gone to bed hungry nor scraped the bottom of our flour barrel, and we pray Thy continued mercy and blessing upon us. We pray Thee that Thou wilt forgive our transgressions and blot out all our iniquities.

Thou knowest, O Lord, that we are in a life-and-death struggle with one of the most infamous, vile, greedy, avaricious, bloodthirsty, sensual, and vicious nations that has ever disgraced the pages of history. Thou knowest that Germany has drawn from the eyes of mankind enough tears to make another sea; that she has drawn blood enough to redden every wave upon that sea; that she has drawn enough groans and shrieks from the hearts of men, women, and children to make another mountain. We pray Thee that Thou wilt make bare Thy mighty arm and beat back that great pack of hungry, wolfish Huns, whose fangs drip with blood and gore. We pray Thee that the stars in their courses and the winds and waves may fight against them.

We pray Thee that Thou wilt bless our beloved President and give him strength of mind and body and courage of heart for his arduous duties in these sorrow-laden, staggering days. We pray Thee to bless the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy; and bless, we pray Thee, the Naval Strategy Board. Bless, we pray Thee, Lord, the generals at the head of our Army. Bless the boys across the sea, "somewhere in France," and bless those protecting our transports, loaded to the water's edge with men and provisions. Bless our boys at home who are in the cantonments. Bless, we pray Thee, the Senate and House of Representatives, and give them wisdom and strength, for they seem to have come into the kingdom for such a time as this. And Lord, may every man, woman, and child, from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Louisiana, stand up to the last ditch and be glad and willing to suffer and endure until final victory shall come. Bless our allies, and may victory be ours. And in Thy own time and in Thy own way we pray Thee that Thou wilt release the white-winged dove of peace until Thou shalt dispel the storm clouds that hang lowering over this sin-cursed, blood-soaked, and sorrowing world; and when it is all over we will uncover our heads and lift our faces to the heavens and sing with a new meaning—

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.

And the praise shall be to Thee forever, through Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a resignation from a committee, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House, Capitol.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Having been appointed a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I beg to submit my resignation from the other committees of which I have been a member, namely, Elections No. 2, Industrial Arts and Expositions, Reform of Civil Service, and Roads, under the exclusive rule governing such cases.

Yours, very sincerely,

J. Y. SANDERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. RIORDAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry Metz, H. R. 14040, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. McARTHUR, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the cases of Eda M. McCammon, H. R. 18641, and Mary J. Davis, H. R. 19580, of the Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF A RESOLUTION.

Mr. EMERSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, at the request of the chairman of the Military Committee of the Mayor's Advisory War Committee of Cleveland, Ohio, I introduced House joint resolution 122. I have been requested to withdraw that resolution. It is

in relation to the service flag. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that resolution.

The SPEAKER. It does not have to have unanimous consent. It is withdrawn.

The Chair wants to admonish the galleries that they are here by courtesy of the House. They are not here to help conduct the business of the House, and it is against the rules for them to show any signs of assent or dissent by applause or otherwise. If I catch anybody violating that rule, I will clear the part of the gallery where they are. [Applause.]

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 215 (H. Rept. 236).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 200. There shall be not exceeding four hours' general debate, to be divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution, but such general debate shall be concluded at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. At the conclusion of such general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage, without any intervening motion, except one motion to recommit: *Provided*, That all debate shall be confined to the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There was some confusion in the Hall while the resolution was being read and I did not hear how many hours were given to general debate.

The SPEAKER. Four.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the ranking minority member of the committee, I take it, is in favor of the resolution now before the House?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to submit to the gentleman from Illinois a suggestion that we might agree upon time upon the rule. Has the gentleman from Illinois any suggestion as to that?

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that we agree upon one hour's time on the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Can we not agree to adopt the rule without debate and let the time that would be devoted to the discussion on the rule go to the general discussion of the proposition before the body? In other words, my suggestion is this, amplified a little: That we have no roll calls in connection with the adoption of the rule or the previous question. Let it be agreed that the rule shall be adopted and that the previous question shall be ordered, and the time saved in that connection could then be devoted to the discussion and added to the time of general debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a roll call may be avoided, but the suggestion that there be no discussion on the rule comes after some arrangements have already been made with respect to the discussion. That will largely revolve around the main question, rather than on the merits of the rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Could not that time be utilized in the discussion of the main question? It would more appropriately come in in connection with the discussion of the main question.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia will recognize that it is the custom on the rule to discuss the merits of the proposition.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is the reason I suggest that we add that to the general debate, and consolidate the debate upon the main proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. So that whatever time would be given to the discussion of the rule shall be given to the discussion of the main proposition. I suggest that there would be no practical difference.

Mr. GILLET. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. I notice that the rule does not fix any time for voting. That, of course, leaves it in the power of those in control of the measure to close debate under the five-minute rule at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true.

Mr. GILLET. May I ask what the program is—how much time you intend to devote to the five-minute rule; whether you intend to have a vote to-day; and if so, at what time?

Mr. FOSTER. The intention is to have a vote before the House adjourns to-day, and I will say that when the resolution comes before the House I am unable to say as to what time the debate under the five-minute rule will be closed, but I apprehend that the gentleman who may be in charge of this resolution will give sufficient time for the offering of amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GILLET. Genuine amendments?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I think so.

Mr. GILLET. I suppose it follows that any time wasted now in roll calls would either postpone the time of voting or would take so much from the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. It will.

Mr. GILLET. So it will be better not to have any roll calls?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the rule be limited to one hour, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered, and that the time be controlled—if satisfactory to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]—one-half by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who is opposed to the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was not the suggestion made in the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be confined to one hour, half the time to be controlled by himself and the other half controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], and that at the close of the hour's debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the rule.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I did not quite catch how the time was to be controlled.

Mr. FOSTER. My suggestion was that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] who is opposed to the rule, be permitted to control one-half the time.

Mr. LENROOT. And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] half and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] the other half of the time for the resolution? Is that the suggestion?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not of my own time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I could not consent to that.

Mr. LENROOT. Reserving the right to object, if I may call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to the informal understanding in the committee, it was that he should control one-half the time, dividing it equally on his side between those for and against, and that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] control one-half, dividing it equally upon this side between those for and against.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that that is satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That was not my understanding.

Mr. GARNER. That does not give the opposition any chance.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My understanding was that we were to have the control of the time in our own right.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] whether or not he proposes to let the gentleman from Tennessee control the time in opposition to the resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. That was what I first proposed.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] propose to yield half his time to those in opposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That, of course, is my purpose.

Mr. GARNER. If so, who is to control that time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When it comes to the resolution, I assume that the tentative suggestion made yesterday will be carried out—that Miss RANKIN will control for the majority and that Mr. MEEKER will control for the minority, the opposition here. Upon the rule, any gentleman opposing the rule on this side of the House may have half of my time.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest that there is a distinction between the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules and the Republican members, in this, that all of the Republican members are for this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, my impression is—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he thinks, and if the Rules Committee think, that four hours are ample time for the House of Representatives to discuss a great constitutional question like this?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, yes!

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Florida, I believe that two-thirds of this House have made up

their minds to adopt this resolution [applause], and I see no occasion for discussing it a great length of time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that may be true; but posterity has a right to know why this great fundamental change was made at this time.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to make one more request. Do I understand that the gentleman's request for unanimous consent goes to the extent of ordering the previous question on the rule, so as to cut out the offering of amendment to the rule?

Mr. FOSTER. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida objects.

Mr. FOSTER. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the resolution.

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

A MEMBER. Division!

The SPEAKER. A gentleman can not sit in his seat and demand a division.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House providing for the consideration of House joint resolution 200 simply provides that there shall be four hours general debate, but that these four hours shall expire not later than 5 o'clock p. m. to-day. If it extends beyond that time, if the four hours have not been occupied, then it will close at 5 o'clock. I have no doubt the resolution will be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How do I understand the time to be divided?

The SPEAKER. The rule of the House provides for 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes for and 20 minutes against.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That would deny this side of the House any time on the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] controls the time for the rule and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] controls the time against it, this side of the House is without time.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I suggest a way that it can be solved. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, is opposed to the resolution, and 20 minutes' time can be given to him to yield to Members who are opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] will yield some of his time to this side of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly I will; I had made promises for more time, but I will see that that side gets an equal division of the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield 10 minutes to this side?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is settled now that I have 20 minutes under my control. Is that correct?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not understand that the proposition was that the gentleman from Tennessee should have 20 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am entitled to it under the general rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this does not go by political lines. The rule of the House is that there shall be 40 minutes' debate allowed on a rule where the previous question is ordered without debate, 20 minutes to the proponents of the proposition and 20 minutes to the opponents of it. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee was the first Member that arose to oppose the rule, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I deprecate bringing a constitutional question of this sort before this House, especially at this time, when all of our energies ought to be given to carrying on the war. This is not a war measure. It is said that it has been regarded as such in England, and that suffrage has been granted in rather limited form to the women

of England as a war measure. It is a sufficient answer to say that there is now no suffrage whatever in England; that Parliament by successive resolutions has refused to allow any general election for four successive years and has extended their own term of office, because they did not want to go into an election in England at the present time, and certainly not into one into which an enlarged electorate is brought, unshaking the whole foundation of government.

I will not debate the question as to whether in a time of war women are the best judges of policy. That great student of human nature, William Shakespeare, in the play of Macbeth makes Lady Macbeth eager for deeds of blood until they are committed and war is begun, and then just as eager that it may be stopped, while the man, as man should be, is slow to enter into a quarrel, but, being in, knows that he must so bear himself that his opponents may beware of him.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that certain rights are reserved by the Constitution to each individual State, and that one of these is the right to determine what its electorate shall be. [Applause.]

I deny the moral right at any rate of any State to enforce an electorate upon another State. There was a seeming exception to that principle after the Civil War. There is now no such necessity as seemed to be upon the States then. It is a fundamental right of the locality to determine its own electorate. It is one that may have to be determined as to cities. There are now parts of some cities in which the janitors cast the vote and the clerks who live in the tenements cast the vote, while those most interested in the hundreds of millions invested there have no control over the business affairs of the town. The electorate is the foundation of local free government. It must often be determined by the local conditions as to what is the right thing to do, but it is certainly wrong in time of war, when our whole energies should be devoted to measures to carry on the war, that there should be thrown into every State a discussion on any such subject as this. It was wrong as to the amendment as to national prohibition, and it is wrong as to this, and I oppose the passage of this rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. Before he uses it I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, in the presidential campaign of 1916 I was Democratic campaign chairman for the State of Kentucky. For five long months, day and night, I gave the best that was in me, physically and mentally, and cheerfully gave several thousand dollars of my individual funds for Democratic success in my State. On the night of the election I was full of hope and eager for results. I was deeply grateful that Kentucky rolled up her biggest majority in 30 years for the Democratic ticket. When the returns began from the great States of the North and East my heart sank within me. State after State in the North and East, which we Democrats were sure of, rolled in big Republican majorities, and, as the night grew, these majorities against us grew until it seemed that all hope was lost. Nearly every big Democratic newspaper in the country, except the Courier Journal, conceded Judge Hughes' election after all of the man suffrage States of the North and East had reported their returns. Not, until the early morning hours came, was there a single ray of hope for Democratic success. Then there came a report from the West showing a Democratic victory, then another and another until our hopes began to brighten. State after State from the Golden West, where woman suffrage prevailed, sent in cheering victories for Woodrow Wilson and Democratic policies. When all seemed lost, the tide was turned from defeat to victory, and every Democratic heart sent up a prayer of thanksgiving and praise for the woman suffrage States of the great West. It was on the morning following the election that I resolved, as a Democrat, that I would take advantage of the first opportunity to show my appreciation of the women's vote of the West. That opportunity for the first time presents itself to-day, and I will return, in part, my obligation as a Democrat, by voting in favor of the woman-suffrage amendment now before the House. I would feel myself an ingrate if I did otherwise.

Woodrow Wilson, the President of the greatest Republic on earth, and the spokesman of the world for humanity and liberty, speaks to the nations of the earth because the women of the West by their ballot so decreed; CHAMP CLARK, one of the greatest champions of the rights of the people, presides over this House because the voters of woman suffrage States joined hands with the Southern States in support of Democratic policies. The Democratic Party of the Nation controls the legislation of our country in the Senate and in this House, and upon our country depends the safety and happiness of the world. Our party has

taken this position of world leadership for civilization and Christianity because the woman-suffrage States of the West by their votes made it possible. This being true, then right and justice demand that those of us on the Democratic side of the House should stand by those States which have stood by us.

In taking this position I find myself in good Democratic company. Many of our most distinguished leaders in all parts of the country have declared in favor of the woman-suffrage amendment; nearly all of the members of the President's Cabinet have declared for it; the great Speaker of this House favors the amendment; the President of the United States is in favor of this Congress now sending the woman-suffrage amendment to the States for ratification.

It was my privilege yesterday afternoon to be one of a committee of 12 to ask the President for advice and counsel on this important measure. [Prolonged laughter.] Mr. Speaker, in answer to the sentiment expressed by part of the House, I desire to say that at no time and upon no occasion am I ever ashamed to confer with Woodrow Wilson upon any important question [applause], and that part of the House that has jeered that statement, before it adjourns to-day, will follow absolutely the advice which he gave this committee yesterday afternoon. [Applause and laughter.] After conference with the President yesterday afternoon he wrote with his own hands the words which I now read to you and each member of the committee was authorized by the President to give full publicity to the following: "The committee found that the President had not felt at liberty to volunteer his advice to Members of Congress in this important matter, but when we sought his advice [laughter on the Republican side] he very frankly and earnestly advised us to vote for the amendment as an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world." Now, you gentlemen on that side of the House can jeer that statement, if you want to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To ask if the gentleman will yield in order that I may ask him whether the President wrote that with his own hand?

Mr. CANTRILL. He certainly did write it with his own hand, I will state for the information of the gentleman. To my Democratic brethren who have made these Halls ring with their eloquence in their pleas to stand by the President, I will say that now is your chance to stand by the President and vote for this amendment "as an act of right and justice to the women of the country and the world."

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

Mr. CANTRILL. I decline to yield. Do you wish to do that which is right and just toward the women of your own country? If so, follow the President's advice and vote for this amendment. It will not do to follow the President in this great crisis in the world's history on those matters only which are popular in your own districts. The true test is to stand by him, even though your own vote is unpopular at home. The acid test for a Member of Congress is for him to stand for right and justice, even if misunderstood at home at first. In the end, right and justice will prevail everywhere.

This terrible war has made it necessary for the Congress to do many things which it would not have considered for a moment before the declaration of war. No one thing connected with the war is of more importance at this time than meeting the reasonable demand of millions of patriotic and Christian women of the Nation that the amendment for woman suffrage be submitted to the States. An affirmative vote to-day does not commit one to woman suffrage in the State in which one lives, but it is simply a vote to permit your State to say, through its legislature, if your State favors woman suffrage. Eighteen States of the Union, with 184 electoral votes, have already given women presidential suffrage, and several other States in addition recognize the right of women to vote in other matters. The question has reached such magnitude that it is deserving of being submitted to the States for final settlement. One of the chief arguments used by the opponents of woman suffrage is that women are unable to bear arms in war, but the fact stares us in the face that when the men who are bearing arms in France had a chance to vote on the question of woman suffrage they voted 2 to 1 in favor of the proposition.

If the men who are daily risking their lives in defense of our Nation in the trenches are willing to trust the women to vote as to their welfare, surely those who are fighting the war behind mahogany desks can trust the women of the land with the ballot. Gen. Pershing says, "This war is being fought by women; it is women who suffer and lend courage to us; women

are the ones who will deserve honor for their aid in establishing democracy." No one asks for the passage of the Federal suffrage amendment as a pretty compliment to womanhood. It is urged as a vital, sound, tremendous step in putting every ounce of power that can be marshaled behind our country in its time of need. However bitterly in the past I might have opposed woman suffrage, in the face of the statements from Gen. Pershing, our great military leader in Europe, and of the statement from the President, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, I would cheerfully support the woman suffrage amendment now. As the President states, it is a question of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world. The American Congress at this critical time must do those things which are just and right toward all mankind. Every single one of our great allies have given or are about to give suffrage to the women of their countries. We must do the same for the women of America, because this country, above all others, boasts of liberty and justice. What becomes of our boasted democracy when we deny to half our population the right to participate in the affairs of government? No man on the floor of this House will dare say that the women of America are not as patriotic as are our men. As Gen. Pershing says, they are the ones who suffer most. Justice demands that those who suffer most for the Nation should have at least some recompense for their suffering. The least reward that can be given them is to say that they should have a voice in the affairs of the Nation which takes away from them their fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands to bleed and die that democracy might live.

What answer can we give to the nations of the earth when we send millions of our men, the very flower of our manhood, to fight for democracy and then at home deny the very fundamentals of democracy to millions of our own women? What answer can we give when we spend billions of our wealth that the world may be free and then at home tax millions of our own women without giving them the right to vote on questions of taxation? What answer can we give when we give our all for freedom of foreign countries and keep in political slavery our own women? No, Mr. Speaker, right and justice will not permit us to do these things. The war in Europe is for the freedom of mankind in the centuries to come. This amendment here to-day is for the freedom of American women, which freedom has too long been denied to them. Let the American Congress catch the spirit of the times; let the lawmakers of the Nation catch the spirit of the men in the trenches who are upholding our laws with the bayonet; let the Members of Congress join the Speaker of this House and the President of our Republic in justice for American womanhood. Right, justice, liberty, and democracy have always been, and will always be, safe in the tender care of American womanhood. From this day on, let the men and women of America be equal and united, citizens all, for the common good of our beloved Nation and for the welfare of all mankind.

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

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, before addressing myself briefly to the question, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I may make.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I suspected as much. That is about all the gentleman from Massachusetts is capable of doing. I shall say then what I have to say in the time granted and to be granted to me.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FIELDS. I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon this question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen shall have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on woman suffrage. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I hope this does not come out of my time.

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, a few hours for debate upon a question that will add 14,000,000 of voters to the electorate of the United States is a want of consideration of one of the most important questions ever presented to this House. The time ought to be extended for this debate or gentlemen ought at least to be permitted to express their views in the RECORD.

For the gratification of those most excellent women and men who desire the passage of the pending woman's suffrage amendment to the United States Constitution I would be much pleased to vote to submit it for ratification to the States, but my sense of duty and my loyalty to the platform of the national Democracy and to the principles of my party and obedience to the will of an overwhelming majority of the people I represent forbids that I do so. It is not because I have any opposition to women exercising the right of franchise that I cast a negative vote on this amendment, but because of the manner in which it is sought to be obtained. A restrictive amendment upon the rights and the liberties of the people of a State attached to the Federal Constitution can not be desired by any person who has given careful thought to our system of government and the basis upon which local rights and liberty rests.

There are various reasons assigned why the amendment should be passed and many why it should not be passed. There are many people who believe in the right of women to exercise suffrage who can not, so long as they represent the will of the majority of the people and oppose the destruction of the rights of States, consent to the granting of suffrage by Federal amendment. Some contend that the mingling of women in politics would purify the electorate and make the Government safer and better. They may be correct. Others contend that such conduct would render women less modest and therefore less worthy of the respect of men, and at last produce a race wanting in that delicate refinement and feeling of sentiment that comes from the tender and confiding life of a pure woman, unstained with the gross and sinister methods of political life. This may possibly be true. It is most likely true that both ideas present a remote contingency and can not be of much value in the practical determination of the question.

Logically, no man can deny that a woman is entitled to all the rights and privileges, including the right of suffrage, that men enjoy; nor has man the moral right to determine whether it is best for women to exercise the right to vote or not. Women should be permitted to determine for themselves that which they think is best for them. For men to determine that women ought not to vote is to destroy the equal justice to which the sexes are entitled. The power, aside from the moral right, however, to make men and women equal at the ballot box under existing law rests with the qualified voters. The qualified voters are men, and women therefore have no voice under the Constitution and law as it exists in securing their own enfranchisement. It therefore becomes the duty of men under our dual system of government to determine the manner in which it shall be done, if they conclude it shall be done at all. There are two methods by which women may be entitled to equal political rights with men. One is by amendment to the Federal Constitution, the other is by amendment by each State to its constitution or by its law if permitted under the State constitution to grant suffrage to women. A large number of the States have already granted suffrage to women. They have exercised their political power and sovereignty in the matter and determined in the interest of the rights of women. Other States might be of the opinion that it is not proper to grant this power to women. The proposed Federal amendment, if passed, would deprive the State of its legal right to determine its electorate. It may be said that the amendments that have already been passed to the Federal Constitution that are restrictive of the rights of States do also pro tanto deprive the State of sovereign power. That, so far as it goes, is true, but it affords no reason why the State should be further deprived of sovereignty, nor are the powers of which the States are deprived under the Federal Constitution essential to the maintenance of local self-government. The enumerated powers of the Federal Government under the Constitution are those powers which are essential to the transaction of the greater functions of government that are national in their nature. They do not restrict the States in the most vital function that enables them to maintain local self-government. When you deprive a State of the right to say who its electors are or place restrictions upon the State in determining the qualifications of its electors, you strike down absolutely and unconditionally the life of its sovereignty. The power that names the voter is the sovereign and the only sovereign. The man who assumes that there should be further restriction upon the right of the State understands not the principles of free

government or the foundation upon which American liberty must rest. [Applause.]

There is no necessity for placing this sovereign power in the hands of the Federal Government. It ought to remain in the control of the States where it is, and a restriction upon it in any way or modification of the State's rights is a practical destruction of the power. I do not object to women voting if they get the right to vote exactly as men get their right to vote—by virtue of the State constitutions where they live. There is no reason why women should have the right to vote in any other way. The thoughtless advocate of suffrage does not appreciate that one method preserves the rights of the States and the other destroys it. They say that it makes but little difference how women get the right to vote, so they get it. A right obtained in the wrong way does more wrong than can be done in any other way. If women must have suffrage, let them have it by the acts of their neighbors and friends and fellow citizens of the States in which they live. If a State is not willing to give it to them, let them abide the hour until it is willing, for in no other way can local self-government exist. The destruction of the sovereignty of States is more fatal to liberty than the denial of votes to women. The concentration of all power at Washington must and will ultimately undermine our institutions. We have gone too far in that direction already.

The contention that it is difficult in some States to amend the constitution affords no reason for subverting their constitution by a Federal amendment which will coerce them into submission to a mere policy against what they think is their interests.

Again, the advocates of the Federal amendment say to you, "Why, the Constitution prohibits the denial of the right of suffrage to any person by reason of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Are you not therefore willing to give to the white women of the country the same rights that the negro man has?" Of course this is a mere ad hominem argument, just like a good woman always uses. The negro man does not get affirmatively his right to vote by the fifteenth amendment. But that amendment is a restriction on the liberty of the State and its sovereign power in the selection of its electors. It should not have been passed. The fact that this wrong was done does not justify the perpetration of another wrong along the same line. Then, too, this amendment was passed at the close of a long and bloody war, when the real South had no voice in the Government. Many of the States of the South that were forced to vote for this amendment voted at a time when a majority of its best citizens were disfranchised and had no voice in the local government of the States. It is the only amendment to the Federal Constitution that was coerced. I have no objection to the colored man voting, but this privilege should have come from the States.

Again, with a good deal of complacency some of the advocates of the Federal amendment say that gentlemen who voted to submit for ratification to the States the prohibition amendment must upon the same ground vote to submit the suffrage amendment. The weakness of this suggestion ought to be apparent even to anyone, conditions being different. A man who voted to submit the prohibition amendment in obedience to the will of the majority of the people of the district or State he represented did right, because the highest principle involved in representative government is obedience to the will of the majority of the people as understood by their representative. The representative must comply with the will of the majority as he understands it, or, if he be an honorable man and can not do so, he must resign his commission. The people of the States whose representatives voted to submit the prohibition amendment did so in obedience to the overwhelming will of the people. Those who voted in the negative, if in obedience to the will of their constituents, also voted right.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. So it follows that whether a representative believes in a proposition or not personally he must in his representative capacity carry out the will of the people. If I believed that the majority of the people of my State or my district desire that I should vote to submit the suffrage amendment for ratification to the States I should do so, yielding to their will, regretting and condemning their judgment. This is the people's Government and they have a right to control it. In my opinion, the restrictions by the Federal Constitution are already too great upon the people of the States. We must seriously doubt the wisdom of any further extension of Federal power and authority. Already that power is overwhelming. The Constitution itself is pregnant with the seeds of imperialism. Its dormant

and undeveloped powers, if exercised by an ambitious tyrant, are sufficient to make us an Imperial Republic rather than a representative government. No man knows the extent to which power may be granted by the Congress to the Executive or how far judicial construction will extend existing powers of Government. It is not wise to further deprive the people of local self-government. I shall not discuss those extraordinary powers now being exercised pending the war in which we are engaged. The necessity of the situation has perhaps justified the extension of power that the Congress has granted to the Executive. Just a little more of Federalization of States' rights and the power of the people over their local affairs forever ends.

When men deride the rights of States and of the people for local self-government and seek to bury them in an arbitrary policy to be fixed in the National Constitution, where only principles should find a place, they betray an absence of the knowledge of the principles on which a representative government rests. A monarchy with single power is just the same as a Republic of sovereign States for such people. They are honest, but see no difference. Some of the most intelligent men think that if any proposition can secure the vote of two-thirds of Congress for submission and three-fourths of the States should ratify it under the Constitution nothing more is desired. By this method the President might be given the power to name the officers of a State. This would be an infringement of State rights, but it would be proper in the minds of those who favor centralized power and think that amendments should be made to the Constitution to enforce a mere policy. While this may be an extreme case, it is no less to be considered than the slow processes that have been going on for years in taking away all power of the people locally in the States by centralizing that power at Washington. Power diffused among the people may prove at all times effective. No republic is as stable and powerful as a monarchy. But it is free. The power over vast territory like that of the United States, with millions of people, centralized at Washington, controlling the things that ought to be controlled alone by local power, will be an inevitable source of tyranny. I believe in the full exercise of Federal power under the Constitution, but oppose its extension unless absolutely necessary for the national defense and in the full exercise of the rights of the States. We must look beyond the mere language of an amendment to the conditions in the various sections of our country and the effect on the people in passing an amendment to the Constitution.

It has been insisted that the real purpose of this amendment is the basis for political legislation that will ultimately deprive the Southern States of representation in part in Congress and their force in national affairs. This may be and probably is true. It could occur if Congress should force all persons to vote under penalties. For Tennessee to grant suffrage to her women would be no material harm to the State, but to deprive her of the right by Federal amendment to do so or to force her to do so would be to deprive her of her sovereign power. Some of the Southern States are in a different attitude from Tennessee and Kentucky and other border States which have but a small colored population. In those Southern States where the colored population outnumbers the white to double the number of ignorant voters by giving the colored woman the right to vote would produce a condition that would be absolutely intolerable. We owe something to the wishes and the sentiments of the people of our sister States struggling to maintain law and order and white supremacy, and if suffrage can be given to the women State by State, as the States will it, and the errors and injustice as to some of the States could be avoided which a Federal amendment would produce, it would seem the part of wisdom to do so.

We are engaged now in a great foreign war. It is not the proper time to change the whole electoral system. It is not the time to consider amendments to the organic law. When the German Empire shall have been overthrown and peace given to the world, it will be time enough to urge this question as a part of the policy of our country. Patriotism, in my judgment, forbids the injection of this issue into national politics at this time. This is not the hour for any honest American or patriotic man to press this issue upon the people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record a portion of the minority report and an editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

[From minority report.]

One of the very ablest of living Republicans, the Hon. Elihu Root, of New York, whose great learning and knowledge of the Constitution entitles any utterance of his to most careful consideration, has said:

"There is nothing more essentially and vitally local to a community than the way in which it shall select the officers who are to govern it. Any external power which can control that can control the local gov-

ernment. Nothing is more clear in the Constitution under which our Union was formed than that this is a matter of purely local concern."

Former President William H. Taft, in discussing this question, said: "If in any of the States now acting on the question I were called upon to vote, I would vote against giving the suffrage, because I think to force it on an unwilling or indifferent majority is to add to the electorate an element that will not improve its governing capacity."

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and patron saint of Democracy, thus expressed his opinion of women mingling in political strife:

"All the world is now politically mad. Men, women, and children talk nothing else, and you know that naturally they talk much, loud, and long. Society is spoiled by it. But our good ladies, I trust, are too wise to wrinkle their foreheads with politics. * * * American women have the good sense to value domestic happiness above all other and to cultivate it beyond all other."

Former President Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President after the Civil War, gave utterance to his conviction on this subject in the following language:

"I am willing to admit that it was only after a more thorough appreciation of what female suffrage really means that I became fully convinced that its inauguration would vastly increase the unhappy imperfections and shortcomings of our present man-voting suffrage. Its especial susceptibility to bad leadership and other hurtful influences would constitute it another menacing condition to those which already vex and disturb the deliberate and intelligent expression of the popular will."

Our present President, Woodrow Wilson, never exemplified his great qualities of statesmanship more clearly than when with reference to woman suffrage he said in the New York Times October 7, 1915:

"I believe that it should be settled by the States and not by the National Government."

Again, in a letter to Jane Jefferson Club, of Denver, Colo., October 7, 1916, he gave expression to this statement:

"Both the great political parties have in their recent platform favored the extension of suffrage to women through State action."

The President at various times has discussed the question of suffrage fully and at length, and always with the wisdom which he brings to the discussion of any question. In his textbook, State and Federal Governments of the United States, he announces the following indisputable truths:

"The suffrage in particular is a privilege which each State may grant upon terms of its own choosing, provided only that those terms be not inconsistent with a republican form of government."

"All the powers of the General Government are plainly such as affect interests which it would be impossible to regulate harmoniously by any scheme of separate State action, and only such; all other powers whatever remain with the States. With them rests the regulation of the suffrage."

"Federal law does not determine who shall vote for Members of the House of Representatives. The Constitution provides, simply, that all those persons in each State who are qualified under the constitution and laws of the State to vote for members of the larger of the two houses of the State legislature may vote also for Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. The franchise is regulated, therefore, entirely by State law."

In conclusion we desire to say that we stand with the views expressed by the President on this question of woman suffrage when, on December 23, 1914, he declared: "I still believe that it is a matter to be fought out in the individual States." This sentiment the President has since then on more than one occasion in effect reaffirmed.

Respectfully submitted.

E. W. SAUNDERS.
JACOB E. MEERER.
FRANK CLARK.

[From the Baltimore Sun.]

SELLING THEIR BIRTHRIGHT FOR A MESS OF POTTAGE.

Southern Members of Congress and southern leadership in Congress have been the subjects of bitter criticism for months in many northern and New England newspapers which are in sympathy with President Wilson and which can generally be counted on to support the Democratic Party in presidential elections. While criticism of some southern leaders has been justified by their obstinate attitude with regard to conscription at the outset of the war and by the narrow and sectional spirit which they have manifested with regard to principles of war taxation, the Sun has been strongly inclined to resent the disposition to include all southern Members in this category and to regard a few as representative of the whole.

But in view of the reported change in the attitude of many southern Congressmen toward the suffrage amendment, and the motive unblushingly avowed for that change, we are compelled to believe that the South will have reason to join with the North and East in their scornful appraisal of the average Congressman from the Southern States. In Monday's Sun Representative JAMES C. CANTRELL, from the once proud State of Kentucky, was quoted as follows:

"The fact that the Congress is now almost evenly divided between the Democratic and Republican Parties," he says, "should force the Democratic Members from the South to give heed to the situation. This statement is based on the supposition that each Democrat is looking to the welfare of his party in the Nation and that he will not be governed by local conditions in his own district. The Democratic Party is now in control of all branches of the Federal Government. Almost every committee assignment, so far as the chairmanships are concerned, is held by southern Democrats, who thus far practically dictate the legislation of the Nation. We have this control, as everyone knows, because the woman-suffrage States in the last presidential election voted almost solidly for Democratic electors and candidates. For the Democratic Party in Congress to vote against the States that gave them this power would, in my opinion, be political suicide. For the southern Democrats in Congress to say to the millions of patriotic women of the Nation that suffrage shall not be given them would bring down upon our heads such condemnation from the suffrage States that we would be driven from power."

Mr. CANTRELL assumes that the women voters of the West decided the presidential election. Whether that be true or not—and it is open to dispute—Mr. CANTRELL deliberately proposes to his southern colleagues to trade the South's birthright of local self-government for a mess of political pottage. Committee chairmanships, in his view, it would seem, are more important than "local conditions" in the Southern States. And he thinks a Democratic majority in Congress is more essential than the protection of the South from negro domination. In a word, the new code proposed to southern Members is a code of political expediency and job-holding and not the old southern code of honor.

The proposition represents the practical abandonment of a policy which has been considered vital to prosperity and good government in the South. She is being betrayed in the house of her friends. As Judge HARRISON, of Virginia, points out, the adoption of this amendment will again force the people of the South "to face the hateful conditions which have prevailed in many parts" of that and other Southern States in the past. The conditions will, indeed, be more "hateful" and more menacing than before, because a new element will be added to the electorate, "deadlier than the male."

This southern desertion to suffrage is insincere and dishonest, and it will reap the reward of insincerity and dishonesty. The southern Members are hitching up to partners who have no respect for their race prejudices, no sympathy with southern feeling, and who will throw them overboard at the first opportunity. We trust the people of the South will put on their blacklist forever men who think committee chairmanships are things of greater value than the maintenance of white supremacy in their section. This is the plain issue that these strange southern representatives have raised.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair call it to my attention when I have used five minutes? Mr. Speaker, the man who does not know that to-day witnesses the dawn of a new era in the progress of civilization of mankind fails to comprehend what is passing in the world. Old things are passing away and we are coming into new and greater things. We are about to vitalize and make real the old theory that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. That theory has been the hope of mankind through the centuries. We are about to make that theory a glorious reality for the women of America. [Applause.] The new day that is now dawning will witness a leveling up of mankind throughout the world. It will witness the granting of all the powers of government by the governed throughout the world. Why, then, in our own glorious Republic should one-half of the intelligent people be denied by any State the right to participate in the Government they love and support? The resolution under consideration denies the right of any State to enact a law that will deny any citizen the right of voting because of sex. It is not an affirmative grant, as assumed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon]. It is the removal of an implied inhibition on the right of women to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that women should not be granted the right of suffrage because they can not bear arms. The women of the world to-day have given to every battle front and to fighting ships on every sea the fighting men who are fighting the battles of this epoch-making war [applause], and the women of the world are the inspiration to those men on every battle front. And more, they are doing as much for the success of this war in America and throughout the allied countries as are the men behind the lines. They are doing every kind of work to-day that men are doing behind the lines—manufacturing arms, munition, clothing, and so forth—doing every manner of work. At this very moment in these galleries the women who are listening to this discussion are working for the soldiers. Not a man to-day in these galleries is doing anything except idly listening to what is going on. The women are doing something for the comfort of the soldiers on the battle fields and in the trenches and on the fighting ships. [Applause.] The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] said that this resolution should not be agreed to or considered at a time when the Nation is engaged in an awful war. There never was a more propitious time for this Nation, that entered this war to secure for those who are governed the right to have a voice in the Governments under which they live than at this hour for America to grant the right of suffrage to the noble women of the Republic. If it is right for America to participate in this war in behalf of the consent of the governed in other lands, it can not be denied that Congress should go as far as it can go to grant the right of suffrage to all the women of the United States. I am for the resolution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

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

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the question before this House is adoption of a rule. I object to the adoption of the rule with such extreme haste. The gentleman who has just preceded me has many times spoken in this House, and spoken very strongly, against bringing in a rule and adopting it with a provision for only 40 minutes for debate, 20 minutes for each side. Here is an important matter which is brought up for consideration. The question of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is, to my mind, a very much different proposition than the presenting for consideration and enactment into law of a measure which might be a proposition of only minor importance. But in my opinion a constitutional amendment, which vitally affects the entire country, should have more mature consideration. I shall not argue as to the privilege of any man in this House or any man in the country

or any woman in the country to have the right to their own views on the question of the adoption of this amendment, which the arbitrary action of the Committee on Rules forces us to discuss and consider. I do say for myself I believe it is literally wrong for Members to stand here and talk about the adoption of a rule and then begin to use as an argument for the proposition that we follow the rule if adopted, and then propose to limit the debate in which 435 Members of this House ought to have the privilege of participation when less than 300 minutes are granted for debate.

We are here to consider the question of the advisability of the adoption of this rule with such a limited debate. Now, I have been a Member of this House for nearly 20 years and I have seen rules brought in here from time to time with very limited time allowed for debate on the question of the rule. I have seen gentlemen on the other side of the House, when the Republicans were in the majority, pound us as hard as they could, because we brought in a rule providing for a limited debate on a simple proposition, and they solemnly and vigorously protested that when the Democracy came into power there would be no such arbitrary rules presented. But if you will examine the Record I think you will find that very many more drastic rules have been brought into this body during the limited time the Democracy has been in power than was ever done by the Republican Party when we were in power during the long term of our service.

I oppose this rule because I believe it is wrong to take up a constitutional question and to act on it with such limited debate. Even when the rule is adopted, we shall have so little time for debate that the question can hardly be brought to a decent consideration. Now, I have rarely voted for a rule in this House. I do not believe in bringing matters up in that way. I do not believe that this rule is necessary. We have a very limited calendar, and there would have been ample opportunity to bring up this proposition, and have it properly considered, before the time when the congressional session will be brought to a close, because we are going to be in session for a great many months, and there is no reason in the world for this House to bring up and force its immediate consideration such a drastic rule. I am opposed to the rule on that ground. When it comes to the question of the adoption or the passage of the resolution, if I can get a little time, I shall talk briefly on that proposition; but I am speaking now on the question of this drastic rule, brought in by unanimous vote of the committee, and putting such a limited debate on an amendment to the Constitution.

I am not a lawyer, but I am one who has read the Constitution a great many times. A very few Members of this House, I fear, have read it, but I have read it many times, and there have been just 17 amendments adopted since the original Constitution was framed by the master minds whom God had inspired in the cabin of the Mayflower to formulate the Constitution of the Plymouth Colony which was made the basis of the Constitution of Massachusetts and subsequently resulted in the establishment of the Constitution of the United States under which we now live. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments were passed by this body and were concurred in by the Senate. That is, the men from the South could not obtain representation in this House and return to the home of their fathers unless they voted for the acceptance of these amendments which were intended for the protection of the slave whose freedom was provided as the result of the Civil War. They voted for these amendments because they wanted figuratively to get back to the fleshpots of Egypt. They did not want to stay out in the cold any longer. They had been whipped in the war and wanted to get back, and they were willing to adopt any amendment in order to get back home once more. But it is to their everlasting discredit that they have ignored these amendments ever since. They are here now with the privileges their successors now enjoy.

I still strongly desire to state that I think the rule is wrong and ought not to be adopted, and I shall vote against it because I do not believe in it and I wish to reserve my individual rights.

I append a brief reference to some reasons why I shall vote against this amendment. There are many other reasons which might also be referred to, but I deem these I have presented sufficient to justify my actions.

Since the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress opened I have met several women suffragists from the State of Massachusetts. I have immediately propounded to them this one question: "Do you approve or disapprove of the suffrage banners in front of the White House with the following words emblazoned thereon, namely, 'Kaiser Wilson, what will you do for woman suffrage?'" The banners with these words inscribed thereon were flaunted many days during the last session

of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The day the Russian visitors called on President Wilson they were especially offensive. The answer in nearly every case to my inquiry was, "I glory in that demonstration." President Wilson, while not my choice for President, is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and this action in time of war was insulting to him and to the Nation in the terrible struggle in which we are now engaged and were then endeavoring to make successful. Besides, the response to my question was very offensive, and I immediately ordered these suffrage advocates from my office.

I have watched the suffrage movement at close range. I am very much opposed to the efforts made at the Capitol and elsewhere in the propaganda having for its purpose the adoption of the suffrage amendment. Large sums of money have been contributed, and have been and are to be expended, to bring about the adoption of said amendment. This method is objectionable and is corrupting in its nature. Threats have been uttered to me by suffragists that they would be present in my district and oppose my reelection next year. I am not disturbed by this threat. But I respectfully beg leave to state that I can not perform my duty as a Member of the House of Representatives in accordance with my oath of office by supporting this amendment, and I shall record my vote against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] use some of his time?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have only two minutes remaining. There will be only one other speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I have three minutes remaining, and will grant it to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, when the resolution similar to this was before the House three years ago I opposed it. I opposed it upon two grounds. I opposed it as a matter of principle, on the ground that Congress ought not to submit constitutional amendments unless it was reasonably probable that, if submitted, the amendments would be adopted in the near future. Three years have gone by and that condition is changed. That argument no longer applies, and I think that nearly everyone will agree that if this amendment be adopted during this session of Congress it will be ratified by a sufficient number of the States within less than five years. [Applause.]

Another ground that I then took was that if submitted by the States the people directly vote upon the question, whereas if submitted by the Federal Government the legislatures themselves act upon it. But it was a matter of some humiliation to me, within a very few weeks after the House considered that resolution, to find that my own State legislature had refused to permit the people of my State to vote upon the question of woman suffrage. And so I have been compelled to change my mind upon that question. Therefore I am heartily supporting this amendment to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there should be no partisanship in the consideration of this resolution; and yet I must congratulate the Republican side of the House that because of the fact that an overwhelming majority of them will vote for this resolution to-day they have compelled the President of the United States to change his mind upon this proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful from that fact that as time goes on the President may in some other matters be susceptible to Republican influence occasionally. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Speaker, there should be no sectionalism in the consideration of this resolution to-day, and yet we might as well squarely face the fact that if this resolution does not this afternoon secure the necessary two-thirds vote it will be due to one section of this country and to Democratic votes—the solid South. From a Republican standpoint, from a partisan standpoint, it would be an advantage to Republicans to be able to go before the people in the next election and say that this resolution was defeated by southern Democrats. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will not give us Republicans that opportunity. I hope there will not be a solid South upon this proposition.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I shall have to decline to yield.

You gentlemen of the South, how often you have stood on this floor and decried sectionalism! I have agreed with you. Let us not have sectionalism upon this proposition to-day. No other section of the country stands as you have stood upon this proposition, and, as I said a few moments ago, if this resolution is defeated to-day the country will understand whom to

hold responsible—one section of the country, controlling a portion of the Democratic Party.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there will be only one other speech. Has the gentleman from Kansas exhausted all his time?

The SPEAKER. Except one minute. Does he desire to use that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield it back to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

The SPEAKER. That gives the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] four minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who has just taken his seat, and who refused to yield, gives as a reason for voting for this joint resolution that the legislature of his own State refused to permit the people to vote on the question of woman suffrage. Here is the logic of his argument, namely, that because the legislature of his own State refused to allow the women to vote he is going to vote for a joint resolution that deprives the people of every State of this Union of the privilege of voting upon it. [Applause.] That is the logic of his argument. He made a good speech against this proposition three years ago. [Laughter.] Now he has changed his mind.

Mr. LENROOT. Others have.

Mr. GORDON. Gentlemen, this proposition involves treason to the principle of representative government, and is a gross violation of the national platform of the Republican and Democratic Parties adopted in the last campaign. [Applause.] Mr. Hughes bolted the platform before election, and he got his for it. [Laughter.] He lost the State of Ohio because he repudiated his party platform on the question of the right of the States to control the granting of suffrage.

Mr. MADDEN. What will happen to Mr. Wilson? [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Wilson is not running for office now.

A MEMBER. He has kept us out of war. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Any man in this House, whether Democrat or Republican, who votes for this resolution, and who did not in the campaign in 1916 publicly repudiate that plank in his platform, is guilty of bad faith with his constituents, every single one. The Republican platform declared that the question of suffrage is one that should be determined by the people of the States. Now, because in some of the most important States the people themselves have voted down this proposition, you propose to force it upon them by a constitutional amendment through Congress and the legislatures of other States. I say this is an outrage, and every decent man—Democrat or Republican—who votes for this resolution ought to blush for his vote. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] is mistaken when he says that those who favor equal suffrage by their votes to-day will blush for their action. By a large majority this afternoon this House will go on record as favoring a fundamental principle of government by the people, and those who blush for their attitude will be those who vote against it. [Applause.]

The gentleman seemingly does not recognize the fact that we are living in a new world and that old conditions will not return again.

New conditions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth.
Lo! before us gleam her campfires;
We ourselves must pilgrims be;
Launch our Mayflower and steer boldly
O'er the wild, tempestuous sea,
Nor attempt the future's portals
With the past's blood-rusted key.

America is in a new epoch since last April, and we must meet conditions as they exist to-day. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] states that this is not the time for action on this great question. His argument is reiterated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. Gentlemen of the House, this is the time above all others. If America does not act now she will be a laggard instead of a leader in this great movement

for the democracy for which liberty-loving nations are battling around the world.

Even in the midst of the welter of war the allied nations, the neutrals, and even the central powers are pledging equal suffrage to their peoples. At this very moment the question is pending in the British Parliament, in the Chamber of Deputies of France, and the legislative body of Italy. The heroic King of Belgium has promised that one of the first acts after his Kingdom is restored will be to see that women are enfranchised as a reward for the valiant service they have rendered in time of disaster.

These nations, even in the shadow of the Prussian mailed fist, have thought this great task of liberation worthy of consideration and action. Surely America can not rightfully take the position that this question should be delayed indefinitely.

Even in the German Reichstag, in Bohemia, and in Hungary the right of equal suffrage has been discussed, and in some instances that right has been pledged. Surely America will not allow the exponents of autocracy to lead the way in this advance of democracy. Now is the appointed time for action. Let the oldest and greatest democracy in the world lead this movement instead of straggling in the rear.

But, Mr. Speaker, Congress should also adopt this amendment now because there is a Nation-wide compelling demand from the people that this fundamental question be submitted to them for settlement. The Rules Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Woman Suffrage Committee have all held hearings at which were represented millions of American citizens, all asking action on this amendment. From every town and hamlet and city have come petitions urging that at least Congress give the people the right to act upon equal suffrage. Already more than one-fourth of the membership of this House and of the Senate come from States where women vote.

There have been 29 State elections held where this question was an issue. In these elections the total vote of men voting in favor of granting the franchise to women was 4,703,371. These were elections at which only male voters cast their ballots. While the number is increased by the fact that a second election was held in two States, still it is a conservative estimate, counting the women voters and those who favor it in States where no election has been held, that there are to-day at least 7,000,000 American voters who would go to the polls and vote that this amendment should be submitted to the States for decision. Whenever there is such a demand as that this House has no right to refuse to submit any question to the people. Putting aside the merits of the question itself and how individual Members feel about equal suffrage, the fact remains that it is the duty of Congress to refer this question or any question to the States when demanded by such a large proportion of the American electorate and citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, there must also be considered the fact that this amendment is essential to the equality of rights upon which this Government stands. Women to-day in many States help to elect a President and to choose a national administration. Women in other States are absolutely disfranchised, a situation which is manifestly unjust and unfair.

But still worse, the women voters in equal-suffrage States have no protection at all when they change their residence into other States. An amendment to the National Constitution, the recognition that America is a Nation and not a collection of States, is essential if there is to be "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

Congress should pass this amendment now, because this Nation needs as never before the votes of its women. It will add to the molding force that element of citizenship which naturally looks to the common welfare in time of peace. The evils in society are regarded as hostile forces by women, for they see their effects upon the home. The problems of bad housing, unwholesome food, conservation of life and health, commercialized vice, evil working conditions, all need the remedial hand of the home maker.

But if that is true in time of peace, it is doubly true in time of war. America needs the help of its womanhood as never before. The problems of this armed conflict include the problems of food, clothing, nursing, thrift, conservation, and others which are much more in woman's line than in man's. Every call sent out by the Nation to the women has been answered with enthusiastic devotion. Their work has been one of the splendid things of the past year, but I maintain that all these efforts would be vastly more effective if with them went the power to express patriotism, devotion, and convictions in the place where they count most after all—in the voting booth on the day of election.

Let us release the energy which has been expended by necessity in the effort to secure an undoubted right and turn it into

the channels of activities which will make surer the conquest of democracy over autocracy. When we remember that more girls are graduated every year from high schools and colleges than boys; when we remember that only one-fortieth of the inmates of our jails and penitentiaries are women, we must see that this step of liberation will mean an addition to the educated, moral, law-abiding electorate which is needed now and in the trying days which lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, one of the guiding maxims of Napoleon was "A clear pathway for merit." He told his army that every soldier carried in his knapsack the baton of a marshal of France. Because this idea was the exact opposite of the Bourbon idea and because Napoleon's career itself showed that his poverty, low birth, and other handicaps did not act as a bar against ability and genius, the people of France followed the Little Corporal as the very personification of the spirit of their new nation.

America to-day must have a clear pathway for merit. At a dreadful cost in blood and treasure she wrote into the fabric of this Nation that neither color nor race nor previous condition of servitude should bar entrance to that pathway.

To-day, by orderly, peaceable methods outlined in the organic law of the land, we have the opportunity to say that the pathway for merit shall not be barred on account of sex.

That is the issue, for it is a fraudulent affront to argue that the vote will not be used wisely by women. Every observer of actual conditions has testified that the effect of women on political conditions has been elevating. But even if that were not assured, still suffrage is fairly due the women of America, and the debt should be paid. No honest man who owes another \$10 refuses to pay his debt because he feels that perhaps the money will not be wisely spent. The ballot is a debt owed the womanhood of America, and now is the time to pay the debt.

Mr. Speaker, the people demand the submission of this amendment to them. The nations of the world are preparing to enfranchise their own women, and America must not prove recreant. The Nation needs the votes of its women in peace and in war. This amendment is the only way to secure a national solution for a national question. I sincerely hope and believe that this amendment will be adopted by a two-thirds majority, and that this Congress will nobly measure up to its responsibility and its opportunity. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one moment. Those of us who are opposed to the resolution have not interposed any sort of delay by way of votes or demands for roll calls, by which we have saved a good deal of time. I ask unanimous consent of all of the Members of the House that the time that would otherwise be taken in roll calls be added to the general debate. It would be about an hour. I ask unanimous consent to amend the report of the Committee on Rules by inserting "five" where "four" occurs, the effect of which will be to give five hours of debate in this body instead of four hours. I think that is a reasonable request, because, as I said, we have not interposed a moment's delay.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that, in consideration of not calling for the yeas and nays, the time it would take be added to the general debate.

Mr. FOSTER. With the understanding that we conclude this matter to-day?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, yes; certainly, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from Virginia if he would not be willing to fix the time, which may be a little later than 5 o'clock?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. So far as I am concerned, I am agreed.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia that if we can fix it at 5 o'clock, I have no objection. I ask to amend by fixing it not later than 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That is the time that the rule fixes.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that; but it also provides that not exceeding four hours of general debate shall be had, and in any event it shall not go beyond 5 o'clock. I ask that general debate shall not run later than 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the rule shall be so amended that debate shall close at 5 o'clock. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question now is on the passage of the rule as amended.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"Article —

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to ask those in the management of this debate if the Chair understands the situation correctly. The Chair's understanding is that the four following Members shall each control one-quarter of the time: The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER]. Is that correct?

Mr. RAKER. That is the understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And amendments will be in order after debate is closed?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That gives to each one of the four Members an hour and a quarter.

The SPEAKER. It gives to each one one-quarter of the time, whatever there is. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on the resolution be given the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

Mr. NORTON. That is included in the rule.

The SPEAKER. No; there is no such provision in the rule.

Mr. NORTON. It is in the rule that I have in my hand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the wrong rule. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have five legislative days in which to print remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, that was not the request of the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. I intended to make that request after I got consent to my first request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the resolution may have leave to revise and extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to have that qualified so that those who do extend their remarks will not have leave to incorporate telegrams or letters, but that it shall be their own speech.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am, without that qualification.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California adopt that qualification?

Mr. RAKER. I do, under the circumstances.

Mr. McARTHUR. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman how many days we will have?

The SPEAKER. From now until the close of the session, under a general leave of that sort.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is that broad enough to include those who have already spoken?

Mr. RAKER. I intend that it shall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend remarks upon this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend remarks on the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. MEEKER. Reserving the right to object, I think the same stipulation should be made that there shall not be telegrams and letters included.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California accept the qualification?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, personally I had intended to object, because I think it is a bad practice to make the Record show what does not happen; but there have been so many individual requests for time that I do not desire to punish anybody, and therefore I shall not object.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire if it would interfere with the gentleman's plan in any way if he permitted the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] to open the debate on this resolution?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and will permit the lady from Montana to open the debate under the circumstances. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are facing to-day a question of political evolution. International circumstances have forced this question to an issue. Our country is in a state of war. The Nation has had a terrible shock. The result has been a sudden change in our national consciousness. The things we have for years been taking for granted are suddenly assuming a new significance for us.

We as a Nation were born in a land of unparalleled resources, of vast acreage of fertile soil, of minerals, of coal, oil, gas, of timber, and water power. The combinations in which these resources were found, together with our great natural highways, gave us opportunities for development which no other nation could boast. And we had people, people in whose veins ran the blood of all nations, people imbued with the buoyancy of youth, fearless, and with the will and energy to make their dreams of freedom come true.

Without restraint we drew upon the stored treasure of the past. We spent recklessly, and we wasted our natural resources and our human energy with youthful abandon.

And then came the world war, and with its coming our care-free attitude was suddenly replaced by a new seriousness. To-day we are mobilizing all our resources for the ideals of democracy. We are taking stock of our available energy. And we are finding that with all our past wastefulness we still have limitless resources upon which we can count. We have men—men for the Army, for the Navy, for the air; men for the industries, the mines, the fields; men for the Government. And the national leaders are now reaching out and drawing men of talent, picking those with the best minds, with expert knowledge, and with broad perspective, to aid in war work.

But something is still lacking in the completeness of our national effort. With all our abundance of coal, with our great stretches of idle, fertile land, babies are dying from cold and hunger; soldiers have died for lack of a woolen shirt.

Might it not be that the men who have spent their lives thinking in terms of commercial profit find it hard to adjust themselves to thinking in terms of human needs? Might it not be that a great force that has always been thinking in terms of human needs, and that always will think in terms of human needs, has not been mobilized? Is it not possible that the women of the country have something of value to give the Nation at this time?

It would be strange indeed if the women of this country through all these years had not developed an intelligence, a feeling, a spiritual force peculiar to themselves, which they hold in readiness to give to the world. It would be strange if the influence of women through direct participation in the political struggles, through which all social and industrial development proceeds, would not lend a certain virility, a certain influx of new strength and understanding and sympathy and ability to the exhausting effort we are now making to meet the problem before us.

For 70 years the women leaders of this country have been asking the Government to recognize this possibility. Every great woman who stands out in our history—Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Clara Barton, Mary Livermore, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Frances Willard, Lucy Stone, Jane Addams, Ella Flagg Young, Alice Stone Blackwell, Anna Howard Shaw, Mrs. Catt—all have asked the Government to permit women to serve more effectively the national welfare. All have felt that the energy, the thought, and the suffering that was spent in trying to obtain permission to serve directly should as quickly as possible be turned to the actual service. And in the meantime they did all they could indirectly. They learned to read and to know each other. They became interested in each others' problems, for they found them to be their own problems. As they were the stabilizing influence in the home and kept the family unity, so they have become a great possible stabilizing influence in society, asking now to help keep the unity of the Nation to its highest standard of service.

They have stood back of the men. They have pioneered with them, rejoiced with them over their successes, and, when they failed, encouraged them and helped them to begin again. The women have done all that they were allowed to do, all that the men planned for them to do. But through all their work they have pleaded for the political machinery which would enable them to do more.

To-day as never before the Nation needs its women—needs the work of their hands and their hearts and their minds.

Their energy must be utilized in the most effective service they can give. Are we now going to refuse these women the opportunity to serve in the face of their plea—in the face of the Nation's great need? Are you gentlemen representing the South, you who have struggled with your negro problem for half a century, going to retaliate after 50 years for the injustice you believe was done you so long ago? Have you not learned in your struggle for adjustment in the South to be broad and fair and open-minded in dealing with another franchise problem that concerns the whole Nation?

The women of the South have stood by you through every trial. They have backed you in every struggle, and they gave themselves and all they held most dear for the cause for which their men laid down their lives. Now they are asking to help you again in a big, broad, national way. Are you going to deny them the equipment with which to help you effectively simply because the enfranchisement of a child-race 50 years ago brought you a problem you were powerless to handle?

There are more white women of voting age in the South to-day than there are negro men and women together. Are you going to say to these thoughtful women: "After 50 years we have been unable to accomplish more than a temporary adjustment of our problem; and now we refuse to let you disturb us, even to help us"? Dare you say that in the face of our tremendous national crisis—in the face of problems too great to rest upon the old doctrines of our youth, but demanding the action of a Nation united in spirit and using all its power?

These are heroic times, and they call for the strength and the courage and the dignity to think and act in national terms. We thought in national terms when we restricted activities by the prohibition amendment a few weeks ago. Why can we not now think in national terms and extend opportunities?

Our President emphasized the great nationalizing process our country is undergoing when he took over the railroads of the country to meet this crisis. The food and fuel problems must soon be solved by nationalization. We are working and thinking to-day not as separate States but as a Nation. We must discuss public affairs not as Montanans or New Yorkers or Floridians but as Americans, taking always a national perspective and looking toward the welfare of the entire country.

We have made the protection of our child workers a national question. We declared war not State by State but by Federal action. We mobilized and equipped our Army not State by State but through Congress. Shall our women, our home defense, be our only fighters in the struggle for democracy who shall be denied Federal action? It is time for our old political doctrines to give way to the new visions, the new aspects of national and international relations which have come to us already since the war began.

For we have had new visions; we have been aroused to a new way of looking at things. Our President, with his wisdom and astuteness, has helped us to penetrate new problems, to analyze situations, to make fine distinctions. He startled us by urging us to distinguish between the German Government and the German people. We who have been steeped in democratic ideals since the days when our forefathers signed the Declaration of Independence find it difficult to think of government as something separate from the people.

Yet, as we learn to make this distinction for Germany, will not our minds revert to our own situation and be puzzled? How can people in other countries who are trying to grasp our plan of democracy avoid stumbling over our logic when we deny the first steps in democracy to our women? May they not see a distinction between the Government of the United States and the women of the United States?

Deep down in the hearts of the American people is a living faith in democracy. Sometimes it is not expressed in the most effective way. Sometimes it seems almost forgotten. But when the test comes we find it still there, groping and aspiring, and helping men and women to understand each other and their common need. It is our national religion, and it prompts in us the desire for that measure of justice which is based on equal opportunity, equal protection, equal freedom for all. In our hearts we know that this desire can be realized only when "those who submit to authority have a voice in their own government," whether that government be political, industrial, or social.

To-day there are men and women in every field of endeavor who are bending all their energies toward a realization of this dream of universal justice. They believe that we are waging a war for democracy. The farmer who knows the elements of democracy becomes something of an idealist when he contemplates the possibility of feeding the world during this crisis. The woman who knits all day to keep from thinking of the sacrifice she is making wonders what this democracy is which

she is denied and for which she is asked to give. The miner is dreaming his dreams of industrial democracy as he goes about 2,000 feet underground, bringing forth from the rock precious metals to help in the prosecution of this war.

The girl who works in the Treasury no longer works until she is married. She knows now that she will work on and on and on. The war has taken from her opportunities for the joys that young girls look forward to. Cheerfully and willingly she makes her sacrifice. And she will pay to the very end in order that the future need not find women paying again for the same cause.

The boys at the front know something of the democracy for which they are fighting. These courageous lads who are paying with their lives testified to the sincerity of their fight when they sent home their ballots in the New York election, and voted two to one in favor of woman suffrage and democracy at home. [Applause.]

These are the people of the Nation. These are the fiber and sinew of war—the mother, the farmer, the miner, the industrial worker, the soldier. These are the people who are giving their all for the cause of democracy. These are the people who are resting their faith in the Congress of the United States because they believe that Congress knows what democracy means. These people will not fight in vain.

Can we afford to allow these men and women to doubt for a single instant the sincerity of our protestations of democracy? How shall we answer their challenge, gentlemen; how shall we explain to them the meaning of democracy if the same Congress that voted for war to make the world safe for democracy refuses to give this small measure of democracy to the women of our country? [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the Members of the House that I be permitted to proceed without interruption, and I will beg the Chair to advise me when I have consumed 10 minutes. This proposed amendment should be passed "as an act of right and justice" to the women of America.

To my mind, this is one of the most important questions that has been presented to the Congress since I have been a Member, one that has far more wide-reaching effect upon the people of the country, in so far as what the country stands for and what we stand for, than any other question since the writing of the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of our Constitution. There are 20,000,000 of American women in this country who are of age and entitled to vote, and they simply ask that you extend to them the same right that has been extended to the men of the country. The present amendment does not seek to make any change in that respect; it does not make the change that the opponents claim it does. It does not fix the qualifications. The fact is that her sex, for which she is not responsible, has been the basis for a denial to women of the privilege of participating in this Government. The same qualifications that exist in the States for men, giving them the right to vote, will apply to women. At present when she goes to register or to the polls to vote she is denied that right because she is a female and not a male. There is not one of the qualifications provided in the several States that she can not meet. There is no qualification provided for in any of the State constitutions or their laws that every American citizen can not meet. He must be 21 years of age and a resident of the State, and so forth, and only a few States fix limitations on account of property, and we are truly sorry for that. We provide that those under 21 years of age, because of their want of knowledge of the condition of affairs, shall not vote; that the insane and idiots and those convicted of crime shall not vote. Suffrage is extended to every man in the United States except under the conditions named, and the woman simply asks now that she be given the same right as the man.

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

Mr. RAKER. Not at present, if the gentleman will pardon me. This is unquestionably a war measure.

Mr. MADDEN. I was trying to get some explanation about some matters in the report that I do not quite understand.

Mr. RAKER. I will yield for a question then.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice on the first page of the report written by the gentleman the names of a number of gentlemen and of the lady who have introduced resolutions with respect to suffrage, and on the second page I notice the gentleman from California says that Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado has been a true and loyal advocate of this measure and is one of the pioneers in this work, but he does not say anything about what the others have done. What has that to do with this question?

Mr. RAKER. Nothing, only I like to give credit to whom credit is due.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought maybe they were all entitled to equal credit.

Mr. RAKER. I try to give them all credit.

This is a war measure, unquestionably. The American women of this country are doing the same as the men. In the factory, in the field, in the shop, in fact, in every field of endeavor where aid and assistance could be given to the Government in its mighty struggle for democracy this has been demonstrated. In foreign countries the women are necessary to wage the war, so that the supply of munitions and other things to carry it on may be kept up. In justice to the women of America we say that they should be given the right to vote in this country and thereby become actual and living factors in its affairs and activities.

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

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield for more than a moment. I yield to my colleague on the committee for a question.

Mr. MEEKER. Does the gentleman realize that a very large majority of the women who are doing actual war work do not want this vote?

Mr. RAKER. No; it is just the contrary. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. It is not the contrary.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in Canada, where many hundreds of thousands of their men have gone to the front, the Canadian Government realized the need of the support of its patriotic women. Five Provinces of Canada have granted provincial suffrage. The Canadian Parliament realized and recognized that these women must have the power of the vote, and in September of this year granted the Federal franchise to women, which gave the vote to a million and a half of them, and those loyal Canadian women, with the loyal Canadian men, joined in support of the Canadian Union Government. When the question of conscription was up and to carry on the war, the women by their vote helped to win it. It has been recognized by the premier and the other leading men of Canada that if it had not been for the loyal women's vote in Canada the result might have been disastrous or serious to Canada. In the same way in England, where they have been in this struggle for three years, Parliament has seen fit and proper to give enough time to this question to consider it, and it has passed the House of Commons by vote of 7 to 1, and has gone to the House of Lords, where within the next two weeks they expect to pass it, and it will then receive the King's signature. The women of Australia have stood loyally and patriotically by their Government in this war. They have voted for conscription, they have voted for war, because this is a war for democracy, in which the women are as much interested as the men. And while our men at the front are unable to participate, they have by their vote in the New York election demonstrated how they feel upon this question. When the soldier vote came back it was 2 to 1 for woman suffrage, because they know that mother, wife, and sister at the polls will do everything in their power to uphold the hands of their Government in the way of lives, money, and until, if need be, the last sacrifice has been made, although we hope it will not be needed, to win this war for democracy.

I want to recall to my Republican friends this fact, and I want to say to you, my Republican friends, that your action on this matter is ideal, although it followed hours, and even days, after the declaration of the President. You deserve credit for the position you have taken.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DENISON. It was known by the committee that went to see the President that the Republicans were going to take this matter up and pass it in caucus, was it not?

Mr. RAKER. I want to say to my Republican friends upon this question that I have been in conference with the President for over three years upon this question, and that over three weeks ago I went to him for his advice and to ask him how the matter stood. He told me the same then as he told the committee yesterday afternoon; and I leave it to the members of that committee if this was not his own language. He said: "Raker knew, but he knew how to keep his advice and counsel until the proper time." [Applause.]

Now, to my Democratic friends I want to say this: The Speaker of this House, the chairmen of the committees of this House, and the officers who constitute the organization of this House hold their positions to-day as the result of the votes of women. Without the votes of the Democratic Members from California, the Speaker would not be in the Chair. These Democratic Members from California would not have been elected without the votes of the women of California. Every man who holds a chairmanship of a committee owes it to the woman vote of the West. And I want to say further to the Members on the Democratic side that the returns indicated two

hours before we closed our polls in the West that the President was defeated—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment. But when the final vote was taken the women, realizing what had been done and where the President stood, voted to the last minute for President Wilson. They realized that the Democratic Party had stood for certain things; that they had revised the rules of the House, provided for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, established the postal-savings bank act, Philippine independence, the Porto Rican bill, the child-labor bill, the antitrust law, revision of the tariff downward, the anti-injunction bill, labor legislation, eight-hour law for railroad employees, Alaska railroad, Alaska coal-leasing law, public-land legislation, irrigation-extension act, Federal farm-loan law, Mine Bureau legislation, Department of Labor, and many other progressive and liberal laws demanded by the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to notify the gentleman that he has used 10 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. How did the women of California find out and learn where the President stood on this thing just before election last fall? Nobody else seemed to know it.

Mr. RAKER. They knew it.

Mr. KEARNS. How did they find it out?

Mr. RAKER. I will take a minute or two—

Mr. KEARNS. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. RAKER. The President went home and registered. The President went home and voted for woman suffrage.

Mr. KEARNS. He said he believed in it for the several States—

Mr. RAKER. One moment—and the people of California and the women of the West realized that a man who performs and does acts is better than a man who promises and never does. [Applause.] Therefore they voted for the man whom they believed would carry out the principles for which they stood.

Mr. KEARNS. That is the only information they had upon the subject, is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact they voted for him because he kept us out of war? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just for a question.

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield. Again I want to appeal to my Democratic friends. Lying on this table here are hundreds of telegrams from the loyal women of the South. From every organization and association these women are appealing to Congress that they be recognized as are the men of this country in regard to the right to vote. They say that the negro question is a camouflage, and that they can well take care of it. There are over 8,788,000 white women in the South and 4,000,000 colored. You will have over 4,000,000 more white women than you will have colored. The total negro population is 8,294,274, and white women outnumber both negro males and females by nearly half a million. Therefore, from every conceivable point this resolution should pass. Here are telegrams open for your inspection which show that tens of thousands of loyal women of the South in every Southern State are writing, demanding, and pleading that they be given the right to participate in the affairs of their Government.

Woman suffrage is no longer a controversial question; it is an established fact in nearly half the territory of our country. Wyoming in 1890 led the way and New York in 1917 carried the question "over the top." No one denies that the coming of woman suffrage over the entire country is inevitable. The experiments already tried over a succession of many years have proved certain incontrovertible facts. (1) When the opportunity offers women vote in about the same proportion to their numbers as men. (2) Their vote has wrought no mysterious unfeminizing influence upon them, as the world once feared, nor caused neglect of children, home, or husbands. (3) It has not overturned political parties, nor the social order, nor in any way proved an abnormal or discordant influence. (4) On the contrary, by strengthening the demand for good laws governing home conditions and care of children mothers have been enabled to do their work in the world to better effect. Their influence upon politics and society in general has been a positive and not a negative force. The opinions of the men and women of the suffrage States are practically unanimous on these points.

With the overwhelming testimony on the one hand that woman suffrage in practice is a success and the unanswerable argument for the justice of woman suffrage on the other, there is nothing for a fair-minded American to do but to recognize the fact that woman suffrage is a sound principle in theory and in practice.

With woman suffrage established as a sound principle, the only question remaining is, How shall it be written into the law of the land?

All political parties are pledged to woman suffrage by the planks of their 1916 platforms. Some construe the planks of the Democratic and Republican Parties to mean suffrage for women by amendment of State constitutions only; but the planks of neither party stipulate that there shall be no Federal action. While they declare for suffrage by State action, they do not declare against suffrage by Federal action.

Since the adoption of those platforms circumstances and opinions have radically changed under the quickened impulse toward democracy brought about largely by the war. The reversal of opinion in New York is indicative of the change of view of the whole country.

To carry into effect this change of opinion by State action is clearly impossible at this time. The process is slow and the provisions of many State constitutions practically prohibit amendment. To cling to that plan of procedure longer is, therefore, to repudiate real democracy in the Nation for a method not applicable to present conditions nor responsive to the present demand.

Meanwhile woman suffrage has made amazing progress in foreign lands. In every belligerent country the services of the women in the munition factories, the railways, the shipyards, the offices of administration, have first amazed men and then filled them with admiration and gratitude. The expressions have been numerous among the chiefs of the war departments in Great Britain and France that the successes so far attained would have been impossible without the aid of women. The most conspicuous change of front is that of Mr. Asquith, long premier of Great Britain and an implacable enemy of woman suffrage. Said he:

Short of actually bearing arms in the field, there is hardly a service which has contributed or is contributing to the maintenance of our cause in which women have not been at least as active and as efficient as men, and wherever we turn we see them doing, with zeal and success and without any detriment to the prerogatives of their sex, work which three years ago would have been regarded as falling exclusively within the province of men. This is not a merely sentimental argument, though it appeals to our feelings as well as our judgment. But what I confess moves me still more in this matter is the problem of reconstruction when the war is over. The questions which will then necessarily arise in regard to women's labor and women's functions and activities in the new ordering of things—for, do not doubt it, the old order will be changed—the questions in regard to which I, for my part, feel it impossible, consistently either with justice or with expediency, to withhold from women the power and the right of making their voice directly heard.

The greater respect for the claims of women to a share in government which the war has brought the world around has resulted in remarkable actual gains.

SUFFRAGE ADVANCE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, 1917.

Great Britain: Premier Lloyd-George on behalf of the Liberal Party has pledged the parliamentary vote to British women (all other electoral rights were extended long ago), and by a vote of 7 to 1 the measure passed the House of Commons in June. It is expected that the bill will be through the House of Lords and receive the King's signature before the middle of February. Lloyd-George said, "To give the women no voice would be an outrage; it would be unjust, inequitable. That is why the woman question has become largely a war question."

Canada: Five Provinces within the last two years have extended full suffrage to women by acts of their legislatures, and in September a bill was passed by the Dominion Parliament giving the parliamentary vote to all women who are mothers, wives, widows, sisters, or daughters of soldiers, making the parliamentary vote practically universal, except for those of alien-enemy birth naturalized since 1902. Premier Robert Borden has pledged full suffrage.

In Mexico, in November, 1917, the State of Guanajuato conferred the privilege of suffrage in all municipal matters upon women of reputable character.

In France a suffrage commission appointed by the Chamber of Deputies has brought in a favorable report on woman suffrage, declaring that women should have the vote "first of all as an act of delayed justice and secondly as a move dictated by public interests." The measure is now pending.

Bohemia: The city of Prague has appointed a commission with instructions to bring in a new plan of franchise for the city, including woman suffrage.

Hungary: The city of Budapest unanimously demanded of the Hungarian Parliament suffrage for men and for women, and the minister of justice has pledged the party in power to grant the petition.

Italy: The premier of Italy, on behalf of the majority party, has pledged municipal suffrage for women.

Sweden: All the Scandinavian countries, except Sweden—that is, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland—have universal suffrage for both men and women. The King of Sweden has recommended full suffrage for women of that country, where

they have long enjoyed municipal suffrage, and the Premier of the Liberal Party now in power has pledged his party to grant it.

Belgium: The King of Belgium has said that if ever his kingdom is restored to him one of his first acts will be to see that the women are enfranchised as a reward for the wonderful service they have rendered to their country in its time of stress.

Germany: Woman suffrage was recently proposed in the Imperial Reichstag as a reward for the war service of the women and was debated.

While other nations are fighting for their very lives in the world war for democracy, they have found time to take steps toward its establishment at home. Yet those nations are supposed to be more conservative than ours, and most of them are pledged to institutions that are more or less monarchical rather than democratic.

The Congress of the United States has not acted upon this question; it can pass the question on to the States. That is the purpose of this proposed amendment. For the Congress of the supposedly most democratic country in the world to refuse to take this action, to block the progress of democracy at home while professing to fight for it abroad, would be so high handed a performance as to fill the world with suspicions of our purposes in the war. To deny the States the opportunity to establish woman suffrage if they wish to do so is an act of autocratic injustice which would certainly be misunderstood abroad and would deeply incense the millions of women who are voters as well as the millions more who are petitioning for the vote. The opinions of millions of men and women are expressed in an editorial of the Los Angeles Times of December 24, 1917:

The women of the States where equal suffrage now prevails have fully justified their claim to the ballot. The game of politics is played more cleanly and occupies a higher plane than before women were permitted to vote; and the part which the women of America have taken in the war crisis proves incontestably that they are qualified both mentally and temperamentally to assist in the direction of the destinies of the Nation. To oppose longer the right of equal suffrage is simply to play the rôle of illogical obstructionist.

The West wants the opportunity of ratifying the Federal suffrage amendment and thus to stop delay in the establishment of this measure of democratic justice. Gov. Lister, of Washington, calls attention to the fact that the legislature of that State by joint memorial asked Congress to submit the amendment, and that the State is ready to ratify it. Gov. Stewart, of Montana, wires, "I hope the Federal amendment will pass. Montana is for woman suffrage."

The governor of Wyoming wires, "After 40 years' experience with woman suffrage Wyoming enthusiastically and unqualifiedly recommends the adoption by the Nation of the Federal woman-suffrage amendment."

Gov. Gunter, of Colorado, wires, "Woman suffrage has been beneficial to Colorado and I recommend the extension to the women of the Nation."

Gov. Capper, of Kansas, wires, "Woman suffrage has been an unqualified success in Kansas. I hope Congress will pass the Federal suffrage amendment and give the woman of the Nation the right to vote, a right which should never have been denied them."

Gov. Boyle says Nevada's people "want to see suffrage established Nation wide as part of Federal Constitution."

"Idaho is in favor of national enfranchisement of our women. It is in favor of the Federal suffrage amendment, woman suffrage having worked in Idaho so satisfactorily that we believe its benefits should be Nation wide," wires Gov. Alexander.

Oregon's governor, James Withycombe, wires that he is a strong advocate of the Federal suffrage amendment.

"The Utah Legislature, by unanimous vote, recommended the adoption of an amendment to the National Constitution granting woman suffrage. I heartily concur in this recommendation and feel that such an amendment will be favorably acted upon by Congress," reads the telegram signed by Gov. Simon Bamberger.

"The people of Arizona have already ratified an amendment to the State constitution giving full suffrage to both sexes alike. I regard such ratification as an index to the manner in which the people of this State would receive a Federal amendment providing for universal suffrage," wires Gov. W. P. Hunt.

Gov. Whitman, of New York, says: "I believe that the proposed Federal amendment providing for equal suffrage should be passed, and I believe, too, in the event of its passage that it will be ratified by at least three-fourths of the States. The State of New York by an overwhelming majority has given the vote to its women, and I think that it is the wish of our people that our Representatives in Congress should support this measure."

The Legislature of California in session in 1917, both houses concurring, unanimously passed a joint resolution, which reads as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 22, relative to urging Congress to submit to the legislatures of the States for their ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution granting women the right to vote.

Whereas the women of the United States are being called upon to share the burden and sacrifice incidental to the present national crisis; and Whereas they are patriotically responding to that call: Be it

Resolved, That denial of the right of women to vote in any part of the Nation on equal terms with the men is an injustice; and be it further

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring therein), That we do urge upon Congress the submission to the legislatures of the States for their ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution granting women the right to vote.

In other words, the people who have seen woman suffrage in operation, who know what it is and how it works, recommend it whole-heartedly to the rest of the country, and those who are blocking its progress are those who do not know what it is nor how it works but are governed by preconceived notions emanating from traditional prejudice.

The fact that the soldier vote of New York went 2 to 1 for suffrage should not be forgotten. These men, or those of them who come back, will be our Congressmen, our governors, and so forth, a few years hence. To vote with them on this question now is not to be regarded by them later as bigots and obstructionists.

It should be remembered the suffrage amendment is only a referendum. Those who vote for it are not committed to woman suffrage; they are merely committed to the proposition that they are willing to grant the States an opportunity to act. Those who vote against it are obstructing this movement which has already so far succeeded that 10,000,000 women of voting age live under woman-suffrage laws.

In 1916, 91 electoral votes were controlled jointly by men and women, and it was commonly admitted that women in the Western States played an important rôle in deciding the election. During the year 1917 the number of electoral votes cast by equal-suffrage States grew from 91 to 193. These voting women, as well as the millions of nonvoting petitioners, are certain to be deeply incensed if the same Congress which referred prohibition to the States refuses equally fair treatment to woman suffrage.

It must be borne in mind that it was the Nation, not the States, which declared war, conscripted men, voted a necessarily huge war tax, and has taken over the control of food and fuel. It is the Nation which has appealed to women to take the places of men, to give their money, their labor, their sons. All these things which but a few months ago seemed impossible have happened, and the Nation is engaged in the greatest war of its history—a war for democracy.

This crisis of our Nation calls for bolder action than would have been necessary a year ago. We can not consistently profess to lead in a war for democracy and be the last nation to establish it at home. Nor can we claim that the Nation is fighting for democracy abroad and leave the States to demonstrate our understanding of democracy at home. The loyal votes of women who would vote in the places of absent men are a national concern. The war has made woman suffrage a national question. The Congress should treat it as such.

The Congressmen who called on him to ask his advice were advised very frankly and earnestly by President Wilson to vote for the amendment "as an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world."

The women of America will be grateful to President Wilson for his advice and consequent great assistance in their cause, and the Members of the House can well afford to follow such advice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used 13 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon].

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, House joint resolution No. 200 is entitled "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women," and provides for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which prohibits the several States from refusing to permit women to vote in any and all elections.

Section 2 of this resolution provides: "Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of

this article." Here the authority is conferred to enable the Government of the United States to take charge of every election held in the most remote precinct of every State in this Union, and to override and nullify every constitutional provision and statute in each of the States of this Union enacted to protect the purity and sanctity of the ballot. All these constitutional provisions and legislative enactments in each of the States are subordinated, subverted, and submerged to the will of the Federal Government by the terms of this proposed amendment. We are told that this revolutionary proposition must be engrafted upon the organic law of this Nation, because the people in different States of this Union have voted down proposed amendments to their State constitutions, conferring the right to vote upon women in those Commonwealths. The only reasons which can be assigned for proposing this amendment are: (1) The qualifications of voters are defined in the constitutions of the several States, and any change proposed therein must be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors. (2) By submitting this proposed amendment to the legislatures of the several States, instead of to constitutional conventions called for the purpose of passing upon it, the purpose to prevent even an indirect expression of the people on the amendment is apparent. The advocates of this amendment have a legal opinion from their counsel to the effect that even in those States which have constitutional provisions authorizing a referendum upon all legislation, a referendum can not be invoked upon the action of a State legislature in ratifying this amendment. The real underlying motive, then, for this proposed amendment is to override the action of the people of a number of the States, at the polls, by an appeal to Congress and the legislatures of other States.

This joint resolution is a naked and impudent repudiation of both the letter and spirit of the last national platforms adopted by the two leading political parties in this Nation, and every man on this floor, elected as a Democrat or Republican, who did not in the last campaign openly repudiate the platform of his party on this question is guilty of an act of bad faith in voting for this joint resolution. The Democratic national platform adopted at St. Louis, June 16, 1916, reads on suffrage as follows:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

Here is a plain and unequivocal recognition of the right of each State to control the question of suffrage in accordance with the wishes of the people of the several individual States. The Republican national platform adopted at Chicago on June 10, 1916, deals with this proposed joint resolution in the following terms:

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in Government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of the country, favors the extension of suffrage to women, but recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself.

If this language is not a plain, unequivocal, and emphatic recognition of the right of each State to settle and determine the question of woman suffrage for itself, then there are no words in the English language that would fairly express that purpose. Any Congressman on the floor of this House elected as a Democrat or a Republican who did not in the campaign in which he was last a candidate publicly repudiate this plank in his party's platform is morally bound to vote against this joint resolution. There is not in the Constitution or laws of the United States a single restriction, limitation, or obstruction to prevent, hinder, or delay the adoption of woman suffrage by any State in this Union. If any such obstruction existed, I would vote to remove it. Because the suffrage leaders in some of the large States of this Union have not been able to convince a majority of the electors of those States that woman suffrage ought to be adopted, or that even a majority of the women in those States favor it, these women rush down here to Washington and ask the Congress of the United States, by a species of legislative force and violence embodied in this joint resolution, to override and nullify the action of their own State by the aid of the legislatures of other States and their Representatives in Congress. Permit me to call attention to the history of my own State upon this question. In 1912 we held a constitutional convention in Ohio, which promulgated and submitted to a vote of the people of the State certain amendments, one of which authorized women to vote at all elections. It was defeated. In 1914 this same amendment was again submitted, and in the largest vote ever cast in the State up to that time this amendment was again voted down by a majority of 182,905 votes. These elections would seem to have established the fact that, whatever the sentiment in other States of the Union, the people

of Ohio, both men and women, were opposed to granting the women of that State the right to vote. In the spring of 1917 a bill was introduced in the legislature of our State to confer upon women the authority to vote for and thereby join in the appointment of presidential electors. The broad power conferred upon the States by the Federal Constitution would seem to warrant the selection of presidential electors in any manner that the legislatures of the States might deem wise. This language is as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of [presidential] electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Standing alone, this language of the Federal Constitution would seem to permit the legislatures of the several States to authorize the red-headed women alone in those States to appoint presidential electors, but the framers of the Ohio constitution concluded it would not be wise to leave such broad powers in the general assembly of our State, so a provision was inserted in our State constitution adopted in 1851 that "No person shall be appointed or elected to any office in this State who is not an elector," and in the same instrument the term "elector" is defined as "male white citizens 21 years old." The authority conferred by the legislatures of the several States to join in the appointment of presidential electors, either at elections or in any other way, is unquestionably an office which is defined as "a special duty, trust, charge, or position conferred by an exercise of governmental authority and for a public purpose." A majority of each branch of the legislature of Ohio yielded to the clamor and importunities of the same men and women who are in Washington now attempting to force woman suffrage on the State of Ohio by a Federal constitutional amendment and passed the measure authorizing women to vote for presidential electors. A referendum upon this measure was invoked by the constitutional number of electors of our State, and at the November election in 1917 this Reynolds bill authorizing women to join with men in the appointment of presidential electors in Ohio was defeated by 146,120 majority. This most recent action of the electors of Ohio, of course, furnishes, from the standpoint of these militant suffragists, an additional argument why this constitutional amendment ought to be adopted, because it seems to demonstrate the failure to procure woman suffrage in Ohio with the consent of the people of that State.

In addition to the pending joint resolution and others of similar tenor and effect, the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] have introduced bills entitled, "A bill to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Senators of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives," and then these bills attempt to confer by legislative enactment of Congress authority upon the women of all the States of this Union to vote for United States Senators and Members of the United States House of Representatives. These bills were recently referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the House, and, being desirous of learning what it was the purpose of this committee to do with these bills, I called upon the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] after the bills had been referred to her committee and asked her what the committee proposed to do with them. She replied in substance that the action of the committee on these bills would depend upon the action of the House on the joint resolution now pending.

In other words, if the Congress of the United States refuses to pass this joint resolution to amend the Constitution, this Committee on Woman Suffrage proposes to pass one of these bills in violation of the Constitution as a measure of reprisal against the Congress and people of the United States.

We are threatened by these militant suffragettes with a direct and lawless invasion by the Congress of the United States of the rights of those States which have refused to confer upon their women the privilege of voting. This attitude on the part of some of the suffrage Members of this House is on an exact equality with the acts of these women militants who have spent the last summer and fall, while they were not in the District jail or workhouse, in coaxing, teasing, and nagging the President of the United States for the purpose of inducing him by coercion to club Congress into adopting this joint resolution. [Cries of "They got it!"] Last Saturday one of these suffrage crusaders declared before the Woman Suffrage Committee of the House that unless Congress enacts this pending joint resolution they intend to renew their siege of the White House and keep it up until the occupant surrenders to them. They forget the admonition which one of their orators gave to the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee [Mr. RAKER]: To see the

President in behalf of this joint resolution, and if he was for it to advertise that fact, but that if he declared against it to tell him it is none of his official business, anyway. [Laughter.] This same militant Amazon from Iowa in this same speech declared that the only way they could get woman suffrage in Iowa was through the action of Congress and the State legislatures by constitutional amendment, because the qualifications of electors in Iowa are defined by the constitution, and the people of that State had voted down a woman's suffrage amendment and the legislature could not reverse the action of the people at the polls. She explained that the people of Iowa had also voted down State-wide prohibition, but that the legislature enacted it. What the State of Iowa needs worse than anything else is a lot of first-class political funerals among their Members of Congress and State legislature. [Laughter.] The people of Iowa ought to change their minds on the subject of prohibition and woman suffrage or change their representatives in Congress and in the legislature of their State. [Laughter.]

Now, the President of the United States has no more to do officially with the adoption of a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment than has Carrie Chapman Catt. The action of these militants in besieging the President's official residence with pikes and banners for the purpose of procuring the adoption of this joint resolution is not only an insult to Senators and Congressmen, who are the only United States officials charged with any duty or responsibility in the matter, but it is a reflection upon the President himself, who repeatedly declared before his last election, and which was declared in the platform upon which he was reelected, to be a question for each State to decide for itself. Mr. Wilson did not, like his opponent, repudiate the platform upon which he was running for President in 1916, and having been reelected upon a platform which recognized the right of each State to control the question of suffrage for itself. I say it is an insult for any man or woman to ask or expect the President to use his influence with Congressmen and Senators to induce them to violate the platforms upon which they were elected.

It is only a few years ago that the resounding voice of a presidential candidate was heard throughout the land, propounding the inquiry, "Shall the people rule?" This same man has been in Washington during the present session of Congress, urging Members to prevent the people of their States from ruling on the question of prohibition and woman's suffrage by forcing these policies on them by constitutional amendment through Congress and the State legislatures of other States. Nothing in the Constitution or laws of the United States prevents a single State in the Union from granting suffrage to its women, and if there is any obstacle in the constitution or laws of any State a majority of the people of that State can remove it. This joint resolution ought to be entitled: "A bill to take from the people of the States control over an important matter and vest it in the legislatures of three-fourths of the States." It ought to be defeated, and I hope and believe it will be, here or elsewhere.

In a recent decision by the Supreme Court of Indiana, adjudging null and void an act of the State legislature attempting to authorize women to vote for certain candidates for office, the court said:

The right of suffrage is not a natural or inherent right, but a political privilege, and it is held only by those on whom it is bestowed, either by virtue of express constitutional grant or through authorized legislative provision. The question is primarily one for the consideration of the people in their capacity as creators of the constitution, and is never one for the consideration of the legislature, except in so far as that instrument clearly sanctions an extension of the elective franchise or permits a regulation of its mode of exercise.

The lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] has introduced a joint resolution in this House recognizing the right of Ireland to home rule and political independence, but she is unwilling to permit the people of Ohio to have home rule in their domestic affairs, but by her voice and vote as a Member of this House is attempting to deprive them of it. The people of my State have always sympathized with the desire of the people of Ireland for home rule, but we demand it for Ohio and for every other State in this Union as a matter of right. These vociferous advocates of home rule for foreign nations and peoples ought to apply their principles to their own people, for home rule, like charity, ought to begin at home.

Mr. Speaker, there is very much more involved in this joint resolution than the principle, bad as it is, of coercing the people of a number of States into granting to women the privilege of voting at elections. The exercise of this power involves the assertion of the right by constitutional amendment to overturn, alter, amend, and repeal the taxation laws, the school laws, the statutes of descent and distribution of real and personal prop-

erty, and numberless other local laws and institutions which were deeply rooted in such old States as Virginia and Massachusetts many years before the Federal Government was organized. To protect the States from the possible invasion of these rights by the Federal Government the tenth amendment was adopted concurrently with the Constitution itself, by which it was solemnly asserted that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

This amendment was designed and intended to declare and define the relations between the States and Federal Government, and it was only because their relative rights and powers were so designated and generally understood that a Union was agreed upon. If any considerable number of people, prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, had asserted the right and power of three-fourths of the States to usurp by constitutional amendment jurisdiction and control over purely local matters, the Constitution would never have been ratified by the requisite number of States. The right to vote is a privilege, coupled with a duty and responsibility, which in free States is vested in those of its citizens who may be trusted to exercise it wisely for the general welfare; it is not, as so many of our militant friends so vociferously assert, a right inherent in the citizen like the right to life, liberty, and property. If a voter sells his vote, the law condemns him to penal servitude in the penitentiary for the betrayal of a public trust reposed in him by his fellow citizens to be exercised solely for their benefit, in accordance with his best judgment, which it is unlawful for him to delegate to another. Our woman-suffrage friends, who contend so glibly that all human beings have an inherent and inalienable right to vote and that they have been deprived of this "right" by "man-made" laws, are, of course, driven to the extremity of conceding the same "right" to all other human beings, hence we hear the most fantastic arguments adduced in support of laws permitting parents to vote their children, guardians of imbeciles and lunatics their wards, and mothers their babes in arms, and so forth.

I would not vote to deprive any woman of the voting privilege she now enjoys by the action of her own State, but Members of Congress before voting for this joint resolution ought to weigh and consider all the consequences involved in such action. You are invading the jurisdiction of many States against the protest of their own citizens upon a matter of local or State concern and upon a subject concerning which you can not claim any special or superior knowledge. What do Members of Congress know about the qualifications of citizens, men or women, in remote States, to exercise the elective franchise? They know still less about the state of public sentiment where no election on the subject has been held.

In the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Texas aliens are permitted to vote after having declared their intention to become American citizens and after having been residents of the States the required time, usually six months; and, therefore, we have the anomalous situation of hundreds of thousands of alien enemies in these States voting at all elections. Although final naturalization will be refused to them during the period of the war, they are excluded by law from military service, from suing in the courts, and some of them are confined in internment camps. If this joint resolution shall be adopted by Congress and approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, the practical effect of it will be to place the ballot in the hands of many thousands more of alien enemies who are under the disabilities above described.

In the summer of 1915 I attended a luncheon of the Ohio Woman's Suffrage Association and occupied a seat next to the president, who has held that office for 13 years continuously. She is one of the best educated and most accomplished women in our State. I asked her if she believed that since woman's suffrage had been rejected in Ohio by more than 180,000 majority, I, as a Representative from that State, ought to go to Washington and attempt to force it on them by Federal amendment. She answered, "No." I asked her further if she did not believe that whenever a majority of the women in Ohio desired to vote, the men would grant them that privilege. She answered, "Yes." And yet this lady is now here in Washington with an opinion of her lawyers to the effect that if this joint resolution passes and the legislature of our State ratifies this amendment, such action can not be submitted to a vote of the people under the initiative and referendum provision of our State Constitution, and she is urging that Congress enact this joint resolution. Because childish and imbecile arguments are adduced in favor of a proposition, does not prove that it is wrong or unwise, but it raises an implication that sound reasons

are lacking. We are told that because the men of the Nation are being mobilized in training camps and rushed to Europe to defend the rights of this Nation, the women ought to be rushed into the voting booths to take their places there. The logic of this argument is that because the men are required to defend with arms in their hands the rights of our people under international law, the women ought, with their well-known pacifist tendencies, to be armed with the ballot in order that they may vote for a treaty of peace, dictated by the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs. I have been told that by voting against this resolution I am showing disrespect to the memory of my mother. The only suggestion my mother ever made to me on the subject of woman's suffrage was that she hoped I would not aid in forcing this additional duty and responsibility upon the mothers of this land, because it would add enormously to the already too large number of ignorant and incompetent voters. Do not be misled into believing that the shrill and strident voice of the militant suffragette is the voice of the people or the voice of God.

When Elijah stood upon the mountain top listening for the voice of the Lord, we are told in Holy Writ that the Lord was not in the wind. He was not in the earthquake. He was not in the fire, but in the still, small voice which followed these convulsions of nature. If the Members of this House will heed the "still small voice" of reason, justice, and common sense and permit their votes to be controlled by their conscientious convictions of public duty, they will defeat this joint resolution. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am still "standing with the President," or, in other words, the President this morning is standing with me. [Applause.]

Last night the President met his party in conference and advised them to vote to-day for woman suffrage as "an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world." At the same hour the Republican Members of this House were also in conference and voted by a large majority to stand by that part of the plank in the last Republican national platform which said:

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of the country, favors the extension of the suffrage to women.

Woman has conquered. She has met every test and answered every argument, and now demands from this Congress simple justice. It is justice long delayed. The greatest logician that ever lived was John Stuart Mill. His wonderful work on logic is the textbook of every great college in the world. Fifty years ago he wrote a wonderful book on "The Subjection of Woman." In that book he carefully considered every possible argument for and against woman suffrage. He gave to that consideration calm, cold, and merciless logic, and he arrived at the following conclusions:

The legal subordination of one sex to the other is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side nor disability on the other.

To have a voice in choosing those by whom one is governed is a means of self-protection due to everyone. Under whatever conditions and within whatever limits men are admitted to the suffrage there is not a shadow of justification for not admitting women under the same.

Mill has never been answered. He never will be answered. All the arguments of logic and reason have for the last half century been settled in favor of the enfranchisement of women.

But there were those who said "Mill's logic is all right, but he stands for a theory in government that has never been put to practice. Experience will show that women should not have the ballot," and since that time we have had fully demonstrated the argument from experience.

Forty-nine years ago Wyoming gave to her women equal suffrage, and year by year since then State after State of the great western world has enfranchised her women until 11 States, side by side, have full suffrage and 18 States to-day have presidential suffrage. Never one of these States has for a moment thought of returning to the old way. Never a legislature has resubmitted the question to the voters. The women of these States have never asked to be again returned to slavery. Representatives from these States are sitting to-day in this Congress. They are a fine body of men, intelligent, patriotic, and honest. They are the equal of any of the other States in the Union, and every one of these Representatives will tell you that they are proud of the suffrage given to their women; that experience has shown the wisdom of the act; that nothing would induce them to return to the time when the ballot was given only to the male voters. This argument from experience is conclusive; it can not

be answered by the absurd claim that evil would result from now placing the ballot in the hands of American women.

But there are those to-day in this House who invoke the old, discarded doctrine of State rights and say that woman suffrage has no place in the Constitution; that it should be settled by the States. Every one of these arguments could have been more forcibly invoked against all the 17 amendments to our national Constitution, and with a great deal more reason and logic than against the present amendment now before Congress.

Another says you had an election down in Maine last September, and your State defeated woman suffrage. Why should you here on the floor of Congress after that advocate the passage of this amendment? I answer that the election in Maine settled nothing, but only proves the inability of a State to settle this matter by submitting it to the voters at a special election.

In the last State election in my State for governor there were cast over 150,000 votes. At this special election for woman suffrage only 58,000 voted. In other words, 92,000 male voters of my State were afflicted with political indifference and did not go to the ballot box. Of the one-third who voted, the majority were induced to vote against woman suffrage by false testimony and an appeal to their prejudices. Before that election all over my State, at the leading hotels the political leaders of both parties were given banquets by those opposed to woman suffrage, and somebody paid the bills. I do not know who, and at those banquets there was provided a speaker, who was advertised to come from one of the suffrage States of the West, an unknown, smooth of tongue and polished of manner, who claimed to the banqueters that he lived in a State that had given the ballot to women and that the people of his State were disgusted and dissatisfied with their act enfranchising the women; that experience had shown that the women did not want the ballot; that they did not vote at the elections; that a great many evils had grown up by giving the ballot to women, and so forth, and under the influence of a good dinner these men accepted the ex parte testimony of this unknown and were induced to go to the ballot box and give a verdict on such false testimony, when every governor of these States and every Representative and Senator and every public man of any note and influence was eager to give the lie to such statements. And while these dinners were being served hired speakers from out the State were going from place to place in the country towns appealing to the patriotic impulses of the people to stand by the President and against picketing at the White House, and claiming that if the ballot was given to the women of Maine the pickets at the White House would continue during the war, and these appeals to prejudice caused a sufficient number to defeat woman suffrage. Such arguments could not prevail in our legislature. Such witnesses would never be tolerated there. After the election in Maine, New York State met these arguments, exposed their falseness, and from an adverse verdict of over 200,000 two years ago New York voted in favor of woman suffrage by a majority of over 90,000.

A few days before the New York election that approved suffrage the New York Tribune published as a matter of news the following:

WOMEN WHO NEED THE VOTE PLEAD FOR EQUAL SUFFRAGE—LAUNDRY, KITCHEN, AND SWEATSHOP WORKERS, POORLY CLAD, FACE 10,000 MEN IN UNION SQUARE AND SHOW WHY THEY SHOULD HAVE FRANCHISE.

Up from the laundries and the kitchens, from the sweatshops and the factories, the working women came yesterday to plead with the men of New York for the vote. Much has been said of the need of the ballot to remedy conditions for the working women, but usually the working woman has had to keep on working and let some one else do the talking for her. Yesterday she came herself.

Pale, undersized, meanly clad, the women who need the vote climbed a rickety ladder lead up to a platform erected on the north side of Union Square and faced a crowd of 10,000 men. Then in a series of "living pictures," they told the story of woman's place in the industrial world.

Down in Maine both political parties indorsed suffrage in their platforms, and then never lifted a finger at the election to put it into the constitution. In New York State both political parties indorsed not only woman suffrage in convention but worked and voted for it on the day of election, and they won. Maine's legislature is ready to-day to indorse this amendment, but she is not satisfied with this special election which settled nothing.

As a Representative from Maine, I am unwilling that the great States of New York and Illinois should double their voting population while Maine is shorn of her power. The suffrage States to-day control 163 electoral votes for President. What influence will Maine and other nonsuffrage States in New England have in the next presidential campaign if their women remain unfranchised?

Thomas B. Reed, of my State, ex-Speaker of this House, who submitted every argument to the court of common sense, said of woman suffrage:

If suffrage be right, if it be true that no man has a claim to govern any other man, except to the extent that the other man has a right to govern him, then there can be no discussion of the question of

woman suffrage. No reason on earth can be given by those who claim suffrage as a right of manhood which does not make it a right of womanhood also.

The late Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, said:

We have driven our leading opponents from one position to another until there is not a thoughtful opponent of woman suffrage to be found who is not obliged to deny the doctrine which is affirmed in our Declaration of Independence.

The late Hon. John D. Long, ex-governor of Massachusetts and Secretary of the Navy, put the argument for woman suffrage in a nutshell when he said:

I have never heard an argument against woman suffrage that was not an insult against the intelligence of a 10-year-old boy. If one man or woman wants to exercise the right to vote, what earthly reason is there for denying it because other men and women do not wish to exercise it?

If I desire to breathe the fresh air of Heaven, shall I not cross my threshold because the rest of the family group prefer the stale atmosphere indoors? When the Government extends the principle of voting to a citizen it says to him, "We do not compel you to appear at the polls; we simply give you the liberty to vote or not to vote, as you desire. You may express your consent or your protest against conditions, and you may help make civilization if you wish." On the other hand, when the Government refuses the privilege, it says, "We compel you to remain away from the ballot box. Whether you wish to vote or not, you shall not. We will impose upon you any laws which we see fit, and you shall have no official authority to protest or to consent."

Human ingenuity can not suggest a single distinction between the sexes so far as the right of voting is concerned. They are equally intelligent so far as the intelligence to vote is concerned. They are equally competent to judge of the merits of measures and the comparative merits of candidates. * * * If it is a right, why should it be denied? When yet in the history of the world has it been found that what is right is inexpedient?

The New York World, of October 28 last, said:

The case for woman suffrage rests upon a fundamental principle of democracy, the right of the governed to have a voice in their government. Women have the same kind of a stake in government that men have. In modern civilization there is practically no sheltered woman who lives apart from her times. She may exist in the fiction of novelists and in the fiction of the common law, and there may be an instance now and then of complete feminine isolation from the current of events, just as there are men and women who live in monasteries and convents; but the Government affects most of us in the same way regardless of sex, and civilization that compels women to be wage earners has destroyed the last argument against their voting.

And so one by one, every argument either from reason, logic, or experience has been decided in favor of woman, and here to-day on this floor everyone admits that if this amendment is submitted by Congress it will be adopted by the States. Here to-day everyone admits that there is no argument against woman suffrage and we only differ as to methods, as to whether woman suffrage shall be given by a Federal amendment or be delayed and defeated by special elections in the several States.

The American woman stands before us to-day with every argument in her favor and she demands of us only justice.

It has been well said that "There is something grander than benevolence, more august than charity. It is justice," and that "justice delayed is justice denied."

The Sacred Record gives us an apt example of justice denied:

Then said Pilate unto Him, * * * "knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?"

Pilate therefore went forth again, and saith unto them, "Behold, I bring Him forth to you that ye may know that I find no fault in Him."

When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this Just Person; see ye to it."

And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required.

And when he had scourged Jesus he delivered him to be crucified.

It is not up to the President. The responsibility can not be shifted to our political party or to the revival of State rights. The Members of this Congress have the responsibility and the power. We, too, can say to the women of this country as Pilate said of old, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee and power to release thee?"

We must meet this responsibility. We can not deny women justice and then wash our hands in the waters of State rights.

Woman does not ask you for praise; she does not demand flattery. She begs of you not to ridicule her further, but to let her have in the battle of life the same weapons of defense that you possess; to let her stand and work by your side, your equal, your companion in the battle of life. She asks only and simply justice.

For all mankind one Christ has sighed
Upon the cross; but hourly
Is every woman crucified!

O sons of mothers, shall the pain
Of all childbearing be in vain?
Shall we drive nails, to wound her thus,
Into the hands that fondled us?

In this Capitol sits the greatest court and most august judicial tribunal in the world—the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the greatest minds that ever graced that tribunal was the late Justice Brewer, of this city. Shortly before his death he reviewed woman suffrage from the standpoint of

the judge. He submitted her case to the judicial mind. He reviewed all the arguments for and against her and summed up the case in her favor in the following eloquent language:

Female suffrage will come; woman's broader education, her increasing familiarity with business and public affairs, will lead to it; and why not?

The chief reply is the home. God forbid that it should be jeopardized. But female suffrage will not debase the home or lessen its power and influence. On the other hand, it will introduce a refining and uplifting power into our political life.

Union in effort is the growing lesson of the times. Our first parents, guilty of a mutual sin, were, according to the allegory in Genesis, driven out of Eden, that garden which gave men all things to live with and nothing to live for. Hand in hand they went out of Eden; hand in hand they must enter the new paradise, grander and nobler than the pristine Eden, because wrought out of the thorn-growing earth by their united labors.

This is the case for woman suffrage. I submit that it meets every argument; that it justifies the affirmative action of every Representative; that it calls for our votes in favor of this amendment as an act of justice to woman. We can not vote against woman suffrage and go out into the world and meet the eyes of women when we have denied them justice. How can I go down Pennsylvania Avenue to my home and meet the 10,000 women who, early in the morning, throng our streets on their way to do the work of the men in the departments, in the shops, and in the industries when I have denied them justice? How can I meet the eyes of the women in the munition factories and in the homes who are fighting the battle for life and bread to keep the home fires burning while the men are at war? Three-fourths of the teachers in our public schools are women. How can I meet them after I have denied them the ballot? Ten million women are out in the ranks of industry, loyally supporting the country, doing all the work that men could do to preserve our institutions and our flag and give democracy to the world. If I cross the ocean and go upon the present battle fields, there I will find the Red Cross women in the hospitals, in the ambulances, thousands on the battle fields, risking their lives standing by man's side in this great world war. I can not vote against her and meet those silent patient eyes when I have denied her justice; and so to-day I stand—

For equal rights,
For human weal,
For nobler aim,
For laws that heal
The wounds of tyrants.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when the woman-suffrage amendment was before the House, January 12, 1915, I stated my position as follows:

Mr. Speaker, woman suffrage is another of the questions which the younger States of the Union are passing up for acceptance to the older and more populous States. The Legislature of Pennsylvania has partially indicated its purpose to submit this question to a vote of the people of the State. Thus far, apart from the preliminary step taken by the legislature, we have had no real expression from the body of the people of the State upon the subject, and we can not have until further action is taken by the legislature. It is therefore impossible at this time to say definitely whether Pennsylvania approves of the wisdom or desirability of woman suffrage. We are not assured that a majority of the women themselves desire it. Some of them oppose it bitterly upon the ground that it will tend to degrade rather than exalt the womanhood of the State. Women who hold this view contend that in America no such social or legal inequalities as are said to prevail in England and other European countries exist. There is also a considerable feeling amongst the women opposed to suffrage that the high place which American women now hold in the esteem of many men may be prejudicially affected by forcing upon all women, regardless of their domestic relations, the responsibility that would be imposed by the voting power. While I recognize the "right" of mothers, wives, and single women, if they so desire, to inject themselves into the maelstrom of politics, even though the exercise of that "right" may tend to lessen the sacred preference which is already accorded to them by all true Americans, I do not believe I am authorized as a Representative to impose such responsibilities upon them now, nor until at least a majority of the people of Pennsylvania have indicated that such a course shall be pursued. I shall therefore vote against the resolution.

It will be recalled that the amendment was defeated in the House. Subsequently the question of woman suffrage, under an act of the legislature, was submitted to the people of Pennsylvania, and the amendment there was defeated by a majority of more than 55,000. In the third Pennsylvania district, which I represent, the majority against suffrage was overwhelming. Every one of the 11 wards gave a majority against. Without again discussing the merits of the proposition, and leaving open the question of right or wrong, or the further equally important question as to whether a majority of the women themselves desire suffrage, I do not feel warranted in ignoring the officially expressed sentiment of the voters of the district I represent. This was substantially the position I assumed when the question was before the House in January, 1915, before the vote had been taken in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, when I cast my vote against this resolution I shall have to stifle my personal inclinations, be-

cause if you were to ask me why the women in the United States, wherever they may live, should not vote, I would probably be unable to assign to you a sufficient reason, but there are several impelling reasons why I am not going to support this joint resolution. The first reason is because before I could get my name on the official ballot to be voted for as a Representative in Congress at the primaries I had to sign this declaration, as did every Republican Member of this House from the State of Ohio, as well as every Democratic Member from that State. It seems to me that we soon forget the pledges that we take, and this pledge was indeed a solemn one, because each one of us from Ohio, Democrats and Republicans alike, had to go before a notary public and sign it. I am not one of those who look upon this statutory obligation as "a mere scrap of paper":

I further declare that if nominated and elected I will qualify as such Representative and that I will support and abide by the principles enumerated by the Republican Party (or the Democratic Party, as the case may be) in its national platform and in its platform in the State adopted or to be adopted during the present year.

That declaration of candidacy was signed in the presence of an officer authorized by law to take acknowledgments, as solemn a declaration as a man can take, that if nominated and elected he would support each plank of the party platform to be adopted at the party convention. Men in this House from the State of Ohio seemingly have forgotten the pledge that they so solemnly took some 60 days before the primary election of 1916. That plank of the Republican platform read as follows:

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of the country, favors the extension of the suffrage to women, but recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself.

And the Democratic as follows:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield? Is that a pledge or an oath?

Mr. KEARNS. It is a declaration made before an officer authorized to administer an oath. It is not sworn to, but I take it that gentlemen, when they go through the solemnity of going before such an officer and declaring that they will abide by the principles of the party as laid down in the National and State conventions, are not soon going to forget that. That is one of the great reasons why, as I stated in the beginning, I am compelled to stifle my own personal opinion on this great subject and vote against this resolution.

Mr. MEEKER. It is understood by the State that it is made upon a man's honor?

Mr. KEARNS. It is made not only upon his honor but he must reduce it to writing. He must sign in the presence of a notary public or other officer.

I know there are a great many good, loyal, and patriotic women in the State of Ohio who are able to cast just as intelligent a vote as can any Member of this body, but our party platform is against it, and until that barrier is raised I propose to remember the pledge that I have made, and I am going to vote against woman suffrage in this House until the party leaders in convention assembled relieve me of this obligation that I have taken. That I know will be soon. Both parties will, in the future, adopt national suffrage.

Three times the State in which I live has voted upon this subject. Each time I have voted in favor of woman suffrage, but as a Member of this body I can not do it, because my party has declared that it is a State issue and not a Federal issue. They have declared against this resolution. And so did the great Democratic Party at about the same time declare against it.

There is another reason why I am against this resolution. At the November election this fall in Ohio, we had a referendum on the question of woman suffrage. The question of suffrage lost in the State by a majority of about 145,000. In my district the majority against giving the vote to women lost in every county by overwhelming majorities. This, I take it, was a mandate to me as to what I should do here to-day. I am one of those who firmly believe that every man ought to represent the feelings and opinions of his constituency when he is advised what that opinion is. This may be old-fashioned, but I can not help but think that a Member of Congress ought to be guided, in part at least, by the judgment of his constituency when he knows absolutely what that judgment is. I can readily understand where a question may come up on the instant and the people at home have not the time or the opportunity to form a well-defined opinion on a subject that may be in this House. In that case I think it is well for the Representative to be guided by his own judgment. But this is a question that has been before the people of every State in the Union for many years. Men and women have had the opportunity to study

the question from every angle, and in my State and in my district the mature judgment of the men is against this proposition, and I will have to be guided by their opinions as expressed at the last election. I know this will be very disappointing to a great many very fine ladies in the sixth district of Ohio for whose judgment and opinions I entertain the highest regard. But the law of my State is such, together with the expression of the voters at the recent election, as to estop me from doing otherwise.

I shall have to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. KEARNS. I wanted to say about the women of California, that they have the right to vote—

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

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Wilson has declared against it—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is out of order. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. I beg your pardon. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not approve of or believe in picketing the White House, the National Capitol, or any other station to bring about votes for women. I do not approve of wild militancy, hunger strikes, and efforts of that sort. I do not approve of the course of those women that throw themselves in front of horses, become agitators, lay off their womanly qualities in their efforts to secure votes. I do not approve of anything unwomanly anywhere, any time, and my course to-day in supporting this suffrage amendment is not guided by such conduct on the part of a very few women here or elsewhere. [Applause.]

NO DANGER OF NEGRO DOMINATION IN THE SOUTH OR PETTICOAT DOMINATION IN THE NORTH.

Friends of mine in this House have doubts and forebodings as to the advisability of giving women the right to vote, fearful of negro domination in the South and petticoat domination in the North. I entertain no such fears.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield in the short time allotted.

If there were in fact danger of negro domination or if this amendment would contribute to it I, too, would feel apprehensive, for I have no disposition to inflict on that great southern country legislation that is obnoxious to them, offensive to them, or anything for which there is no adequate solution. But I pause and ask them now what is the answer to the question that the same educational test that now prevents the ignorant male voter, both white and black, from exercising the right of suffrage will at the same time deny the ignorant female voter the right? What is the answer to the question that the same poll-tax law that now largely prevents the ignorant male from voting will likewise prevent the ignorant female from voting? What is the answer to the statement that for every negro woman so enfranchised there will be hundreds and thousands of intelligent white women enfranchised? I can not share the doubts and forebodings of my friends from the North or South who are to-day opposing suffrage. I can not think either their doubts or their fears are well founded. [Applause.]

MINORITY OF GOOD WOMEN WHO OPPOSE SHOULD NOT OBSTRUCT MAJORITY OF GOOD WOMEN WHO DESIRE TO BE ENFRANCHISED.

We are told by the opponents of suffrage that there are many thousands of good women in the country who do not care to exercise the right to vote and are in fact opposed to giving the franchise to women. I do not deny this statement, but I answer it by saying that in my opinion there are but a small per cent of the 14,000,000 women affected by this amendment that are really and in fact opposed to granting suffrage. I also assert that they have no good or sufficient right to stand in the way of the major portion of the good women of the country who earnestly hope and pray that this right may be given to them. I answer it further by saying that if this amendment is passed to-day and later becomes the law and full franchise to women is given, it is not mandatory. No woman is compelled to exercise the right. It is merely a privilege which she may exercise or let alone at her option, at her pleasure, in her own way. How can this offend those who do not favor it,—naught but pure selfishness would prompt one to deny to others a right they themselves did not desire.

NATIONAL PLATFORMS OF 1916 COMMITTED TO EQUAL SUFFRAGE FOR MEN AND WOMEN.

Much has been said here to-day regarding party platforms. The opponents of suffrage have said that the vote for this amendment was a betrayal of the party platform. The proponents of suffrage have said that to oppose it was a betrayal of party platform. This brings the provision of the platform into close scrutiny. My answer to this controversy is that each of the four political platforms in the 1916 election, judging them by

any fair interpretation, provide emphatically for equal suffrage. Of course, a technical reading of them provides it is to be accomplished in a certain way, but, after all, I repeat a fair reading of these platforms can not but convince any fair-minded man that the four national political parties of this country are already well and unequivocally committed to equal suffrage for men and women. I shall not present all of these platforms but will content myself in presenting the 1916 Democratic platform under which Woodrow Wilson was triumphantly elected President of the United States. It is as follows:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

This provision of the Democratic platform is short—to the point—it answers all quibbles, all debates, all technical reasoning in connection with the proposition as to whether or not the Democratic Party is committed to suffrage.

CONFERRING OF SUFFRAGE ON WOMAN WILL NOT DEGRADE HER—WILL STRENGTHEN AND ENNOBLE HER.

I hear others during the course of this debate say that to confer the right of suffrage upon woman is but to degrade and debase her, but I deny any and all such arguments and assert them to be both fallacious and untrue. In the State of Wyoming suffrage has prevailed for almost a half century. I deny that the women are debased or mannish in Wyoming or that the men are mollycoddles. In the neighboring State of Colorado, where suffrage has been the accepted doctrine for many years, it has neither degraded the women nor feminized the men but it has strengthened and helped both sexes. It is true throughout the 18 States that have suffrage. [Applause.]

OPPOSERS JEER SUFFRAGE TO-DAY, BUT THEY FIRST JEERED ELECTION OF SENATORS BY POPULAR VOTE—THEY FIRST JEERED PROHIBITION AND OTHER REFORMS.

Opponents of equal suffrage to-day shrug their shoulders and jeer at the thought of enfranchising 14,000,000 American women. I can remember when the talk of election of Senators by a popular vote brought jeers from many of these same gentlemen—it brings no jeers to-day.

I can well remember when the subject of rural routes brought jeers through the newspapers of the country, brought jeers through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, brought jeers from the Members of Congress—it brings no jeers to-day. I can remember when the question of prohibition brought jeers—like the rest, it brings no jeers to-day. Woman suffrage to-day and in this debate has brought jeers from the opponents, but it, like the rest, will bring no jeers on the coming morning, for the enfranchisement and gentling influences that come with responsibility of 14,000,000 women will and can not long be the subject of jeers by thoughtful people anywhere or at any time. [Applause.]

SUFFRAGE NOT MANDATORY—THOSE IN FAVOR OF IT MAY ENJOY IT—THOSE OPPOSED TO IT MAY LET IT ALONE.

We are told to-day by the opponents of suffrage that many women of the land will not exercise the right to vote even if it be given them, and in that they tell the truth. In my own State some 40,000 male voters each year fail to exercise the right. Still none will be so bold as to say because a few fail to exercise the right that it shall even be denied them, much less the denial of the right to those male electors who do desire to vote.

NO ADEQUATE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION—IF A GOOD WOMAN DESIRES TO VOTE, SHE SHOULD BE GIVEN THE RIGHT.

To me there is no answer to the question that if a good woman desires to vote, why should she not be given the right to do so? This question has not been answered in this debate to-day. It has not been answered in preceding debates. It will not be answered in succeeding debates, for there is no just and adequate answer to the question that if a good woman desires the right to vote it should be given to her. [Applause.]

SUFFRAGE A GREAT NATIONAL QUESTION—IT WILL NEVER BE SETTLED UNTIL IT IS SETTLED RIGHT.

No, Mr. Speaker, this question to-day is a great national issue—one involving the rights of our mothers, our wives, our daughters, our women. It will never be settled until it is settled right. Most of them have asked it with upturned face, feeling that it would benefit them, would help them, ennoble them, and strengthen them. It is ours to give or withhold. For me and mine, I am in favor of giving it to them ungrudgingly, first, because I believe it is right; second, because I can find no sound or satisfying argument, logic, or reason that would justify a course in opposition to it; third, in substance, in truth, and in fact, the four great political platforms of the last election promised equal suffrage to women as to men. True, they did not promise specifically by this particular avenue of a constitutional amendment, but in answering platforms made in haste I shall answer to the substance and not to the detail, believing as firmly as that I live that I am doing my duty as a citizen and as a

Congressman, not only to womanhood and manhood but to mankind. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised at the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]. He read the Republican platform on this suffrage question and argued that we Republicans are violating it, but he failed to read the Democratic platform on the same question, which his own party's President has just violated. Moreover, he did not tell you, as he should have done, if he wished to be fair to us, that the President has time and again argued against the Federal amendment when delegations called on him about the matter, as well as on other occasions, and has uniformly said that it is a State and not a national question, and that he was in favor of leaving it for the States to settle, and yet we are informed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] to-day that the President has changed front upon the question, abandoning the platform upon which he was elected, and now says this resolution proposing to submit to the States the question of a suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution ought to be adopted as a matter of right and justice to the women of the country. It is passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that the President should so suddenly change his mind on this proposition. I will not say that he changed it because he foresaw the passage of the resolution or that he realized that this side of the House was going to vote almost unanimously for it and tried to beat us to it, but it certainly is a rather funny proceeding. I am glad he has done this, especially if it will help to pass the resolution; but I do not think it becomes the gentleman from Ohio, under the circumstances, to criticize us for favoring this resolution, notwithstanding the language in our last national platform. It is simply another case of the pot calling the kettle black, a rôle which the gentleman always seems delighted to play. The other gentleman from Ohio, my Republican colleague, Mr. KEARNS, says that he does not think that he could give a good reason for voting against the resolution, and that he is going against his personal inclination, but that he feels bound by a declaration which he made before a notary public when he was a candidate and which binds him to vote that way. The trouble about my friend is that he made a mistake in thus obligating himself to vote against his judgment and conscience. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I can not yield. My time is too short. If the law of Ohio compelled him to do that, as I infer to be the case, before he could come to Congress, then the fault is not his, but with the State of Ohio for passing such a foolish law. We do not pass such laws as that in Kentucky. [Laughter.]

I do not wish to be understood, however, as blaming the gentleman for standing by the wishes of his constituents on this or any other question, because, as I have frequently said on this floor, a Representative ought to represent the wishes of the people who sent him here or resign. My position on that point has been time and again confirmed since I have been a Member of this body by the vote on a number of measures that I recall. As a rule, Members representing a large foreign-born constituency have always voted against restrictive measures, and Members from wet districts usually vote wet, and vice versa. I am finding no fault with them for that, but I can not quite understand why it is that, as a rule, Members who are from wet districts are against this resolution, unless it be that they are afraid of the ballots of the women on that question. I do not say this as applicable to all, of course, but there seems to be a striking preponderance.

Gentlemen complain about this effort to force woman suffrage upon the States that do not want it, and about ignoring the wishes of that class of women in the country who do not ask for the ballot and do not desire it, and yet we are proceeding in the exact manner which the founders of the Republic themselves provided in the Constitution for its amendment, so that this argument is in effect a criticism of the only method of amendment to that instrument which was provided for us. What harm can it do the women who do not want to vote if we give the ballot to those who do want to vote? It might as well be contended that it is wrong to let some men vote because others never go to the polls. There has been a good deal of talk along these lines, but I have yet to hear a single sensible, logical reason why a democracy should deny to any patriotic citizen, with intelligence enough to vote and the desire to vote, the right to do so. Some gentlemen have contended that the founders of our Republic were against woman suffrage. I am not prepared to concede that this is a correct statement of their position, but

even if it is, I firmly believe that if they were living to-day and had the privilege of voting on this resolution, they would vote for it in view of the changed conditions that now exist. Surely, if Woodrow Wilson can change his mind overnight and get by with it, Washington and Jefferson ought to be pardoned if they were to change their minds in a hundred years.

Judging from some of the arguments that have been presented here and elsewhere against this resolution, I suspect that some gentlemen have a conception of woman's sphere that is on a par with that expressed by a certain southern bachelor poet of more or less local fame, who in a spirit of poetic fervor exclaimed:

Woman, woman, thou art divine!
Oh, that I had one I might call mine,
To soothe me in my worstest woes
And cook my dinner and wash my clothes.

[Laughter.]

My distinguished friend and colleague [Mr. CANTRELL], whose political sagacity and wise foresight are everywhere recognized, has warned his Democratic associates from the Southland that if they vote against this resolution they are likely to lose their grip upon the legislative machinery of this body. That is, indeed, a consummation devoutly to be wished for. [Laughter.] If I may be permitted to digress enough to indulge in a political prophecy, I wish to say that, in my judgment, that consummation is already a foregone conclusion. [Applause on the Republican side.] But, however that may be, I am so anxious to see this resolution adopted that I hope you southern Democrats will follow my colleague's advice, and I for one am willing for my party to take its chances in the future upon other issues.

Much has been said pro and con about "picketing"—that rather dramatic chapter in the history of this great movement. It is not my purpose to speak either in criticism or commendation of that; but if it be true—I do not say that it is, because I do not know—but if it be true, as has been alleged, that certain promises were made, as a result of which a great campaign was won, and those promises were not kept, I wonder whether in that silent, peaceful protest that was against this broken faith there can be found sufficient warrant for the indignities which the so-called "pickets" suffered; and when in passing up and down the Avenue I frequently witnessed cultured, intellectual women arrested and dragged off to prison because of their method of giving publicity to what they believed to be the truth I will confess that the question sometimes arose in my mind whether when the impartial history of this great struggle has been written their names may not be placed upon the roll of martyrs to the cause to which they were consecrating their lives in the manner that they deemed most effective.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I entered the halls of the General Assembly of Kentucky, which was more years ago than I care to acknowledge here [laughter], and became the author of the first bill introduced in that body to give married women the right to hold a separate estate; indeed, ever since as a university law student, I studied the history and scope of the bondage in which the canons of the English common law held women, I have had an abiding faith that this measure of justice would, in the fullness of time, be meted out to the women of America. I earnestly hope and believe that, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, this will go down in history as the epochal day on which that was done.

Mr. Speaker, this is woman's era, and her plea for suffrage is as resistless as the tides of the sea. It required the problems developed by this war, and a practical demonstration of woman's usefulness in their solution, to prove that their enfranchisement is essential if governments instituted by men are to be perpetuated. And the errors and sufferings that have already occurred emphasize the expediency and justice of placing in the hands of the mothers of America the power of the ballot that they may have a real voice in shaping the course and destiny of the Republic, especially on questions like those with which we are now confronted, for who are more entitled than they are to have that voice? However much the balance of us may suffer as a result of war, it does not compare to what they suffer. There is the unspeakable anguish, the unending sorrow. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the history of civilization shows that wherever the influence of true womanhood has touched the affairs of the world it has exalted them; that wherever that influence has been exerted, whether in spiritual or material affairs, it has lifted mankind to a higher plane of usefulness and honor. The world would be a barren waste without woman's ennobling influence and the wheels of progress will move faster, as they have already done, as the sphere of her activity is widened.

Give all of them the ballot and we will have better laws, better government, better men, and a brighter and a better world. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this resolution proposes to submit to the States of the Union for ratification or rejection an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the privilege to vote.

It is erroneous to say that it is a proposal to submit the matter to the people of the different States and thus allow them to say whether they want the Constitution so amended, because the people will not be permitted to vote on the question at all. Under this proposed submission the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, without the people having a voice therein, can fasten this amendment on the Constitution and make it a part of the supreme law of the land. But in answer to this I apprehend the advocates of this measure will say that the people will vote on the question because they will elect the members of the legislatures which will ratify or reject the amendment. This is not the fact in all cases, Mr. Speaker. In some of the States legislators already elected, and elected without any reference to this question, will vote to ratify or reject this amendment if this Congress submits it in its present form. Take my own State, for instance: If this amendment is submitted this year, our legislature, which convenes in April of next year, will pass on the question of ratification, and men composing one-half of the senate in that legislature were elected in 1916 and without the slightest reference to this proposed amendment. Would this be giving the people of Florida an opportunity to express their views on this very important question? In view of this condition, which also exists in other States, advocates of this measure should not talk so flippantly of submitting the question "to the people."

But, Mr. Speaker, even if every member of every State legislature should be elected after this resolution should pass Congress, you would not get from the action of the legislatures a real expression of the people's will, because of the fact that so many issues, local and otherwise, enter into a campaign for the election of State legislatures that it would be impossible to state with certainty on what particular issue a member was elected. There is only one way provided by the Constitution to get with any certainty the will of the people relative to an amendment to that instrument, and that is to provide for conventions in the different States for the express purpose of passing on the proposed amendment. When the proper time arrives I propose to offer an amendment providing the convention method, so that delegates may be elected by the people, instructed either for or against ratification after full, free, and fair discussion of the same, and I sincerely trust I shall have the active support of the advocates of votes for women, who are so loud in their demands for fair play, and who are so long in professions of loyalty to the principle that the "people should rule."

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a minute or two about the constitutional aspect of this proposition, and I know that when I mention that gentlemen are going to say, "Yes; you voted to submit the amendment on the prohibition question and you are estopped from raising that question here." But not so. They are different. There is no analogy between them, so far as the power of Congress is concerned. There is absolutely no analogy at all between them. The Constitution of the United States recognizes and leaves in the States themselves the right to fix the qualifications of voters, but the Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress the power to tax the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and if one legal principle in this country has been settled beyond all question it is the principle that the power to tax carries with it the power to destroy or to prohibit, if you please. Therefore the Congress had the right to submit an amendment to the States prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor because they had the right to destroy the manufacture and sale of it.

Our suffragette friends demand the ballot as a "right," and in all their literature and public addresses they refer to women as being "disfranchised." They are absolutely wrong in both of these propositions. Suffrage for either man or woman is not a "right" but is simply a privilege, to be conferred or withheld at the pleasure of the State. The Supreme Court of the United States, the highest judicial tribunal in all the world, has so repeatedly declared this principle that it does seem as though

even the suffragettes would cease to designate suffrage as a "right." Neither are women disfranchised. To say that a person is "disfranchised" is to imply that they were once enfranchised and that the franchise has been taken from them. Women never were enfranchised, and therefore they are to-day as they always have been—simply unfranchised—and the question should be considered free from any idea that women have been deprived of something which they formerly possessed, and therefore that an injustice is to be righted. Several weighty considerations should enter into a determination of the pending proposition, but I shall not have the time to discuss them all, and shall, therefore, content myself by calling attention to a few which I regard as the most important.

My position is that the bestowal of the privilege of exercising the franchise will be extremely detrimental to both the country at large and to women as a class, and I believe I can convince any reasonable and unbiased person that I am right.

Both of these propositions may be considered together, because anything which is detrimental to the country is detrimental to women, and anything which is detrimental to women is detrimental to the country. If women are to take an active part in the politics of the country and in managing the Government, they must undoubtedly neglect some of the duties now imposed upon them by nature and by society. It occurs to me that this proposition is absolutely unassailable, for the simple reason that the multitudinous duties of such great importance now imposed upon the good women of the land constitute a burden entirely sufficient for them to carry. To add to the burden already placed on them would not only be an injustice, but would so increase their responsibilities as necessarily to result in the neglect of some of them, and thus the country would suffer loss. In order for a people to reach their highest development along all lines which make for the good of the whole, duties and responsibilities must be divided among the classes in such manner as to impose upon each class those duties and responsibilities for which it is best suited. In no other way can the highest degree of efficiency be reached, and "the greatest good to the greatest number" secured. Women as a class, while the intellectual equals of men, and frequently their superiors, are peculiarly fitted for those duties and responsibilities which pertain to the home and home life. Gentle, loving, tender, and true, it is their province to guide the children into paths which lead to the higher, better, and nobler life. Their duty to plant in the young mind the seeds of virtue, courage, and honor, and nurture them until they, with strength of character fully matured, are prepared to assume the burdens and responsibilities of life. Can there be in all the world a higher, nobler, more holy duty than that of guiding the thought, molding the character, and shaping the destiny of the youth of the land? There is no truer declaration than that "The hand that rocks the cradle rules the nation," and it is as true to-day as when first uttered. To confer on woman the right of suffrage is to lower her from her proud estate, and, as for me, I shall never consent that she shall be taken from the high pedestal which, since the dawn of civilization, she has so fittingly occupied with the common consent of all mankind.

I now desire to invite your attention for a few moments to a consideration of the question as to whether under our form of government the Congress, under the only power it has—the power delegated by the States—should undertake to submit an amendment of this character. I know that when I shall touch upon this subject I shall be met with the contention that those who supported the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which provided for the prohibition of the liquor traffic in the States are estopped from opposing this resolution on the ground that it is an interference with the rights of the States. Mr. Speaker, I assert and believe I can convince the unbiased mind that there is absolutely no inconsistency in the two positions; I believe I can differentiate them so clearly that "the wayfaring man though he be a fool need not err therein."

The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are two acts which have always been under the ban of the law among civilized, enlightened people, as is evidenced by the fact that heavy licenses and other restrictions have always been attached to such manufacture and sale.

It has always been known and freely admitted that intoxicating liquors are detrimental both to the health and the morals of the people, and the regulation and suppression of the manufacture and sale of such articles comes squarely within the police powers of the Nation. The traffic in intoxicating liquors, either directly or indirectly, is responsible for a large portion of the crimes which fill our jails and penitentiaries, and is the largest contributor of inmates for our public almshouses. It is no interference with the domestic affairs of a State for the

Nation to reach forth her strong arm to stem a flood of crime which threatens the very existence of the Government itself; it is no invasion of State rights for the Federal Government with its mightier power to step in the breach and protect the health of the people against the attack of a deadly disease; it is no usurpation of State jurisdiction for the central power to exert its authority in suppressing an evil which threatens to retard Christianity, destroy morality, and put in jeopardy the happiness, prosperity, and liberty of generations yet unborn.

The liquor traffic is an evil which threatens to undermine the maphood of America, wreck our institutions, and eventually destroy the Republic itself, and to argue that the national authority has no power to deal with a question of this character is to admit that the Federal Government is utterly impotent and powerless to protect itself. Dealing with a national peril such as is the traffic in intoxicating liquors is entirely different from and bears no analogy to the question of who shall constitute the electorate in the different States of the Union.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 1, of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

In this clause two powers are conferred on the Congress, under either of which there is ample authority to warrant the prohibition of the liquor traffic in the States by the Federal Government without doing violence to the principle of State rights. Under the power to provide for the "general welfare of the United States" the Congress is amply justified in submitting an amendment proposing to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the several States of the Union. In view of the sorrow, misery, pain, poverty, and death which have followed in the wake of this traffic for so many years in every section of the Republic, where is the man who will seriously contend that its prohibition is not an effort to "provide for the general welfare of the United States"?

The other power contained in the paragraph of the Constitution which I have quoted, and under which I claim the Congress has ample authority to submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, is the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises," and so forth. No one, I presume, will have the hardihood to deny the constitutional power of Congress to "lay and collect taxes" on the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors at any place within the United States, although such place may be within the borders of a particular State. Such taxes on both the manufacture and sale have been levied and collected practically ever since the organization and establishment of the Government itself, and, so far as I am advised, the right so to do has never been seriously questioned.

If any legal principle is so firmly established in this country as to be absolutely beyond the pale of debate, it is the proposition that the right to tax carries with it the right to destroy, or to prohibit, if you please. This, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is so clear that no room is left for argument. The States delegated to the United States the right to tax the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, and by that same grant of authority delegated the right to destroy or to prohibit such manufacture. The States delegated to the United States the right to tax the sale of intoxicating liquors, and by that same grant of authority delegated the right to destroy or to prohibit such sale. The Congress of the United States, under this delegated power, for very many years was content simply to tax the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, but finally decided that in the interest of the "general welfare" it was necessary to resort to the ultimate delegated power—the power to destroy—and submitted to the States what we know as the "prohibition amendment." Believing that I have demonstrated beyond question that the submission to the States of the "prohibition amendment" by Congress is not an invasion of the reserved rights of the States, I desire briefly to call attention to what I consider a most flagrant attempt to deprive the States of the Union of one of their most sacred and exclusive rights—the right to deal with the privilege of suffrage.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, suffrage is not a right which is inherent in any person, no matter of what race, color, sex, or station in life. It is a privilege conferred by the State, of which the person may be deprived at the will of the State. No person, therefore, has a natural right to vote, and can only exercise the privilege of voting after the State in legal manner has conferred that privilege. When the free and independent States on this continent, in order, as they said, "to form a more perfect Union," entered into the agreement to establish the United States of America, they, through their accredited representa-

tives, agreed upon a Constitution which was afterwards ratified by the States and became effective, and to-day the compact of union between these States contains a full and complete statement of all the power given to the Government of the United States. The Federal Government is a government of delegated powers, and these powers were delegated to it by the several States, and it has power and authority from no other source. The Constitution provides specifically that "all powers not herein enumerated and hereby delegated to the United States are hereby reserved to the several States or to the people thereof," and therefore it is clear that the Federal Government can legally exercise no power unless the same is delegated to it by the Constitution in express language or by necessary implication.

If this proposition be sound—and I apprehend no one with any regard for his own reputation as a lawyer will dispute it—then let us examine the Constitution with reference to suffrage. Is the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors delegated to the United States in express language or by necessary implication? Is the authority to say who shall vote or who shall not vote in elections granted to the Federal Government either expressly or by inference? There is not one line in the Constitution which even hints at the grant of any such power to the Federal Government, but, on the contrary, the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors is reserved to the States exclusively. Article 1, section 2, paragraph 1, of the Constitution of the United States is as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The seventeenth amendment of the Constitution, which relates to the election of United States Senators, contains exactly the same language with reference to electors in the various States. This language of the Constitution referring to the election of Representatives in Congress is the only place in that document where the qualifications of voters is even mentioned, and in this it will be seen that the framers of the instrument simply declared that "electors of Representatives in Congress should have the same qualifications as electors of the members of the most numerous branch of the legislatures of the respective States," leaving, of course, the power to define those qualifications exclusively to the different States, where that power had always been lodged.

It will also be noticed that in dealing with the election of United States Senators and presidential electors the whole matter was left where the makers of the Constitution found it, viz, within the jurisdiction and power of the States.

The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution do not in any wise conflict with my position. By those amendments Congress is not given the power to regulate the suffrage or to prescribe the qualifications of voters in the different States, but it is simply given the power to reduce the representation of a State if that State shall in the exercise of its exclusive power deny to a certain class the right to vote.

In effect the Constitution declares to each State that such State has the sole power to deal with the question of suffrage, and to declare who are qualified voters within its borders, and to exclude all from the polls who do not come within the prescribed class, but claims the right if a particular class of male citizens over 21 years of age are denied the right to vote "except for participation in rebellion, or other crime" to reduce the representation in Congress of each State "in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State." This amendment was adopted when partisan sectional feeling was at its highest tide in this country; and does anyone doubt that if the men who composed the Congress which submitted it had for one moment believed that they had the right they would not have submitted a resolution giving to Congress the absolute power to prescribe the qualifications of voters in the several States? I am convinced that if the right had even been doubtful in the minds of the statesmen of that day Congress would have been given full and complete power to deal with the whole question of suffrage in the States.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the right and power to prescribe the qualifications of electors expressly reserved to the several States of the Union, and therefore not delegated to the United States, but the several States have for more than a century and a quarter exercised this power, with the full knowledge, acquiescence, and I believe I am justified in saying with the distinct approval of the Federal Government. During all these years different qualifications for electors have existed in the different States, and the Government of the United States, knowing that the regulation of the suffrage was not within its powers, has never sought to interfere with the qualifications of

the voters as prescribed in any of the States. The right to regulate the suffrage is the most important, the most sacred, the most vital of all the rights reserved to the individual States in the agreement for the Union of States, and I solemnly warn gentlemen that when they as the representatives of their people consent to give up this greatest of all the rights of a State they obliterate State lines and crucify local self-government. Gentlemen may attempt to satisfy or still their consciences with the reflection that, after all, it is simply a proposition to allow the people a chance to vote on the question; but, my friends, this is a proposal to reverse the order of nature, to repeal the law of God, to ruthlessly set aside the matured judgment of the "Fathers of the Republic," to ignore and trample underfoot the wisdom and experience of the ages, and to sacrifice upon the altar of an unnatural and inexplicable aspiration the priceless heritage of local self-government.

What of the stand of the two leading political parties on this question of conferring suffrage on women by constitutional amendment? Neither a Republican nor a Democrat in this House can square his vote for this resolution with the last utterance of his party. One or both of these parties in the future may declare for the pending proposition, but they not only have not yet so declared but, on the contrary, have, in effect, declared against it. The platform of the Republican Party in 1916 declared as follows on the subject of woman suffrage:

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of the country, favors the extension of the suffrage to women, but recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself.

The platform of the Democratic Party in 1916 declared as follows on the subject of woman suffrage:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

Thus it is seen that neither of the two great political parties in its last official utterance declared for woman suffrage by amendment to the Constitution of the United States. In fact, to all intents and purposes, both parties declared against it, because they said, in effect, that the question of woman suffrage was a question for the several States to consider and determine, and therefore it follows that no Republican and no Democrat upon this floor can vote for this resolution and be absolutely loyal to his party platform. Your party platform says, in effect, that Congress has no jurisdiction to submit this resolution; that the subject matter is exclusively within the control of the States and should be determined by the people of the respective States. Can you claim to be a party man, loyal to your party platform, if you, while that platform declaration is still in force, by your vote say that Congress has jurisdiction to submit this resolution; that the subject matter is not exclusively within the control of the States and should not be determined by the people of the respective States?

Console yourselves, as you may, with all sorts of specious reasoning, the fact remains that a vote for this resolution is in direct conflict with the platform declarations of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. The only political parties which, in 1916, declared for woman suffrage by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States were the Socialist and Progressive Parties, and the passage of this resolution will be a victory for socialism in America. Democrats and Republicans on the floor of the American Congress, ignoring and deserting their own party declarations of faith and embracing, sustaining, and supporting one of the main planks in the platform of the Socialist Party is, indeed, something new in American policy, and demonstrates in the language of the Rev. Jasper that "the sun do move."

Neither Democrats nor Republicans can justify a vote for this resolution on the ground that it is a party principle or policy.

I was pained to notice in the press a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, what purported to be an interview with a prominent Southern Democrat, in which he was reported as warning Southern Democratic Congressmen that if they voted anything like solidly or in large numbers against this resolution they would be in grave danger of losing chairmanships of committees in this House; that the advocates of woman suffrage in the coming elections would defeat every Democratic candidate for Congress possible; and that this would give the next House to the Republicans. I sincerely trust this eminent gentleman, whom I esteem most highly, has been misquoted. He certainly could not have meant what the language attributed to him implies. If the language of that alleged interview means anything, it means that Democratic Members of Congress should sacrifice their views on a great constitutional question in order that they may continue to hold chairmanships of committees in this body. Mr. Speaker, when I became a Member of this body, I took an

oath to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States."

That oath meant that I should "uphold and defend" it according to my best judgment, weak and feeble as it might be, and not according to the judgment and opinion of anyone else, no matter how strong and powerful that some one else might be, and so help me God, I intend to adhere to the spirit and the letter of that oath so long as I am a Member of this great body. No Member of this House can justify in the court of conscience abandonment of honest conviction because of political disaster to his own fortunes. No Member of this House can stand acquit of official perfidy, if he slaughters deliberate, conscientious opinion on the altar of party supremacy. It were better for our country, yea, ten thousand times better, that no Democrat should ever again hold a chairmanship of a committee in this House, than that one Democrat should resort to the ignoble expedient of bartering his own convictions on a great public question for the hope that his party may retain power. As a Democrat, I am anxious for my party to continue in control of this Government. Since we came into control of all the branches of the Government under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, the mightiest figure in all the world to-day, we have met successfully every condition, and demonstrated our capacity and fitness to properly manage the affairs of this great Republic; but, sir, as intensely anxious as I am to retain the reins of Government, I do not hesitate to say that I would rather see the Democratic Party deserve success than to see it succeed by abandoning the solid, stable rock of principle for the shifting sands of expediency. I have heard it said that the Republicans are going to vote for this resolution almost solidly, and that it would be good politics for the Democrats to line up solidly for it also, else the Republicans would get credit for its passage, if it should pass, and the Democrats would be swept from power in the next election. I do not believe it. I have found, during my 13 years of service in this House, that the average Republican Member is just about as loyal to his convictions as is the average Democratic Member, and about as unlikely to sell those convictions for "a mess of pottage." Even if I believed that every Republican upon this floor intended to repudiate the platform of his party on this question, I can not see wherein that would justify a Democrat in repudiating the solemn pronouncement of his own party, and I warn members of both organizations that no permanent good can come to any political party whose members will sacrifice an important principle of the organization for the hope of "a little brief authority." Such a course of conduct will surely earn for the political party which pursues it the lasting contempt of the great body of the American people.

It might be well, Mr. Speaker, in considering this question, to examine the views of some of those great thinkers of the world who have advocated woman suffrage, and who after more mature deliberation, or who, after observing its effect when put in operation, have changed their minds on the subject. John Bright in 1867 voted for woman suffrage, but after he had an opportunity to think and study the question more fully, as his final, deliberate judgment, said:

I do not believe that women suffer by not being represented in Parliament, and I do not believe it would be an advantage to them if they were so represented.

Herbert Spencer was at one time a strong advocate of woman suffrage, but on fuller investigation renounced that position, stating that he had formerly argued the matter "from the point of view of a general principle of individual rights," but, he said, he found that this could not be sustained, as he "discovers mental and emotional differences between the sexes which disqualify women for the burdens of government and the exercise of its functions."

The Revolutionary fathers of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the convention at Newburyport, in 1778, discussed the whole question of suffrage with reference to women and declined to confer the franchise upon them, saying:

Women, whatever age they are of, are also [not to have the suffrage] as not having a sufficiently acquired discretion—but not from a deficiency in their mental powers—but from the natural tenderness and delicacy of their minds, their retired modes of life, and various domestic duties. These concurring, prevents that promiscuous intercourse with the world which is necessary to qualify them for electors.

Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua, and strong advocate of higher education of women, once favored suffrage for women, but, like most of the stronger thinkers, upon thorough study and full investigation of the question in all its bearings, came to the conclusion that he was wrong, and thus gave expression to his changed views:

When about 30 years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of woman suffrage and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage

in America is without foundation in equity, and, if successful, must prove harmful to American society.

I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic, and godly mothers neither ask for nor desire it. The instinct of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the representative relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon and is exalted by the other. This theory and policy tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order, must make man less a man, and woman less a woman.

A distinguished woman advocate of this suffrage movement says: "We need the ballot to protect us against men." When one sex is thus compelled to protect itself against the other the foundations of society are already crumbling. Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him as a babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father. Her influence is enormous. If she use it wisely she needs no additional power. If she abuse her opportunity she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight, now without measure, will be limited to the value of a single ballot, and her control over from two to five additional votes forfeited.

The curse of America to-day is in the dominated partisan vote—the vote of ignorance and superstition. Shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her into the same mad atmosphere, and both man and woman must inevitably suffer incalculable loss. We know what woman can be in the "commune," in "riots," and on the "rostrum."

Woman can, through the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger through his mistaken courtesy.

These are the testimonials of men who have made up their judgments not only after diligent study of the whole question in all of its bearings but men who originally were favorable to woman suffrage, and who were forced to change their views by the force of unanswerable logic. They are men who have earned their high places in the world of thinkers and students, and whose opinions are entitled to great respect. I commend their words to those among us who seemingly, with only a superficial examination, would plunge our beloved country into the maelstrom of interminable trouble, which must inevitably be produced by the engraving of this amendment on the Constitution of the United States.

To-day woman stands the uncrowned queen in the hearts of all right-thinking American men; to her as rightful sovereign we render the homage of protection, respect, and love, and may the guiding hand of an all-wise Providence stretch forth in this hour of peril to save her from a change of relation which must bring in its train discontent, sorrow, and pain.

But we are told that this resolution should be passed as a "war measure," but just why it should be denominated as a war measure I have been utterly unable to understand. How could this legislation possibly aid us in the war in which we are now engaged? Do these good women, if given the privilege to vote, intend to shoulder arms and go to the front? I have heard of no such declaration of that intention on their part. If I knew that was their purpose, then I should oppose it more strenuously, if that were possible, because I am old-fashioned enough to believe that men, and men only, should fight the battles of their country. Women take up arms only after the men have become yelping coyotes and skulking cowards, and, I thank God, America has not as yet become Russified. In what way then can woman suffrage help us win the war? If it could help us at all we could not avail ourselves of the assistance, because the war will undoubtedly have ended long before the proposed amendment could possibly become a part of the Constitution, and thus this claim of its proponents vanishes into thin air.

But, Mr. Speaker, the passage of this resolution will affect the war situation, but not in the helpful way claimed for it by its supporters. The President has said in effect that to win this war we must think together, speak together, and act together. In other words, that the American people must be harmonious and act as a unit if we are to be successful in this great world-wide conflict, and in the face of that statement of our great President it is seriously proposed to pass this resolution and start a riot of dissension, turmoil, and strife in every one of the 48 States of the American Union. Can you imagine any one thing which would be more productive of ill feeling and bitterness than to launch a campaign in every one of the 48 States of the Union to determine if woman suffrage should become a part of and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States? Political parties and candidates for public office would be stirred up over the prospect of these millions of new voters being added to the registration lists, particularly with reference to their party alignment, and instead of presenting to our enemies an unbroken and harmonious front this great Republic in the very midst of the most terrible and devastating war of all time will exhibit to the world such a spectacle of domestic disorder and internecine strife as will inevitably dishearten our allies, strengthen the hopes and courage of our enemies, and weaken us in the opinion of all the world. If

such a contest should ever be desirable, surely it is not desirable at a time like this, when we are engaged in a death struggle with the mighty forces of autocracy, on the issue of which depends the very life of democracy among men. The "picketing" of the White House and of Congress has given us some little idea of the methods which may be expected if this question is submitted to the legislatures of the different States for ratification or rejection. Pass this resolution, and not only will the Nation in time of war be plunged into turmoil, disorder, and bitterness by heated political meetings and inflammatory articles in the press, but the legislature of every State in the Union will be "picketed," governors will be besieged and harassed, legislators will be cajoled and threatened, and thousands of homes throughout the land where contentment now reigns supreme will be converted into a perfect bedlam of unseemly debate and bitter political disputation. It will not do to say that these things will not occur.

They have occurred in England, and in our own country right in our midst, and in practically every other country where the question has been raised. Mr. Speaker, the three things which will raise more disturbance, create more discord, separate more families, and raise more Cain generally than any other things on this earth is a county-site election, a church dispute, and a woman-suffrage campaign.

In the hearings before the committee it will be found that one of the leaders among the suffragettes declared that they wanted the ballot for "protection," and when asked against whom she desired "protection" she promptly and frankly replied "men." My God, has it come to pass in America that the women of the land need to be protected from the men? I do not live in a State where such a condition exists, and I am profoundly thankful for it.

If women desire and are to have the ballot to protect themselves from men and man-made laws, if they are to be placed upon an exact equality with men in administering the affairs of government, so that they may in future protect themselves, then they may expect no special protection of the law beyond what is accorded to men, and they should ask for the repeal of those laws which apply to them now by reason of being under the coverture of marriage.

No more when charged with crime can she be heard to plead coercion on the part of the husband; no more when marital troubles come can she go into the courts of the country and so easily secure the payment of her counsel's fees in divorce proceedings, alimony for herself pending the litigation, and permanent alimony in the final decree for the support of herself and children. In other words, she can not exercise the rights of a man and at the same time claim the privileges of a woman. The two are entirely incompatible, and she must relinquish the one or the other. If she relinquishes the privileges of a woman and secures the rights of a man, then, in my judgment, we shall soon see woman becoming more manly and man becoming more womanly. God forbid! It is said that "nature abhors a vacuum," and I want to say that about the nearest approach to a vacuum that I know anything about is a manly woman or a womanly man.

I come to the platform again. I was amused at my friend from Oklahoma, Mr. FERRIS, who wants us to stand with the President. God knows I want to stand with him. I am a Democrat, and I want to follow the leader of my party, and I am a pretty good lightning-change artist myself sometimes [laughter]; but God knows I can not keep up with this performance. [Laughter.] Why, the President wrote a book away back yonder. He said this:

The suffrage in particular is a privilege which each State may grant upon terms of its own choosing, provided only that those terms be not inconsistent with a republican form of government.

He said again:

All the powers of the General Government are plainly such as affect interests which it would be impossible to regulate harmoniously by any scheme of separate State action, and only such; all other powers whatever remain with the States. With them rests the regulation of the suffrage.

That is what the President said. Again he said:

Federal law does not determine who shall vote for Members of the House of Representatives. The Constitution provides simply that all those persons in each State who are qualified under the Constitution and laws of the State to vote for Members of the larger of the two houses of the State legislature may vote also for Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. The franchise is regulated therefore entirely by State law.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I have not the time.

Now that is not all that the President has said.

Mr. SLOAN. Does not the statute of limitations intervene?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In a letter or in an interview with the New York Times on October 7, 1915, the President, referring to woman suffrage said:

I believe that it should be settled by the States and not by the National Government.

He never rose to a higher plane of statesmanship than when he uttered that sentence. Again, on October 7, 1916, the President expressed himself in a letter to the Jane Jefferson Club, of Denver, Colo.:

Both the great political parties have in their recent platforms favored the extension of suffrage to women through State action.

Not only that, but my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] construes the Democratic platform to mean that we should pass this resolution. I want to say that your leader and mine did not so construe it. I want to tell you that Mrs. Catt, the leader of the suffragettes, denounced the President after the Democratic convention for "playing fast and loose" on this question, and Mrs. Catt also delivered the utterance that some people may claim that that plank in the Democratic platform was in favor of a Federal amendment, but she did not believe anything of the sort; and she was right.

Ah, gentlemen, you can not get around it. Both political parties in their last official utterance have put themselves on record, and that is the law of the Democratic Party and that is the law of the Republican Party to-day. No President has a right to repeal the law of his party. No leader of any party has a right to do that; and both of those parties declared emphatically for woman suffrage, it is true, but through the regular legal channels of State action. That is where they both planted themselves.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not yield. No specious reasoning can avoid that. It is reported in the Washington Post this morning about that meeting that these gentlemen had down at the White House—I do not vouch for its truth—that the President said something else:

Members of Congress who participated in the conference said the President told them he still believed that the proper and orderly way of dealing with the question was to permit each State to take its own action.

Did he say that? If he did, it is in keeping with what he has said heretofore. And I want to say something else. This paper also quotes my friend from California—

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For just a second.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman from California say whether the President said that or not? Let us have it straight.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not time to yield for that. He can answer that in his own time. I do not want it taken out of my time. But I want to say something else. You gentlemen can answer that. This paper says that—

Representative BAKER, chairman of the Suffrage Committee, jubilantly predicted last night that the necessary two-thirds would be exceeded by 15 or 20 votes—

Counting on the weight of the President's influence to swing doubtful Democrats.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. And the headlines in the morning papers.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To swing doubtful Democrats! Is there a man upon this floor worth his salt, or to be considered for a moment in connection with the high office of a Representative, who will change his convictions on a constitutional question because the President seems willing to change his position? I do not believe there is such a man, nor do I believe that our great President would have respect for one who did. The President has a right to change his views on this or any other question, and I claim the right as a Representative on this floor to stand by my own convictions and change my views only when convinced of error in the forum of my own judgment. In a matter of party policy I might be willing to waive my own views to coincide with the superior wisdom of my great leader, but not in a matter involving a constitutional question, which I am to determine for myself under my oath of office.

I want to say, in conclusion, that if I had no other objection to woman suffrage, I should oppose it because, in my humble judgment, the conferring of the franchise on woman will tend to disrupt the family, which is the unit of society, and when you disrupt the family you destroy the home, which in America is the foundation stone of the Republic. Nothing can convince me that a thing which is not only liable, but almost certain, to create discord in the families of men can ever prove beneficial to this country. If this resolution should pass and the proposed amendment should be ratified by three-fourths of the States of the Union, then we would find a condition where the wife would

either blindly follow the husband in the casting of her vote or she would disagree with his views and have her vote counted in opposition to his. If the former is to be the case, then it occurs to me that all will agree that this would be an entirely superfluous and useless piece of legislation, as the only result would be to practically double the number of votes cast without changing in the slightest the political complexion of the State or the Nation, but adding largely to the expense of holding our elections. If the latter should be the case, then we would find the husband and wife constantly engaged in political disputation, which would grow warmer, more heated, and more acrimonious as the campaign advanced, until finally a veritable conflagration of domestic infelicity would be kindled, consuming the marital tie, destroying the home, and sending the children, to all intents and purposes, orphans out on the cold charity of the world to become charges on the State. It may be said that this picture is overdrawn, but, sir, it is not. Man and wife to live happily together must be in harmony. They must think alike, act alike, have the same ideals of life, and look forward with like vision to the happy consummation "beyond the vale." Anything which will disturb this harmony will tend to disrupt the union, and there is nothing known among men so disturbing in its character and so productive of dissension, ill temper, and bitterness of feeling as is partisan political discussion unless it be factional political discussion.

God knows that factional politics, when confined to two wings of the same political party, is bad enough, but when you get factional politics limited to husband and wife, oh, what a spectacle will be presented, my countrymen. Disagreement will supplant concord; discord will take the place of harmony; home will be neglected for the political rostrum; household duties will be left unperformed while political rallies are attended; children will be left without the guiding hand of mother while she goes valiantly forth to save the Nation; respect of wife for husband will give way for contempt, and love will vanish while hate ascends the throne.

But, say some, "You are speaking only of the women who are married; what of those who are not married?" Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of those who are married, and I think this question ought to be settled with relation to its effect upon the married women of the land, because that is the relation which nature intended for them. The unmarried woman who has passed marriageable age is the exception to her class, and no general law should ever be passed to fit the exceptions to the class upon which it is intended to operate. I am quite sure this is a principle of legislation so sound and so universally accepted that no one will be found to question it. The Creator of us all intended that men and women should mate—one woman for one man is the law of God, and the law of all enlightened Christian people everywhere. It is not only in accord with the law of nature for men and women to marry, but it is also in accord with that law for them to establish homes and rear children. I dare say there is not a girl throughout this broad land who does not expect at some time in the future to marry, have a home, rear children, and be supremely happy in her own little world. Why, then, should we make a general law to fit the case or suit the convenience or cater to the whim of a few exceptions to the general class of women? I confidently believe that a great majority of the women of America do not want the burden of suffrage placed upon them.

If they do, why is it that the suffragists never make a proposition to leave the question to a vote of the women of the State or the Nation? If this were done in a primary or by some other method, and the suffragists came here with proof that a majority of the women of the country really desired to assume this burden, they would at least be in position to speak with authority as representing their sex. But, Mr. Speaker, before I will believe that the American woman, contented and happy in the love of her husband and children, desires to exchange her proud estate for the poor privilege of dragging her skirts through the mud and mire of partisan politics I must have indisputable proof. I know that it is quite out of fashion in some circles to speak of man's protection of woman and her dependence upon him. I know that in some quarters there has grown up out of the progressive civilization of our time a tendency to ridicule and sneer at every reference to the finer and more tender emotions of humanity, and this tendency to ridicule reached its climax when a suffragette leader some time ago sneeringly referred to the Association of Women Opposed to Woman Suffrage as "the Home, Mother, and Heaven Party." I thank God for "the Home, Mother, and Heaven Party." If she had only added one more word and made it the "Home, Mother, Wife, and Heaven Party" it would have been complete, and she would have linked together the four sweetest words in all the language. These four—home, mother, wife, and heaven—are the corner stones of our governmental structure, and if

either be destroyed, the Republic will crumble to decay and self-government among men will pass from the earth. Ridicule it, if you please; sneer at it, if you will; but I shall never cease to reverence and love the sweet, womanly wife and mother who, in the fear of God and with queenly dignity, presides over an American home. Hers is the proudest place in the economy of the universe. Talk about rights, about influence, about power—all mankind is at her feet, and she wields a scepter more powerful than that of any king or potentate, the scepter of wifely fidelity and motherly love. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if every Member of this House could have heard the splendid speeches of Mrs. Maud Woods Park, of Massachusetts, and Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, of New York, and of the other splendid women who appeared before our committee, there would be nothing left to say on the adoption of this amendment. I have racked my brain to discover some new point or idea on this question, but, so very ingenious and comprehensive were their arguments, I must, indeed, be careful if I avoid repetition. I take it that every Member in this House may be classified into one of two groups, and two only; first, those who are in favor of women voting, and, second, those who are against women voting. You can make all the excuses imaginable, and attempt to satisfy your consciences with this or that reason for denying to woman a God-given right inherent with citizenship, to enjoy equally with men the privilege of voting; and you can say what you please about dodging this question behind the proposition of State rights, but, after all, when the excuses and reasons are stripped down there is nothing left but a blunt unwillingness to let women vote.

When my southern colleague says that he is against it because of State rights, when you pin him down to the crucial question you will find out that he is unwilling for women to have the vote at all, even though acquired through the State method, and that generally and every other way he is against the proposition of women voting in this country. The first group that I have mentioned are willing to admit women are a part and parcel of the people of this Nation, and that when the Constitution of the United States says "the people of the United States" that term embraces women as well as men. The second group believe that the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established for "men only," and, with teeth clenched and eyes shut, are still manfully asserting that such expression "the people of the United States" is of the masculine gender and applies and relates only to him who each evening hangs his hat in the hall after he enters the front door of his castle.

So far as State rights are concerned, if this amendment sought to take away from any State the right of fixing the qualifications of its voters, I would be against it first, last, and all the time, but such it does not. With the exception of the question of sex, it does not affect one single qualification that any State has now or may desire to impose, and all such qualifications will remain the same as now until changed by State action. No State, however, should prescribe a qualification which it would be absolutely impossible for an honorable, intelligent, high-minded, and high-principled citizen ever to acquire. Why, so far as this bugaboo negro question is concerned, your Constitution has already fixed the right of negro women in this country. Show me a State to-day that has suffrage in its constitution and I will show you a State which now can not regulate the question entirely, for it could not let white women vote without also enfranchising the negro women. Let the legislature of that State attempt to-day to restrict the vote to white women, and what would happen? Why, it would be unlawful under the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. You could not do it, because the Supreme Court would hold that if you attempted to give the suffrage to the white women of this country, under the terms of the fifteenth amendment, you must likewise give it to negro women. Hence, so far as the color question is concerned, the Constitution has already fixed that, and what we seek now, merely, is to fix the sex question, a matter for which God alone is responsible, and over which the particular individual, unfortunately born a female, has no control. After this amendment has been proposed by Congress and ratified by the States and becomes the constitutional law of the land, States will still prescribe all qualifications—age, residence, registering, procuring poll-tax receipts, reading and writing, and so forth.

My friends, I want to say to my Texas colleagues that my district has already spoken in no uncertain terms on this question.

It is my honor to represent the biggest district in the United States, a district that embraces 58 counties, some of them about 100 miles across, north and south, such as Pecos, Reeves, El

Paso, Brewster, and Presidio, and which district, east and west, is 556 miles, a distance over twice as far as from this Capitol to New York. In that district there is a greater territory than in six of the smaller States. In that district there are 400,000 people.

In the last campaign I ran against a man who had been an honored Member of this body for 14 years. In my platform I made an issue upon national woman suffrage in favor of it, and he was against it. I had joint debates with him in that district. My district elected me by an overwhelming majority, and thus spoke for national woman suffrage. [Applause.] If my friends from Texas believe that the Texas people are not in favor of this question, let them just try it once and fail to put the issue in their platform, and let their opponents espouse it and make it an issue in their districts, and you will see how they will act. I shudder to think of the consequences, for the Democrats of Texas have not forgotten what democracy and our Government owes to the western suffrage States and to the good women of the West, and particularly to the loyal mothers in America. I take it that so far as my territory is concerned, which in area embraces nearly one-fourth of the whole State, the Texas people have already spoken.

I am not surprised at my friends on the Republican side of the House who criticize the President of the United States. They are on the outside looking in, and he is on the inside looking out; but I am surprised that a Democrat from Florida should make the kind of an argument that he has made upon the floor of this House, when to-day he enjoys his standing in the organization of this Congress and his chairmanship of the committee by reason of the fact that the President won a reelection because he was willing at all times to derive his power from the people he governed and to do justice to all and at all times, and hence gained a Democratic victory in the last campaign. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Had I the time I would, gladly. I wish I had the time so that every benighted Member of this body opposing this resolution could ask me a question, as it would be a pleasure for me to enlighten him; but my time is limited and I can not yield.

My friend from Florida did not emphasize that particular part of the article which the President wrote in his book when he said it should be left to the States to fix the terms; he said also that they should fix those terms so long as they were not against a republican form of government. If you deny the 14,000,000 white women of this country the right to vote, you are interfering with a republican form of government. [Applause.]

When the President of the United States says, "I get my power, not from God above, like an autocratic German Kaiser, but I get my power from the people of the United States, the people whom I govern," is it anything strange that a President who represents a Republic like that should say that it would be unjust to deny to the women of this country the right to express their voice in the affairs of their Government? [Applause.]

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

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is a party to the great war not only to save the world for democracy but to protect its own homes and firesides from the wolves of Prussia. We abhor the German philosophy that might makes right; but, on the other hand, we know that right without might means the triumph of wrong. The future of our Nation and of civilization itself is at stake. We have become the deciding factor in the situation. If we win the war or do our part in winning the war, it will be by the exercise of physical force; and that physical force is vested in the manhood of the Nation. A nation is just so strong as its men are strong. A nation will endure just so long as its men are virile. History, physiology, and psychology all show that giving woman equal political rights with man makes ultimately for the deterioration of manhood. It is therefore not only because I want our country to win this war but because I want our Nation to possess the male virility necessary to guarantee its future existence that I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Our country entered into this war by the votes of the male Members of Congress. If we win the war or do our part in winning the war, it will be done primarily by the physical force of the male men of the Nation. The majority of the women of the Nation may be for war or they may not be for war. We can not afford to take the chance that they are not for war and give them the vote. We are determined to win this war, no matter what it may cost us in men and in treasure, and we should not stand for the introduction of any uncertain domestic element into the proposition. That high priest of pacifism, Wil-

liam Jennings Bryan, said that woman should have the vote, and that then the question of war should be submitted to a national referendum. That sole female representative of woman suffrage in the House, Miss JEANNETTE RANKIN, admitted, not from judgment but from her woman's heart, that while she loved her country, she could not vote for war. This war may last a year or it may last 10 years. At all events, it is not impossible that it will last long enough to see this proposed amendment adopted by three-fourths of the States and made part of the organic law of the land. With the war still on, how would you like to see a majority of the membership of Congress made up of women? And that in the face of the fact that this is a war to the death, a war of extermination, a war of annihilation, a war to be fought to the finish by strong men, courageous men, red-blooded men, virile men, men who can watch their life-blood flow without whimpering. This is no issue to be decided by woman's fears and tears and emotions; this is an issue to be decided by the real, manly men of America. And that is another reason why I am opposed to the pending amendment.

The advocates of woman suffrage point to the heroic part the women of France and England have played in the war and the splendid part the women of America are playing in the war as a reason why woman should be given the vote. Do they mean to suggest that if the women of America are not given the vote, they will be less loyal to the cause? Do they mean to insinuate that the womanhood of America is so base as that? Why, real womanhood has always stood behind real manhood. Woman has, from the very institution of family life, been man's second-line of defense. I have said that the United States was in this war not only to save the world for democracy but to protect its own homes and firesides. The two objects are one; they go together. And the women of America, in gladly sending their men forth to fight for democracy, know that their men are fighting for their women as well; fighting to save them from the barbaric savageries of German soldiers; fighting to keep the United States of America a safe place for them and their children and their children's children to live in for all time to come. Are the great mass of the loyal women of America who have sent and are sending their husbands and brothers and sweethearts forth to battle caring whether they, the women, shall be given the vote or not? Not—if you are honest in your observation—not so that you could notice it.

It must follow, as a logical sequence of the German philosophy that might makes right, that war and not peace is the normal condition of society. We, however, to whom the German philosophy is abhorrent, take the view that war is an inversion of the normal condition, that it is disorder, insanity, chaos, or, as Gen. Sherman expressed it, it "is hell." If our women find it necessary to work in the munition factories and to plow the fields, as the women in France and England have been obliged to do, it will not be because they prefer to do that kind of work, but because they are willing to do it to back up their men at the battle front. If our women find it necessary to do this kind of work, it will not be because their men elect it, but because their men are willing to yield to the exigencies of the situation, much as the idea is revolting to them. Therefore, again it must follow as a logical sequence that if in this abnormal condition brought on by war, if, in the inverted state of things in which society finds itself by reason of war, woman should be given the vote because of the part she is taking in war, then, by the same token, when conditions go back to the normal and peace once more hovers over the land, the vote should be taken away from her.

Suppose the United States should be engaged in this war as long as England and France and Germany already have been, and had lost as many men as they have lost, what do you suppose the principal industry in the United States would be after the war was over? I will tell you. It would be the having and the rearing of children. And that would be woman's mission, the maternalistic inclinations of many modern men to the contrary notwithstanding. And if, after the war is over, the economic condition of woman shall so nearly equal that of man that she shall be entitled to the vote, if for every man working in the factory and the field there shall be a woman so engaged, then, I want to tell you, your social structure will have gone to smash, and your family, as the unit of society, will have gone to smash. If, after the war is over, woman is not free to have children, to establish and reestablish and maintain the home, without any thought of political equality with man, but with a firm reliance upon man as her God-given protector and champion, then you will have to confess that your civilization is a failure and that God and nature both have erred in their scheme of things. And that is another reason why I am opposed to the pending amendment.

I have used the war argument against woman suffrage because I deem it to be the most immediate and convincing at this time. But I am opposed to woman suffrage on a more fundamental basis, and it is this: That "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. And God blessed them; and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." Male and female created He them; and while they so remain they will not only be fruitful and replenish the earth, but they will subdue it. But when the sexes coalesce, when the masculine becomes effeminized and the feminine becomes masculinized, they will do neither. And the inevitable, the ultimate result of giving woman equal political rights with man will be the coalescing, the deterioration of the sexes. Even now we have a powerful element in the woman suffrage movement represented by the feminists who demand that if they submit to the inconvenience of having children the State shall support those children. Even now it is a sorry commentary on the male sex, a sorry augury for the future, that they are willing to yield up their natural dominion as men to the unnatural dominion of women. I am not thinking of the immediate effect of the enactment of woman suffrage; it will be merely to complicate and make more expensive our elections. I am not thinking of political expediency, for my actions and utterances here to-day may spell my political finish. But I am thinking of the future of society and the race. You men who are going to vote for the amendment may lay the flattering unction to your souls that you are getting away with something that will mean your reelection. Well, have your reelection. But allow me to predict that when you are dead and gone, and your political achievements have long since been forgotten, the historians of the future will describe this day, if you pass this amendment, as the day that marked the beginning of the decay of the great American Republic. And it is because I think more of the future of the country than I do of my own future that I am opposed to this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I notice on the front page of one of the leading dailies of this country a large headline which reads as follows: "Freedom of the world is U. S. aim." Similar headlines have appeared on the front pages of the press throughout this country the past two days. Of course, they refer to the President's historical speech, in which he outlines the aims of America and the allies in this world war. The President has several times, and again on yesterday, stated what every thoughtful American begins to realize, that hereafter America must and will assume not only an important but a leading place in all the international affairs of the world. Never again in our history will our country pursue the policy of exclusion, or refrain as we have heretofore, from interfering, if necessary, with the international affairs of the world. If "the freedom of the world" is the aim of our country, if we are to be leaders in liberalizing the human race, if that is to be the policy and the aim of every loyal American, I can not conceive of how any patriotic citizen, who loves his country and respects the rights of common humanity, can vote against a proposition intended simply to accord those rights to the good women of our country. There never was a time in the history of the world when the women, not only of this country, but of every other country, have demonstrated so overwhelmingly their right to this recognition as at the present time. In fact to deny them the right, especially in America, of a participation in the affairs of our country at this time would be a most colossal act of injustice. The eyes of the whole civilized world are centered on our action here to-day. This vote is one of the most important and far-reaching that has ever been, or ever will be, cast in this House, and I can not believe that in view of the hopes and prayers of the women of the world, and the eloquent and forcible appeal of the President of the United States to pass this amendment, "As an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world," that one-third of this great body will vote against it. This is not a local or even a national matter. This is an international and a world-wide proposition. It affects all of the other nations as well as our own, and as much, if not more, than any act of Congress during this war. It is the test of our good faith and of our preaching of liberty and justice to all humanity. Within the next three years the women of the entire British Empire; in fact, of all the English-speaking people of the world, outside of the United States, will be granted the right of suffrage, and it would be a colossal blunder as well as an unspeakable outrage if the United States shall fall behind the rest of the civilized world in granting this plain and simple act of justice to our good women.

I have been an advocate of woman suffrage for over 30 years. Colorado was the second State in the Union to adopt woman

suffrage. The women of my State have been voting now for nearly 25 years. Our women are entitled to the lion's share of the credit for redeeming the State of Colorado from being one of the most "wild and woolly" of the West to one of the most orderly and best-governed States in the Union. While I have not recently examined the statistics, I feel reasonably confident in saying that Colorado spends more money per capita on both her schools and her roads and has a smaller percentage of crime than any other State in this Union. If the question of woman suffrage were submitted to the voters in Colorado to-day, there is not 1 per cent of the voting population who would vote against it. During the nearly 25 years that women have been voting and holding office in Colorado there has never been a defalcation or any dishonest act committed by any of the over 10,000 women who have held public office in my State, and no record equal to that has ever been made by an equal number of men from the time the world began to this hour.

But, Mr. Speaker, time will not permit a discussion of this great subject. I can only say that I confidently believe this amendment will pass this House to-day. But whether it does or does not, a few men can not block the wheels of progress or prevent the evolution of the human race or the final triumph of justice and right, and those who oppose this measure to-day will see the triumph of it within the next two years, and they will have occasion to sorely regret its opposition at this time. The women of this country are going to be given this right for the reason, first, that it is absolutely just, and for the further reason that wherever women have been given this right throughout the civilized world they have wisely exercised it, and their influence has been unqualifiedly beneficial. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, woman suffrage in America is inevitable.

Political status flows out of and is supplemental to social and economic status. The belief prevalent in certain circles that the former is the means of achieving the latter is not based upon the experiences of the human race. The history of civilization teaches us that political equality can not permanently be withheld from a class or a division within a people which approximates social equality and economic independence; furthermore, attempts to bestow political equality upon such classes as are socially and economically dependent upon the rest of the population have universally failed. In the past the restriction of the right of suffrage to the male population was not contrary to democratic philosophy, because under the old order of civilization women derived their social status from their men and were economically dependent upon them.

For the past half century a change in this regard has been taking place in the social structure, particularly in the last generation. The old conception of the place of woman in the scheme of existence was that she was the member of a household, which was ruled by a male head; that her place in the world was determined by the place held by this head; and that he was responsible for her economically. Among many this conception still obtains as a theory, and is still to an extent recognized in the law, but in reality has been substantially modified. The mass of women in this country are no longer entirely and solely dependent upon the men for their support and maintenance. In a large majority of American households girls are prepared for and enter gainful occupations, just as the boys. On the farms their labor within the sphere allotted them contributes to the common support, just as that of the sons. In the marriage relation the wife is no longer under such domination of her husband as he might exercise over an older child. She retains control of her own property, and her liberty of action in ordinary affairs is unchallenged. The restrictions of old conventions that limited her social activities no longer obtain. These strides toward social and economic independence do not result from the demands of women for them, but flow from industrial conditions.

This status by women having been achieved, participation in political affairs is a necessary corollary. The opponents of woman suffrage are not in reality opposing the giving of the vote, but are protesting against and are trying to deny the existence of the present order of things that makes the granting of the vote logical and necessary. I deeply sympathize with those who regret the passing of the old ideal, wherein the activities of womankind are bounded entirely by the home, brightening the life of her husband, guarding and rearing her children, while she enjoys the love, support, and protection of her mate.

But in solving public questions we must square our actions with realities and not with fond delusions. Woman suffrage, then, is inevitable. Under normal conditions we might well allow it to become universal in the country after protracted struggles through a long period of years and by piecemeal,

Now we are at war. The entire energy of the Nation and its resources need be utilized to achieve the victory. For this reason I deem it wise that this controversy be ended as speedily as possible, and in the only way in which it sooner or later necessarily will be settled. Consequently I shall vote to submit this amendment to the States for ratification. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, a little more than 400 years ago Columbus discovered America. Before that page of American history was written he was compelled to seek the advice and assistance of a woman. From that day until the present day the noble women of America have done their part in times of peace and times of war to make this grand country what it is to-day. For that reason I am in favor of this resolution, and I am in favor of granting suffrage to the women all over America.

I believe that the time has come when the efforts of the noble women of this country are going to be crowned, and that they have arrived at the brow of the hill from which they can see Jerusalem and the temple walls. [Applause.]

I come from a State that, I am proud to say, whose delegation in Congress is practically unanimous on this proposition of woman suffrage. It is a divided State politically, but I desire to state in justice to the Members of Congress from that State that I believe the opinions of none of them have been changed by the miraculous conversion of the President to this cause. I have no criticism of the President coming out for woman suffrage. I am glad that he is standing with me on that proposition, and I hope that his conversion will be like that of St. Paul, and that he will become a master worker in the vineyards of the Lord for this proposition. [Applause.]

I can say but little in the two or three minutes allotted to me on a question like this. It has been suggested that 38 or 39 men who made the Constitution of the United States possessed all the wisdom of the earth. I will grant that these men were noble, that they were wise, but you must remember that at the time these men made the Constitution none of them had ever seen a cook stove, none had seen a telephone, a telegraph, an automobile, or any of the modern things which we have in this day. They were all right in legislation and in the making of constitutions for their time, but we are living in a progressive age, and, while the politicians may stand still, very often these great questions get beyond them, which this seems to have done. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. President, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. SMALL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANDALL). The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I shall not attempt to discuss the merits of woman suffrage, although it is obviously a debatable proposition. There are sharp differences of opinion entertained by intelligent citizens throughout the country, and even in those States which have granted suffrage to women it is still an experiment in government.

Even if one were in favor of equal suffrage, he should be opposed to securing it by the method of constitutional amendment. My objections to the method are fundamental. This amendment is to prohibit the States from denying to women the right to vote. In its results it commands the States to grant the franchise to women. Under our scheme of government this is an unwarranted and dangerous invasion of a fundamental right of the States. In our governmental structure there are two independent units of governmental power. The Federal Government has jurisdiction of all national and external affairs. The States have jurisdiction of all local and internal affairs. With the State rests exclusively the right of local self-government. Such of these rights as were left with the States by the framers of the Constitution, and which clearly and unreservedly are comprehended as matters of local self-government, can not be impaired without serious injury to our form of government.

The extension of the franchise and the regulation of the right of voting at elections was by the Constitution left with each State, and, except as modified by the fifteenth amendment, it still remains unchallenged within the jurisdiction of the States. It has been the opinion of those who formed this Government and of every reputable student of the Constitution that the right of the States to control elections should not be disturbed. This was clearly expressed by Jefferson and Hamilton. However much these constructive minds may have differed

about the interpretation of the powers granted to the Federal Government, they both agreed as to the importance of maintaining unimpaired in the States all the essential rights of local government. This position has been ably affirmed by such distinguished writers on the Constitution as Judge Story, Judge Cooley, Mr. Pomeroy, and John Randolph Tucker.

We are therefore squarely confronted with the query whether, as the representatives of the people and the defenders of the Constitution, we shall depart from this settled and well-defined principle of government. I do not feel free to make that departure. My judgment and my civic conscience constrain me to stand by the form of government under which for more than a century we have maintained liberty, promoted civilization, and become the acknowledged premier among all the republics of the world.

Under Article I, section 2, of the Constitution it is provided that the House of Representatives shall be chosen by the people of the several States, "and the electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This means that the Members of this House are elected by those citizens whom each State has declared are entitled to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures.

This provision was in the original Constitution and this interpretation has never been questioned. It was so satisfactory that when, within this decade, we adopted the seventeenth amendment providing for the election of Senators by the people of the several States it was provided in substantially identical language that Members of the Senate should be elected by voters having "the qualifications required for the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Subject to the provision in Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government," the States have continuously exercised the power to regulate the right of voting at elections. If it could be expressed with propriety, it might be said that those who seek to change this fundamental principle exhibit an ignorance and disregard of the history and structure of our Government.

It may be profitable to examine some of the reasons assigned in behalf of this amendment. It would be superfluous to refer to those noisy and sentimental men and women who declare that they favor equal suffrage and therefore favor this amendment. Their innocence of any knowledge of our Government would be ludicrous if the results were not so serious. They have a feeling that they are in favor of equal suffrage, and they follow the procession of that class of people who appeal to the Federal Government in behalf of every kind of reform.

The advocates of this amendment point to the action of Great Britain and other countries in extending the suffrage to women, and conclude that the United States should do likewise. They forget that what Great Britain may do is, under our form of government, denied to the United States, but rests with the several States. They might the more consistently contend that whereas 12 of the States of the Union have adopted suffrage that the remaining 36 States should likewise extend the suffrage to women.

These advocates further contend that by the constitutions of most of the States suffrage is denied to women, and they plead the length of time which would be consumed in inducing these States to amend their constitutions as an argument in favor of forbidding these States to deny women the right to vote. If this amendment can be submitted and ratified, it will unquestionably be the most expeditious method of overriding the will of the States and depriving them of an essential power; but such expeditious method would dangerously weaken the capacity of the States to manage their local affairs and would undoubtedly centralize power in the National Government. We are a confederated Union, which has grown to be a giant in power and influence, but that Union is composed of many States, and the Union has grown strong through the States. Any impairment of the independence or the rights of the States to manage their internal affairs will, by reflex action, weaken the strength of the Union.

The advocates of this amendment have attempted to inject this issue into the political parties. They have threatened to defeat for reelection members of the opposition, although such threats in the past have not materialized. They have attempted to secure the support of the Democratic and Republican Parties and induce rivalry between them by threats of reprisal against each.

This is no party question, and such efforts will be futile. It almost equals in intelligence the scheme of that delectable and imane group of women who picketed the White House on the theory that the President could grant them the right to vote. Some of these demonstrative advocates of suffrage are evidently

imitating the tactics of another class of moralists and Constitution tinkers of the Anti-Saloon League, who regard the Constitution as an elastic instrument which Members of Congress may seek to amend at the instance of any numerous body of citizens. They insist that if the people in large numbers wish to secure a reform and are unwilling to wait upon the States, that it is the duty of Members to submit such amendments. They say that any representative number of citizens have the right to demand the submission of an amendment in the nature of a referendum to the legislatures of the States, regardless of the nature of the amendment or whether it violates the fundamental principle of government.

If the confederated union was the unit of local government, and it was consistent with our political structure for the Federal Government to attempt to fix the qualifications of the franchise throughout the country, then it would be in order in this forum to argue the merits of equal suffrage and its adaptation to the country, but neither of these propositions are correct, and therefore the desirability of equal suffrage has no place in this discussion.

I have stated that with the exception of the fifteenth amendment the power of each State to regulate the right of voting at elections had never been challenged. That amendment prohibited any State from denying the right to vote to any citizen on account of race or color. I shall not attempt to question the motives of those who advocated that amendment. It was a direct aftermath of the great Civil War. But I will venture a brief and frank discussion of its merits. This amendment, followed by the efforts to enforce it, created the horrible era of reconstruction in the Southern States. There were racial conflicts. Industrial and educational progress was arrested. Not until Federal troops were withdrawn and the Southern States were left to work out their own local government were peace and sectional unity restored. As an academic and ethical proposition the fifteenth amendment could not be condemned, but it is a political fact that it violated a fundamental principle of local self-government. The people of every State are jealous of this right. It is no more peculiar to North Carolina or Louisiana than it is to Ohio or Massachusetts. To force equal suffrage upon an unwilling State will not be tantamount to the peaceful and undisputed enjoyment of this privilege. I ask Representatives if, in the face of the one experiment which we have made in interfering with the right of each State to control the exercise of the franchise, we should be willing to repeat that unhappy experiment? I submit the question not alone to Representatives of the South but to intelligent and conscientious students of government from every State in the Union.

The proposition substantially resolves itself into this question, Shall we maintain the dual form of government instituted by the fathers and embodied in the Constitution, which has been characterized as the greatest political handiwork of man? Shall we continue to limit the power of the Federal Government to purely external affairs and to the exercise of those powers which are essentially national? Shall we preserve in the States unrestricted jurisdiction over those subjects which are internal and which have always been recognized as inherently embraced among the rights of local self-government? If we intend to change our form of government, if we intend to centralize the administration of local affairs in the Federal Government, and if we intend to make the States mere subdivisions and dependencies of the Central Government, we may be justified in submitting this amendment, but not otherwise. My duty seems clear, and I shall vote against the submission of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUFKIN].

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely opposed to the passage of this amendment at this time. I could offer many excuses for this opposition, but they would not appeal to me as good reasons. I could cite, for example, the fact that in a State-wide campaign in Massachusetts two years ago universal suffrage was defeated by over 133,000 votes, or I could cite as a more personal reason that in my own congressional district in that election universal suffrage was defeated by nearly 10,000 votes, or about two to one. Moreover, I am not opposed to the amendment because I believe that the women of this country are not intelligent enough to vote. A trial of the system in many of the States of the Union has proven the fallacy of this argument.

My opposition to the passage of this resolution is based solely and entirely on the fact that in my opinion this is no time to be trying an experiment of such tremendous magnitude as the granting of the franchise to millions and millions of new voters. These are decidedly abnormal times. The management of this

great war is, to my mind, pretty much a one-man job, and, so far as I am concerned, until peace is finally declared, I should prefer to restrict the suffrage of the country rather than to increase it. This especially applies to the State of Massachusetts, which I have the honor in part to represent. Our State is so fortunate, or so unfortunate, according to one's viewpoint, as to have annual elections of all State and of a great many of the municipal officers. The result is that we have a State-wide primary every September, a State-wide election every November, municipal elections in the cities every December, and municipal elections in the towns in March. That seems to me to be quite enough politics for one community to undertake in one year, with war work and the horrors that go with it on all sides of us. Two years ago we had a State-wide campaign for woman suffrage in Massachusetts, lasting from early spring until November. I venture to say that there was not a street corner in any city or town of our great Commonwealth which was not entertained at least once a week during those eight months with orators on one side or the other of the suffrage cause. The campaign was conducted intelligently and energetically by both sides. It was perhaps interesting and educational at that time, but to-day the people's minds are on other questions. Our officials, both State and National, are striving with but one point in view, namely, to fight this war successfully and to bring it to the earliest possible end. With such conditions around us, I do not desire to see Massachusetts obliged to go through an eight months' campaign for the adoption of the suffrage amendment this summer, and, if it fails, to have a repetition next year, the year after, and perhaps for a number of additional years, until it is finally adopted. That, Mr. Speaker, is the sole reason why I believe the introduction of such a vastly important economic question at the present time is ill timed, is unnecessary, and that is the sole reason why I shall vote against it and why I hope it will be defeated by this House. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women. In so doing I am not voting either for or against woman suffrage. I am simply voting to give the people of my State, along with the people of every other State in this Union, the right, if they desire to exercise it, of amending the Constitution of the United States in the only way in which it can be amended.

I am not afraid to trust the States. They made the Constitution and reserved to themselves the right to amend it when two-thirds of both Houses of Congress deemed it necessary that an amendment be submitted.

Aside from the merits or demerits of woman suffrage, the question for me now to decide is, Shall I, by my vote, help to give the States the right and opportunity of amending their own joint Constitution—the Constitution of the United States—or shall I help to deprive them of that revered privilege and sovereign right?

This joint resolution will have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States before it can become effective. If three-fourths of the States do not want to adopt it, then no harm can possibly follow its submission to them. If three-fourths of the States do want to adopt it, I submit that it is our bounden duty to submit it to them for that purpose, because that is the only way in which they can exercise their sovereign right of changing their joint Constitution.

In the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Washington, California, Arizona, Kansas, Oregon, Montana, Nevada, New York, and in the Territory of Alaska, men and women now vote upon equal terms.

In the States of Illinois, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Michigan, and Nebraska women now have the right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States, or rather their electors. This shows how the right of suffrage to women is regarded in many of the States of this Union. There are thousands of intelligent and earnest women in every other State in this Nation, who believe and feel that the right of suffrage should be extended to them through Federal amendment. I shall not by my vote here to-day attempt to deny three-fourths of the States from according women this privilege if they deem it wise to do so. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the State of Massachusetts voted on the suffrage referendum in the election of 1915. A very large vote was cast against suffrage. The first district, which I represent, voted nearly 2 to 1, or by

a majority of 8,939, against it. In view of these facts a person in my position who supports the amendment to-day is entitled to an opportunity to express his reasons.

This I will do in a very brief manner. First, I voted in the Sixty-third Congress for the amendment, and I also cast my ballot for it as a voter in the election in Massachusetts. Secondly, I have frequently explained to the suffrage and anti-suffrage supporters at home my attitude upon the question. It is this: It does not seem logical to me that one sex should have the power to deny the right of suffrage to the other.

I have invariably told my friends that if the women by their own conduct and knowledge of public affairs and by an expression of the majority of their own sex showed their desire to exercise the right of franchise, I, for one, was willing and glad to assist them in procuring it. It is for this reason that I shall vote contrary to the expressed opinion of the male voters of my district and the State of Massachusetts on the question. [Applause.]

In response to a question at the hearing before the Massachusetts delegation, an advocate of suffrage remarked that the women of Massachusetts would gladly have a referendum given to them and would abide by the results. In my opinion, suffrage would win on such a vote at the present time.

It further seems to me that the conduct of the women in the prosecution of the war offers still another argument for suffrage at this time. The women of the country have arisen to their full duty and have proven themselves worthy of being the mothers of the fighting force of this Nation. Many of their boys are overseas and many more are going. If these young men were asked in whose hands they would leave their right of franchise, there would be a unanimous response in favor of leaving the question with their mothers, wives, and sisters. [Applause.] It is nearly 15 years since I first saw active efforts on the part of suffragettes, and, while the militants made mistakes then and while they have made mistakes here in Washington during the past two years, I am convinced that the majority of the women of this country have become capable of properly making use of the franchise, both through education and study of the affairs of government.

Certainly I credit the women of Massachusetts and the women of the first congressional district as possessing as much if not more knowledge and intelligence as their fellow women of the country and as being as capable as others of exercising the right of franchise.

In view of these facts as applied directly to my own case and my own district, I shall vote to-day to refer the amendment to the States. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS].

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] I almost imagined that he was trying to impeach the President of the United States, but a little further on in his speech he showed that he himself had not been standing squarely on the platform of the Democratic Party. He blamed the President for recommending this method of securing suffrage for women, which the Democratic platform clearly stands for, and then himself said that he was not for suffrage; that he thought it would disrupt the home; that it would destroy the families of this country, showing he was opposed to suffrage when he stood upon the platform or pretended to stand upon the platform of the Democratic Party. He is now receiving emoluments and honors by virtue of the fact that he stood on that platform upon which he had no right to stand, according to his own confession.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] worked himself into a fever heat about State rights, saying that he would not consent that Tennessee should have forced upon it a suffrage question against its will. Yet I see by the RECORD that the gentleman from Tennessee himself voted to force upon my State, against its will, the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. My State expressly objected to that amendment, expressly repudiated the amendment, and never did ratify it. Yet the gentleman voted to impose that amendment relating to a suffrage question upon the State of Utah against its consent. The question is, Did the gentleman from Tennessee infringe upon the rights of my State? I do not think so, because when Utah consented to join this Union it came in under the Constitution, and it admitted the right of three-fourths of the States of the Union, in a regularly orderly way, to change the fundamental law of the land. The rights of the State of Utah were not infringed upon and neither will the rights of the State of Tennessee be if we adopt this amendment against its consent.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] became emphatic in saying that this repudiated the Constitution, that it took away local self-government. Yet the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOR-

DON] voted upon my State of Utah this same seventeenth amendment against its will, and he also voted for the child-labor law, putting into the Federal statute a law that no State had a right to say whether it wanted to have child labor or not and regulate its own customs in that regard.

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

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The child-labor law does not interfere with any State in reference to its child-labor laws. It is enacted under an express provision of the Federal Constitution to regulate commerce between the States.

Mr. MAYS. If the gentleman thinks that and acts accordingly he will go to jail some of these days. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio knows very well that the interstate-commerce clause was used simply as a vehicle to control the child-labor laws in this country. Some one on our committee asked the distinguished ex-Senator from Texas, who was appearing before us, if he would grant to women the right to vote at all, and he said, "No; except in a sewing society or in a purely woman's association." That is the kind of man you will line up with—who would not be in favor of letting women vote on school matters, taxation, problems on municipal affairs, or anything "except in a sewing society." He is 40 years behind the times. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. At least.

Mr. MAYS. He spoke at length of southern chivalry. I thought of what Edmund Burke said when the lords of England were trying to force upon this country taxation without representation, saying that their dignity was tied to it. He said:

My lords, I do not know how it happened, but this dignity of yours is a terrible incumbrance upon you, because it has of late been ever at war with your interests, your equity, and every idea of your public policy.

And that is true of the southern chivalry. It is a terrible incumbrance upon them. What the women want is not chivalry and reverence, as the president of the national association said before our committee, but they would rather have the vote to protect themselves than the chivalry and reverence that these men so graciously hand out to them while denying justice. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the resolution proposes the following amendment to the Federal Constitution:

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

SEC. 2. That Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

It will be observed that the proposed amendment undertakes to deal with the rights of citizens of the United States. The proposed amendment has been introduced into every Congress for 40 years. It will continue to be introduced into every Congress for twice 40 years more unless favorable action is taken. Some thought that it was killed when defeated three years ago. Others knew that ceaseless persuasion and vigorous agitation would continue until justice was done to one-half the people of the country. I have scanned those debates of three years ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and noticed that many fine speeches were made. The then majority leader, arguing against the resolution, stated that the right to vote was not really a right at all but a high privilege. Of course, he was obliged to take that position; otherwise he would be discovered in the attitude of arguing that a right of a citizen of the United States should be denied. He could not be placed in that attitude, especially when such citizen had committed no crime, was entirely law abiding, was not a lunatic or an imbecile, or even illiterate. He therefore elaborated upon the theory that to vote is a privilege. The Constitution of the United States, in Article XV, section 1, calls it a right, but suppose the learned gentleman were a higher authority than the Constitution, suppose it is a "privilege," would he discriminate against citizens of the United States in the matter of granting privileges when each is a supporter of the Government, a contributor to its financial necessities, and each of equal intelligence and of good moral character?

Suppose by some political miracle the women of his State or of his country should gain control of affairs political and should conclude to withhold the "high privilege" of voting from the gentleman, would he not protest and complain with great vigor and most persistently that an undemocratic régime was depriving him of his inherent rights? A little of his own medicine might be the best remedy for the affliction from which he suffered.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] made upon that occasion an elaborate argument. He may make it again to-day. He was for woman; he eulogized his chivalrous regard

for her. He could yield to no man in his extravagant esteem. He followed this statement by asking this pertinent question:

If women are to demand and receive equal privileges at the polls, in the workshops, and in every walk of life, then why should men be longer required to support the wife?

Apparently, he would deny women equal privileges, not only at the polls, but in the workshops and in every walk of life. They are there, and they are there to stay. They are in the countingrooms, in the factories, in the business houses, in the schoolroom, in the churches, in the workshops; they are helping to win the war; they are in every walk of life, laboring as effectively as men. Millions of them are not being supported by any man, but instead are helping, in many cases, to hold families together. Would this chivalrous gentleman deny them equal privileges, even in these walks of life? His question would so indicate. He asks why should men support the wife? That is a manly suggestion! He knows that in the economy of the household there is a division of labor; that neither husband nor wife can be said to support the other, if each does his or her duty. Both contribute patient labor and infinite care of equal importance. Man does not buy the right of suffrage, or any other inherent right of a woman, by his alleged support of her.

The best part of the gentleman's speech was his quotation from Dr. Shaw, as follows:

The reason men are enfranchised is that, as citizens, they have a stake in the Government. The reason women should be enfranchised is because, as citizens, they have a stake in the Government. That's all there is to the question of woman suffrage.

Dr. Shaw was right. A woman is a stockholder in a corporation. She has her investment in the enterprise; she is assessed for its development; she pays for her stock in good and legal tender. What crowd of male autocrats would say she should have no vote in the stockholders' meeting? Yet that is what the gentleman from North Carolina would say if he were a fellow stockholder.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] exclaimed in his speech:

We are told by our suffrage-seeking sisters that in dealing with this question we should put chivalry aside. "Why, Mr. Speaker," he exclaimed, "that is unthinkable and impossible. Men without chivalry would be masculine monsters!"

Would true chivalry deprive a woman of even a high privilege? He said further:

Because some women want the ballot will not justify us in thrusting it upon those who do not want it.

Would a gentleman, even though unboastful of his chivalry, withhold the franchise from women who have a stake in the Government and want a part in its management because, perchance, there were women who would not exercise the right?

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], now a member of the suffrage committee, then quoted with his approval the arch woman hater of biblical times:

As in the churches of the saints, let women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted of them to speak, but let them be in subjection. If they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home.

No wonder they were ignorant in those days.

Further—

Wives be in subjection unto your husband, as unto the Lord.

Again—

Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection, but I permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over man, but to be in quietness.

The gentleman from Florida would not permit a woman even to teach! Where would go our school system? Would not let her have a voice in church! Where would go our churches? Compel her to remain in subjection! He would bring back the days of slavery, merely changing the color of the subjects.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] said it would infringe upon our sacred theory of federal union of self-governing States. Yet he supported and voted for the child-labor law, denying to those States the prerogative of governing their children and of enforcing their own regulations as to child labor.

Also, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who seemed to lead the debate on the rule that day, after saying it was the most important question before the House in 40 years, said each State should be left free to individually control all questions relating to suffrage, still the gentleman voted for a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators. He loudly proclaimed that he would not have the General Government interfering with the State in matters of suffrage, yet he voted to force upon my State against its expressed will his solution of this suffrage question. I am glad he did so, because Utah was then afflicted with a reactionary government as obnoxious as ever impeded the progress of a commonwealth. Through the help of the women voters of that State, they have relegated that régime to oblivion. Did

the gentleman infringe upon the rights of my State? I think not, because in voluntarily becoming a member of the Union my State recognized the constitutional right of a three-fourths majority to amend the Constitution. Shall one State assist in forcing what it considers a good thing upon unyielding States and then be permitted to invoke the time-worn doctrine of States' rights to prevent the majority from amending the fundamental law in the perfectly regular and constitutional manner?

Another gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], who with keen-edged logic always cuts close to the heart of a subject, made in his speech on that occasion this significant statement:

I shall leave out all question of State rights. My respect for the phrase and logic has in the last few weeks largely diminished. I have found that largely every man of either side can use, or professes to, the doctrine of State rights to favor his contention.

The gentleman from Arkansas, who favored the prohibition amendment but has opposed this resolution and some others, cleverly elaborated this point the other day, and demonstrated from the record that the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, just quoted, was entirely correct.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] expressed uncertainty as to whether a majority of his people favored equal suffrage. He thought many women opposed it bitterly upon the ground that it will tend to degrade rather than exalt the womanhood of the State. He said:

There was also a fear among women that manly men would not love and esteem them if the responsibility of voting should be thrust upon them.

That is surely a weighty argument, worthy of the distinguished gentleman; but can not he believe the evidence and accept the assurance of nearly half the States of the Union?

The gentleman from Alabama, Dr. Abercrombie, spoke against the resolution but uttered this impressive sentence:

One of the most hopeful results of the spread of education and democracy is that which reveals itself in the gradual emancipation of woman.

He felt bound, however, by some caucus action with which, fortunately, we are not handicapped to-day.

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bowdler, who appeared to be the humorist of the House in his day and time, said in his speech that his wife and sister both wanted to vote, but he did not think it safe for man's sacred prerogatives to permit them to do it. He could trust them to teach his schools, train his children, to run his church, but not to vote. He would let them pay taxes, but would deny them representation. He made the unique argument that it was on account of their ignorance, and said he had formed his opinion by taking account on a street car, on seven trips, of the number of men and women reading the newspaper; also by consulting a Jewish newsboy on Pennsylvania Avenue. This was high authority, but he forgot that statistics show women quite as intelligent as men, though they may not read the sporting page of the morning papers quite so generally. They read in the home, they attend lectures, they hear speeches, they attend political meetings, in this House they listen attentively to debates from the galleries, and are quite the equals of man in all the pursuits of life which they wish to enter. This gentleman, as well as a gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. SLOAN, wanted the question left to the women themselves, but the gentleman from Nebraska said there should be no dissenting voice. He wanted to govern by unanimous consent. He would permit a feeble minority to deprive the majority of women of the franchise.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], who always utters extravagant praise but denies simple justice to what he terms the divine feminine, wanted the subject left to each State and expressed the fear that the negro women might enter politics. In this he took counsel of his fear instead of his chivalry. Surely rendering justice to their women will not disable the Southern people from handling their peculiar problems. Regulations may, of course, be imposed. I have a table here which purports to show the number of negro men and women in each of 11 southern States. In all but 2 of the 11 the white women outnumber both negro men and women. This being true, it is sufficient to say that the white women, if they are of the same spirit as the white women of my section, will far outvote the colored women. If not, they should cheerfully submit for a while to negro domination. Of such submission, however, I believe there is not a particle of danger.

In this connection I am reminded that many benevolent lovers of the negro race, who admire them from a distance, from States like Massachusetts and others, have precipitated sectional arguments of much bitterness by insisting that negroes in the South be allowed to vote without restriction, while they and other States denied the right of their women to vote. It occurred to me then, and I think now that when a white woman pays her taxes, helps support the Government, takes care of her

home, looks after the education and welfare of her children, attends to her duties faithfully and modestly, as a teacher, as a doctor, as a minister, she is almost as good as a negro and her rights should receive some of the generous and benevolent attention which these philanthropists extend to the negro race.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROTH] made a peculiar argument that day. He opposed the resolution solely because he thought it would not pass, although voicing his belief in the eternal verity of the principle. What reform would ever be effected under his plan? The world admires and always will admire the man who is willing to stand alone and go down to defeat for what he believes to be right. Such men and women are the pioneers of progress.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] spoke that day against the resolution. He repudiated, however, two of the arguments of his fellow opponents. He said in part:

I believe that if they were given the ballot and should exercise it that they would maintain on the political field and in the booth that high standard of womanhood which characterizes their everyday life in their home and the social circle and that this standard would be maintained by all good women.

That is the type of chivalry to be admired, rather than the sort which pretends to worship, but will refuse to treat justly. Along the same line spoke the gentleman from Indiana, who opposed the resolution, but who said:

I do not believe, as gentlemen seem to believe, that women are unqualified for the right of franchise. On the contrary, I believe that they are qualified for it, and would use it to good advantage. I do not believe, as some believe, that to exercise the franchise would pull them down into the dirty mire of politics. On the contrary, if we have dirty politics they would cleanse the same and elevate the standard.

This gentleman voted against the resolution, because of the defeat of his proposed amendment, submitting the question to conventions instead of to legislatures. In that memorable debate we observed that gentlemen depended upon the following arguments to justify their opposition:

First. That suffrage was not a right, but a privilege.

Second. That there would be danger of negro domination in the South.

Third. That women did not want it.

Fourth. That they could vote through their husbands (8,000,000 have no husbands).

Fifth. That it would pollute the womanhood of the country.

Sixth. That it would infringe on the constitutional rights of the State.

Seventh. That it could best be secured through State action.

Probably the most important reason of all against the reform was not mentioned, namely, that women, if voting, would be dangerously unfriendly to the liquor traffic. It may be that friends of the saloon should vote against the resolution to-day, unless their love of justice and fair play is greater than their love of the institution called the saloon. On December 17, a day which will always be memorable in the history of legislation, we passed a resolution submitting the prohibition amendment. If this equal suffrage resolution should pass and should precede the other in adoption, undoubtedly the vote of the women would assist in carrying the necessary number of States for the prohibition amendment. If prohibition carries first, opposition to equal suffrage will evaporate. The striking similarity between the list of negative votes on both subjects is evidence of this fear. I observe that only 21 gentlemen voted for woman suffrage three years ago who voted against the prohibition amendment on December 17 last, while 104 voted against both amendments. This is significant, indeed. I note in the Record an interesting incident in the House in the debate on suffrage three years ago. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] interrupting the gentleman from Michigan, said his State had defeated woman suffrage by 182,000 majority.

The gentleman from Michigan replied that Michigan had also defeated woman suffrage, but that the liquor interests had stolen the election. There was such confusion and cheering in the galleries that the Speaker had to make such vigorous efforts to preserve order that the gentleman from Michigan thought he was being called off the floor. The Speaker explained, and threatened to clear the galleries. One of the gentlemen, Mr. SABATH, voted for equal suffrage, though opposing prohibition. He believed it to be righteous that he should vote for suffrage, and incidentally his State had gone for suffrage and the women were voting out there; so, in fact, had practically all the States from whence came those who acted so strangely as to vote for suffrage while opposing prohibition. That was the reason given the other day by the eloquent gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER]. So it happens that men's opinions are civilized by the practical operations of equal suffrage wherever it is adopted. Some say that pro-Germans and pacifists are back of this movement. This movement was full fledged before anyone

heard the name pro-German or pacifist. The efficient work that friends of equal suffrage are rendering in the death grapple with autocracy brands the assertion as vile and slanderous. It should be noted that the soldiers at the front voted 2 to 1 for suffrage.

Some say to-day that they are ashamed of the action of the militants in picketing the White House and the Capitol. So are we all; but we should be more ashamed of the unreasonable stubbornness on the part of men who refuse them the justice they have so long and patiently asked. Every reform has the overzealous, but it would be a narrow-gauged statesmanship which would let such incidents decide the action to take.

By reviewing the arguments against this reform we find that most all are sufficiently refuted by speakers on the same side. Some charge that women are not intelligent enough. A gentleman on the same side of the question repudiated the statement. Some say that the standard of womanhood would be lowered. Others on the same side emphatically deny it. Some say it would be an infringement upon State rights. Others on the same side of the question assert that this is only a convenient contention. The opponents have disproved their own arguments which are entitled to any weight, excepting perhaps the contention that the reform can best be secured by State action. There are serious obstacles in the way of State action. It might be far into the distant future before the constitution of some States, with men only voting, could be changed in this regard. In the meantime unjust discriminations would prevail. Citizens of the United States removing to and owning property in such State would suffer the injustice of taxation without representation.

Equal suffrage has been tried in many of the States in the Union and is adopted in most of the really civilized nations of the world. Wherever tried and adopted the effect is uniformly wholesome. No nation has taken a step backward. No State has ever abolished it. Every Representative here to-day from a State civilized and progressive enough to render justice to one-half the citizenship will vote for this resolution.

MISS RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

MR. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored in this Congress, to the best of my ability and judgment, to so speak and vote as to give the greatest aid possible in upholding the honor and the dignity of the United States. I have endeavored first to decide whether or not the proposition presented was right and just, and, second, whether it would aid in the successful carrying on of the present war. In arriving at the decision as what best to do I have been governed in a large measure by the recommendations of the President, recognizing as I do that he is the responsible head of the Government of the United States and the Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. So far I have not taken any position during this Congress contrary to his recommendations. [Applause.] I believe thoroughly and earnestly it is right, just, and proper to give the vote to the women of America. [Applause.] I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it will aid in this great war to give this recognition at this time to the American women. I believe it will help in every way in showing to them that the burdens and great sacrifices they are making, and which are equal to the men who are engaged in this war, are appreciated fully by the Congress. The great State of Missouri, which I have the honor, in part, to represent here, has not yet given an opportunity to women to vote upon any proposition, but I am in favor of giving it to them now.

I did my best to bring this about in the past and voted to give that right to the women of Missouri whenever the opportunity presented itself. When the roll is called to-day in this House that patriotic State will not only be for woman suffrage by a big majority but every vote cast here by the membership of this House, with the exception of one, will be in favor of the enfranchisement of the women of America. [Applause.] The great city of St. Louis, which I have the honor in part to represent, through the Republican Party organization of that city some weeks ago took action and unanimously indorsed the Susan B. Anthony amendment. [Applause.] The mayor of our city, a Republican, serving now going on six years, has officially time and again spoken in favor of this amendment and there is every evidence that the people in my city want to give this right and this opportunity to women because it is just. The women of Missouri ask this privilege and I, as one of their representatives here, endeavoring to represent them as well as the male sex, am ready to give it to them and hope the time may soon come when the necessary three-fourths of the States will ratify this amendment, which we ought and I believe will submit, so far as this House is concerned, to the States to-day. And, Mr. Speaker, if there were more evidences

needed of the desire of the people to have this done, if there were more evidences that it is right and just, and if there were more evidences that it is a war measure in truth and in fact, I could state them here to-day. I need only call attention to the lady from Montana sitting in this House and say to you that this is one of the very best evidences that we should give the right of suffrage to the women of America. [Applause.] I would be glad to see more of them come if they came as capable and well able to help the people as she. I am willing to let down the bars of opportunity for the women of America to do their part in government and in the management of this great war. Franchise to them will help in State and municipal government as well as from a national standpoint. Mr. Speaker, there should be no sectionalism in this question. The women of America are patriotic and worthy in all sections, and we should all vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary when that committee had charge of the woman-suffrage resolution I voted to return favorably the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I also filed minority views touching the resolution (H. J. Res. 1), and which views are as follows:

The Federal amendment for woman suffrage should be passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress for the following reasons:

1. It is fundamentally just. The principle on which the American Government was established—that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed—demands it.

That woman is industrially and legally an individual and not a mere family factor in the social system is no longer a matter of argument. Logic demands that she be a political entity as well.

2. The justice of the principle of woman suffrage has already been admitted in 12 States. Half a century ago it was proved that a democracy can not exist half slave and half free economically. It is clear it can not continue to do so politically. Recently Mr. Root has said "the world can not be half democratic and half autocratic. It must be all democratic or all Prussian. There can be no compromise." No more can one country be half democratic and half autocratic; part of its States ruled by the voice of all the people, the rest ruled by an autocracy of sex.

3. Woman suffrage is inevitable. It is plainly written in the signs of the times. The only question is when and how.

Women and men throughout the United States—and the civilized world generally, for that matter—have come to understand that real democracy must recognize the political freedom of women as well as men. Opposition still blocking their enfranchisement comes mainly from two classes of people: (1) Those whose private interests are best served by the status quo, and (2) those whose minds are inherently reactionary. It is folly to oppose longer a measure so imminent. New York ought to point the trend of the times to even the blindest.

Moreover there is a peculiar fitness in Congress adjusting the grievances of women, for Congress and the legislatures are the nearest approach to representation that voteless women have, since their Members are apportioned among the several States on the basis of population and not on the number of voters.

4. The time for national action has come.

Educational propaganda as a means of extending the suffrage through the States has done its work. The College Suffrage League, which has been active for many years, held its last meeting in Washington on December 15, 1917, "because its work is finished." It set out to convert the women in the colleges to suffrage for women. It now finds college women so generally suffragists that there is nothing for the league to do. This fact is tremendously significant. What is true of the colleges is true outside. It means that the chief business of suffrage organizations is no longer educational, that there is no longer such need to convert large numbers of men and women to the faith. It must therefore become political; that is, to induce the few in power to grant the demands of the many. Briefly, woman suffrage is no longer a subject for educational propaganda but for political pressure.

The passage of the Federal amendment would conserve the time and energy and money, not to mention the good will, spent in State campaigning, and divert it to war service.

5. Never was there a time so fitted to passing this measure as now. Never was there a measure so suited to the times.

"We are fighting for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government," said President Wilson, defining our position in this world war. What better pledge of the sincerity of the purpose of the Government than to give to the women of the United States a voice in their Government—when they with the men of their country are giving all they have to make this principle safe throughout the world.

To insure democracy at home in the one concrete case before the country is to strengthen confidence in the Government's declaration of the purpose of the war—democracy. It will dissipate the fears of thousands of working men and women that the war to establish the principle of democracy throughout the world does not always mean its application at home. It will make for devotion and singleness of purpose in the prosecution of the supreme task of the moment—the world war.

The reaction of the passage of this bill on the minds of the people will be salutary—the people who are far away from the operations of cabinets, commissioners, and generals, but who are close to the realities of life, to the sufferings and sacrifices of the war, who get their opinions through vague and contradictory news reports, may at times grow suspicious and disheartened.

They understand facts where they are confused by words and argument. Pass the Federal amendment enfranchising the women and there will be no confusion in the mind of anyone about the intention of the Government, however slow it sometimes works out. Devotion and singleness of purpose will be strengthened immeasurably throughout the whole United States. The Federal amendment is a war measure of the most definite sort.

6. To limit the time allowed the several States for ratification of the amendment is to trip up justice by technicalities.

When Congress has once indorsed the principle involved in the extension of the franchise to women it will defeat its own ends if it limits the legislatures in their procedure.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, at my home in Texas, I was discussing the woman-suffrage movement and this proposed amendment with an eminent lawyer, who told me that he was a supporter of the movement, and that if the Legislature of the State of Texas would submit an amendment to its constitution to confer upon the women of that State the right to vote he would support it; that he would go upon the stump and advocate it before the people; but that if he were a Member of the Congress of the United States and this amendment came forward for consideration and came to a vote he would oppose it as one of the inexcusable invasions of the constitutional, fundamental, necessary rights of the States, if they are to exist.

It is entirely fit, Mr. Speaker, when the few remaining dignities of the States are being destroyed, that it should be done with shouts of laughter and cries of "Vote! Vote!" Gag rules are historically associated with assaults on the liberties of free States, central or federated, big or little. That practically no time is allowed for the debate of a revolutionary change in the Constitution is not surprising, for that also is associated with an invasion of the rights of States.

It will be recorded when the history of Jeffersonian-Jacksonian democracy, so soon to die, comes to be written that the first, although not the only, voice raised here to-day for the preservation of the right of the States of the Federal Union to control their own electorate was that of Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, a Republican, who is, however, so thoroughly grounded in Americanism that he refuses to be stampeded by political exigency to commit the crime.

Everybody knows, so far as the question of suffrage for women is concerned, that there is no reason for this amendment. The right for women to vote is being granted State by State, and so rapidly that it seems probable that it will be given them in the regular constitutional way much sooner than was expected.

Mr. Speaker, I forbear to say that in my opinion it will bring an era of emotional legislation when it does come.

Mr. Speaker, of Democrats who take national platforms as their guide to political votes in this House I ask, Where is the platform authority for a vote in support of this amendment? It can not be found. In fact, every time a Democratic platform has spoken on the question at all it has specifically and plainly condemned any such violation of the existing constitutional rights of the States as written in the charter of our liberties.

Very few, if any, Members of this House were elected to propose or support an amendment of any sort to the Constitution. We all took the oath to support the Constitution as it is, and before doing so radical a thing as this the whole question should be submitted to the people. Let it be referred to them. Go to the people themselves for orders in so vital a matter as this. I hope no man who calls himself a Democrat or American is afraid of such a referendum.

Mr. Speaker, in the New York World of this morning there was an editorial which, in the main, discusses the amendment to the Constitution recently agreed to in this House. It was referring to the precipitate action of the State of Mississippi, which, it said, it had the unquestioned right to take, but which it may deeply regret hereafter. I ask attention to the concluding paragraphs of that editorial:

We make these comparisons as a basis for the statement that in the matter of a constitutional amendment well calculated to destroy home rule, the States acting as units, the one vote of Mississippi has the same power as that of New York, with a population of 10,000,000 and a male representation at the ballot box as great as the entire population of the southern Commonwealth, which makes haste to inflict upon its neighbors an odious centralization of power wholly subversive of personal rights.

Mississippi, of course, has accepted for itself the policy of prohibition, its right being unquestioned. In rushing with breakneck speed to fasten the system undemocratically upon the country at large, it assumes a leadership which we believe it will have reason to regret. If the other States of the South would retain the political power they now possess, they will not follow an example so inviting to reprisal at the North.

I ask the Democrats from the South who do not want to see their representation in this body reduced to take that thought home with them. At present it is a cloud no larger than a man's hand, but behind it a storm threatens, and when it breaks, as very likely it will, the South will be the sufferer.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, supporters of this proposed constitutional amendment commit themselves for all time to a nationalistic form of government as opposed to the dual form of government as founded by the framers of the Constitution. Nothing is more fundamental in our national polity than that

suffrage is a matter for the States. That has been recognized as recently as 1914, in a decision rendered by not only a jurist but a statesman, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, when in construing the suffrage law of Oklahoma and passing upon the construction of the fifteenth amendment, that relates to suffrage, in the case of *Guinn v. United States* (238 U. S. Supreme Court Reports, p. 364), he used this language. I invite the special attention of those Democrats who still believe in the State-rights theory of government and of those few Republicans who believe in it—and I class myself as one of those who believe in that principle and who has, since I entered this Congress, tried to consistently adhere to that policy. I believe it is the best policy for the welfare of this country to recognize and follow the policy of leaving to the States that which pertains to the internal affairs of the States. He uses this language:

Beyond doubt the amendment—

Referring to the fifteenth amendment—

does not take away from the State governments, in a general sense, the power over suffrage which has belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and organization of both governments rests would be without support, and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground.

I follow that political statement of principle—not of policy—but of the principle of government that was enunciated from the Supreme Bench of the United States. He believed it not as a matter of expediency, but in harmony with our form of government, that it was for the best interests of the States to control their suffrage affairs. I am unwilling for the West, for the Northwest, or for any section of the country to foist their views as to suffrage upon an unwilling section, whether it be the South, the East, or the Northeast.

In my own State, in a vote had in November, 1912, nearly two-thirds of the electors of that State registered themselves as in opposition to suffrage. Only 14 of the 71 counties registered themselves in favor of suffrage, and yet because in the legislature two years afterwards, in their august judgment they saw fit not to submit again the question of suffrage to the voters of my State, because they had only so recently had an opportunity to express their views, my distinguished colleague, Mr. LEXROO, says that he opposed this proposition two years ago because the sentiment was not ripe for suffrage and because it did not leave it to the vote of the people, and he wishes to change his position, because the legislature of the State followed the very policy which he had enunciated as the reason for opposing this provision three years ago. [Applause.]

You gentlemen from Illinois who commit yourselves to-day in favor of this national amendment would take away the right from your legislature to limit the extent of the franchise as it has done to the extent of presidential electors and Congressmen. You from Maine who are going to vote in favor of suffrage to-day would take away from your people the right to determine that question for themselves, and by your vote would indicate that you view their attitude at the polls in opposition to suffrage with disapproval.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I can not yield. You gentlemen from Iowa will register your disapproval of the vote of the people recently on the prohibition question when they protested against making permanent law by constitutional amendment what the legislature had favored as against allowing the people of the State at any time to change its policy when once this amendment is adopted.

We have given suffrage to a limited extent a trial in the State of Wisconsin. The people of Wisconsin have the right in their sovereign capacity to say how far that suffrage shall be exercised. You who favor this proposal want to put upon the States for all time to come an amendment which will deprive them of all opportunity of determining hereafter what shall be their policy, whether it would work out well or ill.

So far as suffrage is concerned, if suffrage is going to be exercised at all, it should be exercised not by a small fraction of a class but by all the class; and you should not force an unwilling fraction of American voters to have to go to the polls to counteract the action of another fraction of woman voters, and possibly a very small fraction, who wish to go to the polls and register their votes. If you once pass this measure and force suffrage upon unwilling States, they are deprived of the right of ever changing their form of government, so far as suffrage is concerned. I urge you earnestly to adhere to the old and fundamental principle of State rights, so far as the government of internal affairs is concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment, if it passes Congress and is thereafter ratified by three-fourths of the States, will constitute the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The fathers of the Constitution soon after its adoption quickly recognized that it ought to be amended in many particulars. In less than 10 years after the organization of the Government 11 amendments were added to it. I imagine that the debates for and against those amendments would reveal substantially the same argument made here to-day for and against the proposed amendment.

I imagine that those amendments were not adopted by Congress without a struggle, although they are known to-day as our "bill of rights." At the time of the organization of our Government we did not have universal manhood suffrage in the thirteen original States. In many, if not all, of those States property voted instead of men. This condition continued for more than a quarter of a century, but during the period of the early development of our constitutional form of government the common man, the poor man, the man without property, said "I, too, desire the right to vote." This argument and determination on the part of all mankind to be free and to be given the right to vote could not be held down or smothered into silence. It burst forth about 1825, and thereafter the right to vote, so far as manhood suffrage is concerned, was not denied to men by the new incoming States of the Union, but all were armed with the ballot without regard to property qualifications.

The right of women to vote is not a new question in our country. It had its origin nearly three-quarters of a century ago, but the last two decades has witnessed a determination on the part of women to be free, to be armed with the ballot, to have a voice in the maintenance of her country, and to in all things be recognized as a citizen should be recognized. One of the beauties of our form of government is the fact that we can amend the Constitution of the United States. It is not an iron-clad, unamendable instrument, but an instrument that can be amended by the people along lines set forth in the Constitution. [Applause.] One of the beauties of our form of government is that we are not governed to-day by a military autocracy such as governs the German Empire with which we are now at war. [Applause.]

Many able Members have argued to-day that it is wrong to force on a State a proposition which it does not like. This argument does not appeal to me. It is unsound, illogical, and can not be based upon constitutional foundations. Within the last five or six years the Constitution has been amended in two instances.

One of these amendments enabled Congress to enact an income-tax law, and I imagine that some of the States of the Union, particularly the great State of New York, which pays from one-third to one-half of the income tax, was not over-enthusiased for this amendment. The fathers plainly provided in the Constitution the way and manner in which Senators should be elected, and yet the sentiment in the country became overwhelming for an amendment to the Constitution so as to give the people a direct vote for and against a candidate to the United States Senate, and Congress finally yielded to this nation-wide demand.

Will anyone rise in his seat and declare that our present mode of electing Senators by popular vote has been a failure? Some have argued that voting is a right. Others contend it is a mere privilege. No one yet in this argument has undertaken to draw a clear distinction between a right and privilege. If voting is a right, why deny it to women? If it be a privilege, why give the privilege exclusively to men and deny it to women? Why not treat them both alike? As both sexes are amenable to the laws of the country, why not equally arm them with the ballot? Why not put both men and women on the same footing and let both of them work out their common ideals of government together. I care not whether it be regarded as a right or a privilege, the results are what we are aiming at, and the result aimed at is universal man and womanhood suffrage.

No harm has ever befallen any government based upon universal suffrage of its people. We proudly boast that our Government rests upon the consent of the governed, and the only way those governed can wield their consent is by their ballot, and while making this boast we are denying suffrage to fully one-half of our citizens; not only denying them the right to suffrage but making them amenable to the laws of both State and Nation upon the same ground, upon the same terms, and with the same penalties as men. To hold an individual responsible to a law that he or she had no voice in making amounts to

a complete denial of justice, and to hold women responsible to law without a voice in its enactment is equivalent to denying them a voice in the affairs of their country.

No harm ever befell our Government as a result of universal manhood suffrage. Women are as patriotic as men. Women are just as capable and intelligent as men, and armed with the ballot there is no more danger of them betraying the ideals of our Nation than there is in men.

Some vainly attempted to bolster up a false argument against woman suffrage by saying that this was an inopportune time to grant them this privilege, because of the world-wide war in which our Nation finds itself. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." This is the propitious time, the golden time, the time of all times to arm women with the ballot. War falls heaviest on women, the wives and mothers who must bear the solemn responsibility of loss of boys and husbands, and why should they not be given a voice when the smoke of battle has cleared away and the many world-wide and far-reaching social questions that will forge themselves to the front then affecting their husbands and their sons as well as themselves? Women are as patriotic as men; yea, in the main more so. Examine the court records since we have declared war against Germany. How many convictions of women do you find for violation of any statute for treason or uttering seditious statements? My memory only recalls one, Emma Goldman, an anarchist of international fame. I do not recall the conviction of a single patriotic American woman since we declared war against Germany, not one, while the court records disclose the convictions of hundreds if not thousands of men for violation of some penal code designed to protect our country in time of war.

You will find no slackers among the patriotic women. The slackers are the men and not the women. In every village, town, city, and community you find patriotic women in Red Cross sewing rooms exerting their very utmost to help win the war, while you find millions of wise men sitting around in stores, hotels, barrooms, and barber shops telling how the war could be won and criticizing the way and manner it is being conducted. Women are criticizing by acts of kindness and deeds of mercy, through actual hard work in the Red Cross. Men are wisely and gravely criticizing by word of mouth and doing nothing.

When the final chapter of this war is written the angel of mercy through the Red Cross will stand well to the forefront of having done her duty.

She has never been denied the right to vote on the ground of her inability to make out an intelligent ballot. She has been denied upon the ground of her sex. Woman has had to fight her way upward from the first rung of the ladder to whatever position she occupies to-day. Nothing has been given or granted to her by man except she won it in the open field of competition. And to-day she is competing with man anywhere and everywhere where brain power counts. Our colleges and our universities are filled with brainy women lecturing on subjects side by side with man, but she is denied a right which he enjoys—the right to cast a sovereign ballot.

In my State the vilest man that walks the highways, fresh from the jails and penitentiaries, with a pistol in one pocket and a pint of whisky in the other, if not disqualified by the court, can on election day go to the booth, deposit his ballot, which in the last analysis has the same weight in the final count as the President of the United States or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and yet a woman like Ella Wheeler Wilcox, whose poetry and song has brightened every home in civilization, is denied the right to vote solely because she wears a dress. An absolute mockery upon our institutions, a complete denial of justice to the noble, patriotic women of our Nation.

The immortal Lincoln, as such I name him, because he belongs to the immortals, once said, "All I am, all I ever expect to be, I owe to my mother." The matchless Garfield, the beloved McKinley, our three martyred Presidents, all stricken in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, without a moment's warning, in the heyday of their lives, by an assassin armed with the ballot, and yet the mothers of these great men, who gave them birth, taught them high ideals of life, and made them mountain peaks among the men of the earth, were denied the right to vote. The fight is on. It will never down until the victory is won. The women are eternally right in their request and in their demand, and right was never known to recede. Crushed to earth to-day, it will rise sevenfold stronger to-morrow. Defeat their proposition to-day, and it will rise stronger to-morrow. Its strength lies in its absolute equality of justice and right. I hope the amendment will carry overwhelmingly in the House and in the Senate, and then I trust that the patriotic people of the 48 States will quickly and promptly

ratify it, so as to give the women the right to universal suffrage. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it must seem strange to many who know what is going on in the world, "the New World in which we now live," to note the opposition that is so apparent here and in certain other sections against giving women the right to vote. If the suffrage question were as prominent in those sections alluded to as prohibition, many Members of this House would assume a very different attitude here to-day.

What the women are demanding of this body is simple justice. All this talk about defeating woman suffrage is nonsense. This House can not defeat it. Suffrage is here now and here to stay, and, borrowing an expression of the President from his message on Tuesday last, "This happy fact is now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not linger in an age that is dead and gone."

As I have said, woman suffrage is here now, and is here to stay, and what we should concern ourselves about from now on is how we can best get along with it. It has already elected one President, because in California the women vote—"Oh, you California"—and, take it from me, the women will elect more Presidents hereafter, and possibly defeat some of the very wise politicians in the near future who are opposed to this resolution.

Woman now governs one of the greatest institutions in the land—the home—where her help and advice bring happiness and contentment. It seems strange and unfair that she should be deprived longer of a voice in our Government. Women are already helping to bear war's heavy burdens and the country depends on them as well as on men. They are willingly giving their loved ones to aid us to preserve liberty and civilization, and this great Republic can not longer deny them the right of suffrage. Fair play, decency, and justice demand for women equal rights. I shall vote for the joint resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Miss RANKIN I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some exception taken to this legislation proposed, because of the manner of its proposal. The women, in seeking for suffrage, have adopted the policy universally employed by those who advocated amendments heretofore; and yet their opponents come here and say to these women, "You are taking an unfair advantage of us. You should go at it in some other way, the constitutional method is disadvantageous to us." Gentlemen of the House, I take it that when we address women seeking the right to vote, it is a mighty poor time for a man to plead the baby act. Let them have the same chance men have had. If, as the gentleman from Florida suggests, there is a better way to test public opinion, why do they not invoke it?

When woman first appeared on the pages of profane history, man dragged her in by the hair, and for centuries she was nothing but a slave. Then man reached the conclusion that she was an angel, and every novel in our youth told us of some young fellow who told his girl that she should never soil her lily-white hands with work; but the last chapter, as a rule, showed her taking in washing to support an orphan asylum for a drunkard's home, the children of a man sleeping somewhere in a drunkard's grave. It seems to me, gentlemen, that it is time for us to learn that woman is neither a slave nor an angel, but a human being, entitled to be treated with ordinary, common sense in the adjustment of human affairs, and that is why she is asking for the ballot.

In the good old days when there was a home for every woman a woman's place was at home; but the complications of modern society which have arisen because of the many developments of manufacturing, social, mercantile, and agricultural life have forced women out of the homes and into an absolutely essential struggle for existence. Society is much more than sex relation. There are more women working in the House Office Building than there are men. There are more women toiling in the shops and stores of this city than men. The factories are thronged with troops of those whose place is at home. Gentlemen reason in the terms and under the imaginary conditions that obtained in England a thousand years ago—all gone, like a dream, never to return. Every man of us all regrets the day when all this terrific demand upon human effort became necessary to the existence of the human race, but you can not force women into this struggle with their hands tied. She is a human being caught in the swelling tide of life and struggling for a foothold. You must treat her as such. You must give them the same power and the same opportunity that you give to men when you compel them to battle for existence on the same plane with men.

They have done most of the work, furnished most of the loyalty, devotion, and unselfishness and half the brains of the human race for 6,000 years. When they wish to be heard in the councils of society, you say to them, "Ah, you can not fight." This is unworthy of any man that can fight. They supply different elements to the constituency of society. The child bearer has as many rights as the soldier. They are equally important, and if our race has improved after all the struggles and battles of the ages the time has come for this great Republic to declare that fact. That will give us a mightier Nation, a more resplendent civilization, more ideal homes, and men and women who shall go forward—

To that richer life, where beauty
Walks hand in hand with duty.

John James Ingalls, for years the foremost man in the Senate of the United States, was a vigorous opponent of woman suffrage. He was accustomed to say, "In the last analysis government is force." During the recent hearings before the Woman Suffrage Committee of this House another famous Senator, Joseph W. Bailey, advanced the same theory, charging that woman should not vote because she could not do military service. There has been much persiflage and camouflage and rhetoric and prejudice sounded out as against woman suffrage, but the only argument advanced is that woman should not vote because she can not fight. The trouble with it is that it is simply a recurrence to prehistoric and antediluvian conditions under which our race fought its way out of the woods and into society.

Zobier Pasha, still living, I think, in the Sudan, was the greatest slave king Africa ever saw. From a black adventurer in the African forest he rose to be the chieftain of an empire that extended for a thousand miles in every direction. He gave to me the key to his success when he stated he began his career after the first step by buying slaves for soldiers, not for servants. With evident appreciation of the importance of his idea he said to me in his native Arabic, "I discovered that the man who can carry a spear is the master of him that must carry a burden." He spoke for Rameses and David, for Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, for Frederick the Great and Bonaparte, for Achilles and Romulus and all their mighty predecessors who led mankind to fight its way from chaos and its dangers to civilization and its opportunities. He divulged the theory that was the secret of primeval leadership.

But the debaters have forgotten that force is only useful when directed by intelligence, the master. They have confused the means and the end. The voice is the voice of a Senator and a statesman, but the hand is the hand of a Caesar and a conqueror. If brute strength is the dominating authority of government and civilization, then Moses and Manu, Confucius and Buddha, Socrates and Jesus have lived and died in vain. For generations our mothers were merchandise and beasts of burden, but now the highest watermark for the tide of civilization is one where her loftiest privileges are registered. I challenge the authority of force and appeal to you for the rule of reason. The test of capacity to administer government is not the amount of brute strength which might be furnished by an animal. The only proper method of deciding upon the value of citizenship is the possession of brains. When reason and force work together on equal terms we will have a Christian civilization.

They say a woman can not fight. Why should she? Every boy that marches to battle is hers. The loftiest, most useful, most essential duty of citizenship is not that of the soldier, but it is that of the child bearer. She can not fight? Why should she? The mother furnishes every recruit, inspires every hero. Every man on this floor came into the world at the peril of his mother's life. "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend." Every time a soldier is born a mother goes down into the valley of the shadow of death. Shall she have no voice in the disposition of those for whom she risked her life? What man is there here that claims he has a better right to be heard than the mother who bore him? "Is thy servant a dog, that he shall do this thing?"

The New York soldiers voted to give their mothers the ballot. Who are we in Congress that shall deny our mothers and theirs that privilege? Arms and armaments are society's chiefest menace. When both sexes are heard public opinion will reflect both the strength and the sweetness of humankind. That society is the most powerful, that government is founded upon the most solid basis which employs in its legislation and administration the most intelligence, and that means every intelligent mind of mature age within its borders. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the limited time at my disposal to pay a simple, sincere, and deserved tribute to the fair Member of this House [Miss RANKIN] who so well and faithfully represents the State of Montana, and who is in fact the real leader and invincible champion of the just cause of our noble women in the American Congress. In all fairness, she well deserves the chief credit for the victory which I hope will be achieved here to-day for human rights, for equal justice, for the blessings of liberty, for the freedom and enfranchisement of one-half of 100,000,000 Americans. The highest, best, and strongest evidence that woman suffrage is a success has been established in this House by the enviable record made by our colleague from Montana, who has won the respect, confidence, and admiration of the Members and officials of this House, from our honored and impartial Speaker down. During my service in this House, covering a period of nine years, the greatest ovation given a Member on opening a debate was accorded to the Member from Montana this morning. It was not so much an indorsement of the subject she championed, as it was a just tribute to an able, popular, and successful woman, who has made good as an honored Member of the American Congress. Well may Montana, the women of this Nation, the Congress, and the American people, regardless of politics, be proud of Representative JEANNETTE RANKIN. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia use some of his time now?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will use some of my time. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], the Members from South Carolina are required to take an oath to stand on the platform of the party, State and National; and when the platform of my party in South Carolina was being formed the president of the Woman's Suffrage Association of South Carolina made her speech, in which she said, "I desire that you instruct your delegation to the national convention to vote for a suffrage plank in the national platform, but against a Federal amendment." That was the request made of our convention by the suffrage association of South Carolina. The convention saw fit not to go that far, and declined even to instruct its delegation to vote for a suffrage plank, and, in fact, voted against allowing it to have anything to do with the suffrage business in the national convention, but instructed the legislature that the matter be submitted to the people by proper act or resolution at the next general election. That legislature is now in session, and we are entitled to assume that it will follow the instructions given. So far as I am concerned, I helped to make that action. I am in favor of the State of South Carolina giving suffrage to women. But we consider that the platform and pledge is something more than a scrap of paper, and I remind you to-day that we are at war because this Nation has raised the banner that a contract and pledge between nations is something that must be respected and can not be discarded as a scrap of paper. If that is so, why should we as a party repudiate our platform and our instructions from the people of our State?

Something has been said about the control of this House passing from the Democratic Party and the South. We are a good deal more concerned in the South in controlling and arranging our own affairs than we are in controlling the chairmanships and Speakership of this House and the small amount of patronage of the gang of politicians that are coming to Congress merely for the loaves and fishes. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the national Democratic platform adopted at the St. Louis convention June, 1916, says upon the subject of woman suffrage:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

Mr. Speaker, the merits of the question of woman suffrage are not here up for consideration. The method of obtaining votes for women is the only question that we are to consider here to-day. I say frankly that when the women of my State want the ballot I am willing for them to have it, and when they do want it they will get it; but the women of my State do not want this Federal suffrage amendment forced upon our State. The women of my State are convinced that it is wisest and best for the State of Alabama to retain its right and power to handle the suffrage question.

I want to remind some gentlemen on that side—and I do not know from the way some of you talk whether the white people

of the South have your sympathy or not—but I want to remind you gentlemen in the North that we have a problem in the South that you do not have, and we feel that we know best how to handle that problem. The civilization of the white race in the South is involved in this matter of the ballot. We are working out this question of suffrage wisely and to the best interests of both races, and we ask you, our white brethren and sisters of the other sections of the country, to let us continue to work out this question as the builders of the Republic intended it should be worked out. The States now have that right, and no State ought to surrender it or have it taken from it. There is no necessity or justice to warrant such action by Congress. All the States in this Union that have given suffrage to their women gave it to them through the power now belonging to the States. But gentlemen now, strange to say, want to take this power away from the States and surrender it to the Federal Government. Why, gentlemen, God Almighty will not do for an individual what the individual can do for himself, and surely a sovereign State ought not to call upon the Federal Government to do that which the State can do for itself.

Mr. Speaker, the State can now, and some States have already, granted votes to women. Suffrage is growing all over the country. Let it continue in the old safe and sensible course, but do not, gentlemen, I beg you, strip the States of this vital power and thus contribute to the centralization of power which injures the State and endangers the life of the Nation. Leave to each sovereign State the right to work out this question as it deems wisest and best. You are not hurt by leaving this question for settlement by each State in its sovereign capacity, and it is infinitely better for us in the South to leave this power with the State. Have you no consideration or sympathy for the people of the South? We have grave questions that you do not have. It was this power of the State that gave us relief from carpetbagger and negro rule in reconstruction days, and gentlemen of the House I am ready to stand or fall in the attempt to preserve this power to my State. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. DECKER].

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I, too, like the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], who has just spoken, am a Democrat. And I am as proud of my democracy as he is of his. I am that kind of a Democrat that believes in State rights, that believes in the right of the State to exercise every right which by the Constitution has not been conferred upon the Federal Government. And one of the most important of State rights is that fundamental right of the three-quarters of the States of the American Union to amend that Constitution. [Applause.]

They talk of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, and of Mr. Madison and George Washington and those great statesmen from the South to whom we owe so much in this great land. Think you, my friends, that any of these men would ever have permitted the imperial State of Virginia to join in a union in which there could be no amendment to the fundamental constitution of that union? Mr. Jefferson had his views on suffrage and so did Mr. Madison and Mr. Washington, but they never stated in any place I have read that their opinions would not change in a hundred years if they were to live so long. In the great State of Virginia at the time these statesmen made the Constitution they had a qualification for property suffrage. Do you think if Thomas Jefferson were living to-day he would stand for that kind of a doctrine? In those good old days the women did not go to school like the boys; that is, they did not study mathematics; they did not learn how to weigh the stars or analyze the sun. They studied music and penmanship and dancing and the cultural things of life, but since those old days we have thrown wide the gates of higher education, and the women have entered in. This is not only a question, my friend from the South, of the right of women to vote. It is a greater question. It is the denial by a solemn resolution here of the right of men like you and me to limit the sphere of any woman or human being that God has made. [Applause.] Who are you and who am I—yes, who was Thomas Jefferson, that he should say what was the proper sphere of the mother who gave me life?

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is always chivalric. No man can vie with him in his tribute to woman. He reminds me somewhat, however, of the man at the banquet in New York City. He and his friends had prospered during the year, and they indulged in a banquet, where they ate and drank until the small hours of the morning. Before the affair was closed one of the gentlemen rose and said:

Mr. Toastmaster, as we sat here around this table spread with the good things of life, all we could eat and all we could drink, my heart went out to the poor people of New York City, the women who have

not enough clothing, the children who have not shoes to wear nor books with which to go to school, and I move you, Mr. Toastmaster, that we now rise and give three cheers for the poor.

[Prolonged laughter.]

My first recollection of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]—and he is my personal friend, as you all know—was his resolution for the observance of mother's day in this country—a mother's day—and he pays the women tribute.

He tells us how wise they are, how they can help in time of war. The gentleman ought not to forget, however, what they are worth in time of peace. The gentleman is willing to pay them all of these tributes and all of these compliments, but, unfortunately, he is like the man at the banquet in New York. When it comes to giving them a vital thing—the ballot—he is willing to stand up and give three cheers for the women of the country. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, I stand for something higher. My lot in life may not have been cast along the pleasant lines of that of the gentleman from Alabama. I loved my mother as much as he loved his, but I have not forgotten the pioneer days—how my mother, with my dear father, who has passed away, crossed the prairie, as “of old our fathers crossed the sea, to make the West, as they the East, the homestead of the free.” It was my mother who heard the coyotes howl upon the plains; it was my mother who, when the hot winds blew and the grasshoppers came, said, “No, Jim, we will not go back to Ohio; we will stick it out.” My mother always did her part not only in time of war but also in time of peace. Some gentlemen seem to think that women's sacrifice in time of war is the great reason women should have the right to vote. In time of war I dare to stand in the Halls of Congress and give you a higher reason why women should have a right to vote. It is this. Women suffer the agonies of hell in time of war, and I demand that women shall have an equal right with men to say when war shall come. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, not many hours ago I left an interesting group of Members who had been discussing this resolution, and reaching my room, unable to dismiss all I had heard, decided to ask time enough to pay this brief tribute to that portion of our population who are not yet included in the American electorate:

It was she who entered the valley and passed under the shadows to give motherhood to humanity. It was she who, through the lonely night and anxious day, waited and watched the ebb and flow of hope and despair as the childhood of the world was guarded and guided by her hand. It was she who taught us to take our first step, to answer to our many childish wants, to lisp our simple prayers. It was she who supplied us the things that would help and withheld from us the things that would hurt. It was she who commended our virtues and condemned our vices. It was her heart that warmly loved, and her hand that gently chided the wayward child throughout the years of tender teens. It was her mother love that was transfused into a nobility of character that proved a safe anchorage in the hour of temptation. It was her steady hand that led the youth step by step through the unsettled and unsettling period of adolescence, when, if ever, wise council should prevail. It was the memory of her pleading which won the pledge of devotion that stayed the impulse of passion and appetite when absent from home and homelike environment. It was her voice of admonition to which response was open when the call of country was first heard; her heroic sacrifice which buoyed up hope when the command to advance was given; her tender touch which smoothed the fevered brow when the agonies of war filled the earth with the dying and the dead; and her mother heart which suffered greatest agony when war's ravages submerged humanity in its own blood. It was she who clung to the faith that wars will cease, and a better way in the Providence of God must be found.

To her we owe the uplifting and refining influences of our race. To her we are in debt for a higher standard of life, both individual and social, as well as political. To her our churches point to a deeper faith in things spiritual. To her our schools go for the keenest devotion to the training of childhood, for a stronger manhood, and a sweeter womanhood. To her our institutions must look for a firmer grip upon the humanities. On her we must depend for a better state in our political life.

As wife and mother she will always be the queen of the home. As a power of personality she will ever be the guiding influence

in our schools. As a spiritual force she will continue to be the chief reliance of the church. As a member of society she will become more and more the determining factor in the betterments of social and industrial conditions. As a citizen she will exert an abiding and a salutary influence upon the political life of a people.

Her nature readily responds to the humanitarian calls of the times. What the masculine character refuses to heed, she, more sensitive to duty, will answer with less hesitancy and without becoming any less a woman. No man, no woman, ever lowered a standard by performing a duty.

Woman, God's noblest creation, man's better counterpart, humanity's perennial hope, the world's object most to be admired and loved! The past has not been kind to her. Much of the world's woe is recorded in her prayers and her tears; much of humanity's burdens has been borne on her frail shoulders; much of history's tragedies, which we all would fain forget, is written in the agonies of womankind throughout the world.

But a better day has dawned. She who was first to reach and last to leave the sepulcher of Him who brought a new life has generations ago come into a new inheritance step by step until to-day she marches by the side of her brother almost his equal in the rivalry of life. America, the first great Republic, the most powerful representative democracy of all history, is now about to decide whether by our organic law, the Constitution, we shall remove the last barrier which denies her equality with her brother. From whatever angle the issue may be viewed, my duty, as I see it, is clear. I will not assume a superior intelligence over her who has in a thousand ways proved her equal with her brother. I will not, simply because I have the power, withhold from her a right which she can claim with equal force that I may monopolize it. I will not deny her a privilege which I demand for myself. I will not refuse her entrance to a field of duty in which her abilities peculiarly qualify her to exert an ever-widening influence against prevalent evils and on behalf of the good of humanity. I shall, so far as in me lies, remove every barrier against her right and privilege, and shall open wide the door of opportunity to her performance of public duty by placing in her hands America's most effective weapon, the ballot, democracy's instrument of command. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RAMSEY].

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, without in any way giving expression to whether I favor or do not favor the right of women to vote, I desire at this time to give my reasons briefly why I shall vote against this proposed constitutional amendment. The reasons are, first, because each State has, under the Constitution, the right to regulate the qualifications of its electors, and I do not believe that a matter of this character should be disturbed by a constitutional provision. Many States have justly exercised the right accorded them by the Federal Constitution and have given to women the right to vote, against which I have no objection. Second, the State which I have the honor, as a Member in Congress, to represent, in 1915, by a legislative enactment, permitted the people of that State to vote upon this question. There was no organized opposition to it, but it was defeated by more than 51,000 majority. Third, I believe this to be a very inopportune time to present this matter before the people. We are engaged in a great war and I do not think the great political agitation which would necessarily result from the adoption of this resolution should be carried on throughout the various States at this time. Fourth, of all the letters and requests and demands made by the people of our State, at least by 20 to 1 the representative women of the State of New Jersey are opposed to this proposed constitutional amendment. Among the letters from people who are opposed to it are one from Mrs. Preston, who was formerly the wife of ex-President Cleveland, and Mrs. Garrett A. Hobart, widow of former Vice President Hobart.

With the permission of the House I shall insert the following letter from J. Gresham Machin, a professor in Princeton Seminary, who writes to me as follows, and whose thoughts and expressions have my approval:

PRINCETON SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J., January 8, 1918.

Hon. JOHN R. RAMSEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In urging you to vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment I am not animated chiefly by a spirit of opposition to woman suffrage in general, though personally I am not yet convinced that it is just or wise. Even if I were an ardent advocate of woman suffrage I should still be strongly opposed to the present amendment, which seems to me to run directly contrary to the manner in which important constitutional changes ought to be made. The step once taken can scarcely be reversed. Is a time like this the time to give careful consideration to such irrevocable and far-reaching changes? If the suffrage leaders had the slightest inkling of what true patriotism means, they would cease all divisive agitation until the present war is over.

Furthermore, I can not for the life of me see why the suffrage issue should not be left to the individual States. The chief argument for Federal action in many concerns of government as against State action is that often Federal action alone is effective. Such an argument might plausibly be urged, for example, in the case of the prohibition amendment. But it does not apply at all to the suffrage issue. Every State can choose the kind of suffrage it desires and make its choice effective, quite independent of the choice of any other State. And conditions in the various States differ so widely that the forcing of suffrage upon the women of some States may be an offensive piece of tyranny.

Do the people of New Jersey want woman suffrage? The vote of 1915 was a sufficient answer. Do the voters of the United States want woman suffrage? No one can doubt for a moment that a referendum on the subject in the whole country would give an overwhelming majority for the negative. Do the women of the country want woman suffrage? There is no clear evidence of it as yet, and if the present amendment is passed there never will be evidence.

In short, the present amendment represents an attempt to avoid a popular vote (which could be overwhelmingly negative) on an exceedingly momentous question. The suffrage leaders are absolutely unscrupulous in their choice of means. All fairness, all true democracy, all united effort in the present war are abandoned ruthlessly in the interest of an ill-timed and unintelligent feminism. Do such leaders really represent the women of this country? For my part I do not believe it for a moment.

Sincerely, yours,

J. GRESHAM MACHIN.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the proposition before the House is not one for amending an existing article in the Constitution of the United States but to add an entirely new article upon a subject that, to my mind, is entirely unnecessary. Under the Constitution of the United States no amendment is necessary to grant the right of suffrage to women. They have that right under the existing Constitution, the same as the men have that right. Then the only purpose of this amendment, the only purpose it can possibly serve, will be to compel or coerce some State to do that which it does not want to do. Now, there has been a time in this country when that word "coercion" did not sound very sweetly upon the ears of a large number of our people and, to my mind, the word is just as obnoxious today as it ever was to anyone. I do not believe that any State should be coerced or compelled to do that which its people do not want upon a question pertaining exclusively to its own affairs. Of course, I can not speak for all of the States, but in my State, by the way, one of the largest States of the Union, the women had the right to vote there for many years and never exercised it. Not until the adoption of what is known as the "Terrell election law" were the women of Texas excluded from the right, and yet not a woman of that State ever went to the ballot box to cast her vote. Why should Texas be compelled to force this question of suffrage upon them when perhaps a very large majority of the women of that State do not want to exercise it?

But we hear it urged as a war measure. Some gentlemen have referred to the action taken by some of the countries of Europe engaged in the war, claiming that those countries have granted the right of suffrage as a war measure, yet they do not tell us that under the laws of those countries they have no general elections until after the war closes. Now, we have no such provision as that in our law. Our elections will go on whether the war does or not. My judgment is that this amendment can not serve any purpose to assist this country in winning the war. In all probability the war will have been brought to a successful termination long before the amendment could possibly be acted upon by the several States.

Mr. Speaker, the claim that is being made for this as a measure for winning the war is far-fetched, indeed; but I desire to add that the patriotic women of this country are already doing a great and noble work, indeed, to help us win this terrible war, and if we now force this question of suffrage upon them in all the States it will be to detract from instead of adding to their efficiency in this respect. The great work they are now doing for the Red Cross and various other channels is worth a thousand times more from a war standpoint than the political agitation that will follow the adoption of this resolution. Political agitation by either men or women at this time can not be made to serve a good purpose from a war standpoint. What we most need is a country united in our purpose, and to give its entire time and attention to those matters that are necessary in placing and equipping an efficient army in the field, and to furnish the necessary supplies and munitions for ourselves and our allies.

But the claim has been made that the women elected the President, and because the President received the electoral votes of a number of the States where the women exercised the franchise the proposition is that all the States shall now be compelled by Federal command to grant the right or privilege of voting to the women of all the States. Whether this claim that the women elected the President be true or not, I can not say, nor can anyone else speak with authority upon that question. The ballots, I presume, were cast and counted secretly, as the law

provides, and that no election officer had authority to violate the secrets of the ballot box. We do know, however, that in the State of Illinois, the only State in which a ballot was taken by men and women voters separately, and in which State perhaps as many women voted as in all the other suffrage States combined, that State cast an unusually large majority for Mr. Hughes, the Republican candidate. The election records there also show that the ballots of the women voters were cast against the President in about the same proportion as were the ballots of the men voters.

Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that a large majority of the leading female politicians of the suffrage States were open and avowed supporters of Mr. Hughes, the candidate of the Republican Party, he being the only candidate at that time to express himself in favor of the amendment which we now have under consideration. I, myself, have talked with a number of intelligent women who took part in that campaign in those States, who have invariably told me that they took an active part in opposition to the reelection of the President on account of his failure to openly espouse their cause. If the women voters of those States were guided by their eloquent advocates in casting their ballots, it is very evident to my mind that the reelection of the President is due more to the men than to the women voters of the Northwest. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it has been announced in this debate by some of the leaders on the Republican side that the representatives of that great party in this House are standing almost a unit for the adoption of this measure, and that the next national platform of the Republican Party will declare in favor of woman suffrage by Federal amendment. If it is true that the women were the cause of the defeat of Mr. Hughes in the late campaign, the fact that the leaders of that party are now so anxious to reward them for the accomplishment of that end is the best evidence of the fact that their candidate was in no sense of the word the popular idol of that party.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal upon the question of State rights, and many refer to that phase of the question in an ironical manner. Much literature and propaganda has been sent out in which that question has been referred to as of trivial consequence, and those adhering to it are referred to as having lived in a past age and not up with the progress of events. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that some people do not lay as much stress upon this question of State rights as others do. I, for one, have a great reverence and admiration for the highest principle upon which this Republic was founded. Mr. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and founder of the Democratic Party, the man to whom, above all others, we are most indebted for the admirable system of government and laws that have been handed down to us, was the former advocate of this question of State rights. The whole theory of our Government rested upon it as the very name of this country, the "United States," will verify. This is also accentuated by the manner in which that document is to be amended, all amendments being required to be submitted to the several States for ratification instead of to the country at large. There is nothing clearer to my mind than that this manner provided for amending the Constitution was the highest recognition of the States in their joint and several capacities.

I will quote a few sentences from Mr. Jefferson, which I will ask my colleagues upon the Democratic side to consider. In a letter to Mr. Madison in 1786 he wrote as follows:

The politics of Europe render it indispensably necessary that, with respect to everything external, we be one nation only, firmly hooped together. Internal government is what each State should keep to itself.

In a letter to Edward Carrington in 1787 he said:

My general plan would be to make the States one as to everything connected with foreign nations, and several as to everything purely domestic.

Writing to Archibald Stuart in 1791, he made use of the following language:

I wish to preserve the line drawn by the Federal Constitution between the general and particular governments as it stands at present, and to take every prudent means of preventing either from stepping over it. . . . It is easy to foresee from the nature of things that the encroachments of the State government will tend to an excess of liberty which will correct itself, while those of the General Government will tend to monarchy, which will fortify itself from day to day instead of working its own cure, as all experience shows. I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than those attending too small a degree of it.

In 1798, writing to Peregrine Fitzhugh, he complained, even in that day, that too little respect was given to the rights of the several States. In this letter he used the following language:

I do not think it for the interest of the General Government itself, and still less for the Union at large, that the State governments should be so little respected as they have been. However, I dare say that in time all these, as well as their central government, like the planets revolving around their common sun, acted and acting upon according to

their respective weights and distances, will produce that beautiful equilibrium on which our Constitution is founded and which I believe it will exhibit to the world in a degree of perfection, unexampled, but in the planetary system itself.

It seems that Mr. Jefferson never abandoned the doctrine of State rights, but even as late as the year 1811, in writing to Mr. Tracy, he still adhered to his former views. He said:

But the true barriers of our liberty in this country are our State governments; and the wisest conservative power ever contrived by man is that of which our Revolution and present government found us possessed. Seventeen distinct States, amalgamated into one as to their foreign concerns, but single and independent as to their internal administration, regularly organized, with a legislature and governor, resting on the choice of the people, and enlightened by a free press, can never be so fascinated by the arts of one man as to submit voluntarily to his usurpation.

In the State which I have the honor in part to represent we have a constitutional provision for the payment of a poll tax of \$1.75 as a prerequisite to voting. The adoption of this amendment would compel us in Texas to require the payment of this tax by each woman in the State, whether she wanted to exercise the right of franchise or not. The tax would be assessed against her upon the tax roll of each county, and default in payment would be equivalent to a judgment against her property. Not only that, but many of the counties of that great State have adopted special road laws requiring those who are defaulters in the payment of poll taxes to satisfy the same by hard labor upon the public roads in the same manner as misdemeanor convicts are required to labor. Under this amendment we could not be permitted to make a distinction in this respect as to the female voters. They would, of course, be compelled to stand in the same category of the male voters, and the people of that State would be compelled, by the actions of this Congress and by the legislatures of other States, to heap these indignities upon the good women of that State until such time as they could revise and amend their constitution and laws.

In addition to this democratic question of the right of the States to settle these issues for themselves, I will call attention to the fact that the platform upon which every Democratic Member of this body was elected contained the following declaration:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

Let every Member of this body who claims to be a Democrat and who was elected upon that platform now cast his vote for this amendment, which prescribes the qualifications for a voter in the election of all State and county officers in his State, not even excepting the constable of Hog Wallow precinct, reconcile his action with the expressed instructions of his party if he can do so. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, very much to my regret there seemed in the early part of this debate to be an inclination to turn the consideration of this most important question into a matter of partisan advantage, for I am of those who believe that amendments to the Federal Constitution should be considered in a sense of the highest dignity and by the best thought of the body before which such proposed articles of amendment are pending.

I do not believe that the great foundation wall of the Constitution upon which is builded the superstructure of laws affecting rights of collected States in a united nation should lightly be changed by amendment.

Illustrative of my argument, as I shall seek to develop it, I wish to say in my home State of Ohio, as an elector of that State, I have twice voted to extend suffrage to the women of that State.

To me it has always seemed that the ideal American electorate should be composed of the intelligent men and women of the country.

This may be far away in actual consummation, but I believe the continuance of this Republic depends upon the intelligence of the people within its boundaries.

I would go so far as to say that those coming into our country should successfully pass an intelligence test, and I distinguish between "education" and "intelligence" and mean the power to reason and understand that which is best for American institutions.

I do not favor the general possession of property qualification but insist upon the qualification of ability to understand the tenets of American citizenship.

Then, too, I would have the law say to native born and foreign born alike that the privilege of suffrage for either man or woman

should always be limited to those who are loyal to the United States of America and who have its interests at heart. [Applause.]

In the struggle for this ideal American electorate one ever true and loyal to this Government and capable of understanding and reasoning that which is best in principle and in policy, we must realize that we face long and continuous processes of education, training, and experience in the determination of the best selectives.

It is because I believe that an orderly process at present obtains under the Constitution for the procuring of the best electorate within the States that I contend this resolution proposing an additional article of amendment to the Constitution should not be adopted.

The real meaning and effect of the passage of this resolution and its subsequent ratification by the required number of State legislatures will be to prevent the States of this Nation from amending in this respect their own constitutions.

This is a most radical and elementary departure from the principles of that Constitution under whose benign protection the United States has achieved the highest place among all the nations of the world.

Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides:

And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article X of Articles, in addition to and amendments of the Constitution of the United States, provides:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

In all the debates upon the Constitution there never was any contention that the Federal Government, in which was centralized the power of governing all the States, should regulate voting within the States.

To do this, it seems to me, takes from the States an essential element of their very being and removes one of the very strongest reasons for statehood.

The method prescribed by the above constitutional limitations have been followed in all the States of the United States which up to this time have granted the extension of suffrage to women and has likewise been pursued in those instances where such extension of suffrage has been refused; and the recognition of the right of individual States to fix the qualifications of the electors within State boundaries as conceded by the framers of the Constitution has remained unchallenged to this day, save as to the statutory exception concerning aliens and the fifteenth amendment.

As to the wisdom of granting suffrage to women or continuing to withhold it from them, many and various reasons are given, which I do not think here necessary to enumerate or analyze, for, as I have said, I favor it under unquestioned present power of procedure.

During the excitement naturally incident to a state of war some have proposed the granting of suffrage to women as a "reward."

We, as a legislative body, seeking to protect and continue the national life at this time, pass laws to make our power more terrible that the great war in which we are engaged may be brought to a successful and early conclusion, but this proposed article of amendment is a measure for times of peace—not war.

There is no question but that the women of this country rank as high in patriotism as its men, and I prefer to think that the splendid service of the American women in this war emergency, by which they from every part of this broad land are contributing their labor and time to the manufacture of necessities in health and in illness for those of our men who at home or on foreign field fight for a continuation of that great democracy which has given its protection under the law to American men, women, and children is done in a fine realization of their patriotic duty.

That American homes and American women may forever remain free and continue under the rule of a representative democracy American men are preparing even for the most complete sacrifice and American women are sustaining them by a spirit splendid to see.

From the time Betsy Ross sewed the stars upon our first flag until this very present moment our women have done this work, and have nobly done it, and they are doing it now, I am sure, without hope of "reward," proud only that they are American citizens and assisting their country as they best can.

Nor do I think that after the war women will take the place of men, for in the reconstruction of commercial and industrial affairs it will be soon made manifest that while a woman can in emergency do a certain work, as a regular thing she should not

have it to do, and certain other work she finds it always physically impossible to do.

There is much that she has done and will continue to do even better than man, and in the homes, in the schools and colleges, in the arts, the professions, mercantile life, and even some of the very light industries, she has worked with excellent result.

We hope that conditions now abnormal may be soon made normal, and we know the readjustment must inevitably be worked out wisely and sanely and with a recognized regard for the qualifications of both women and men for particular work.

That qualification of electors reserved for the wisdom of the States "has been left to the good people of each Commonwealth to enlarge the class of voters from time to time as the ideas of popular sovereignty obtained more force."

The very vital thing which leads me to vote against this proposed amendment and to have voted against an amendment passed by Congress denominated the national prohibition amendment is that to do otherwise would be to destroy the very essential elements for the creation and maintenance of States, to wit, the selection of qualifications of electors and the right of local self-government, and to set up over these a centralized government so wide and so diverse that it must in the end break again into parts of its own weight, and in the meantime fail to carry out good government, for "it is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers but by their distribution that good government is effected." [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Norton].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the man who to-day votes against this resolution is a man who dwells in the past. He is a man who is asleep to the great events that are taking place in the world to-day. He is a man who slumbers in an age of narrow selfishness and conservatism. He is a man who is inoculated with an indefensible perversity against all progress and advancement. He is a man who is insensible to the great needs of humanity in this hour of civilization's greatest trial and greatest danger. In the debate on this resolution that has been had to-day not a single argument that will long last or bear the scrutiny of time has been made in opposition to the passage of this resolution. The chief arguments that have been made against the adoption of this resolution have been based upon opinions expressed by distinguished scholars and statesmen now living and by others who long since have passed to the great beyond, who were either entirely opposed to woman suffrage or who were opposed to the adoption of national woman suffrage through an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Almost in every case where the opinions of distinguished men now living have been quoted on the subject these men hold different opinions to-day and are in favor of woman suffrage and of its adoption by all the States through an amendment to the Federal Constitution. I, as one who is ineffably proud of the great men who have emblazoned the history of our glorious country by their splendid deeds and noble characters, have too high regard and too much respect for the memory of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and James Madison to entertain for a moment any doubt but that if these men were living to-day they would give loyal, generous, and full-hearted support to this resolution. The argument contained in the minority report from the Committee on Woman Suffrage against the adoption of this resolution is based mainly upon quotations from President Wilson. The conclusion reached by this report is, because President Wilson during the last national campaign and in other years gone by repeatedly in his writing and in his public addresses declared himself opposed to this method of adopting national woman suffrage, by means of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, this resolution, forsooth, should not be adopted. But, as has been evidenced in reference to other important civic questions, as to this the opinions of President Wilson are neither infallible nor immutable.

I do not believe that the President should be so severely arraigned and criticized as he has been to-day for having yesterday afternoon by means of his self-arranged newspaper publicity, gotten aboard the band wagon of national woman suffrage by amendment to the Federal Constitution, which, so evident to him at that time, was being carried on to certain victory by an overwhelming majority of Republican votes. He should not be so roundly condemned if he suddenly decided that he did not wish to be left far behind with the minority on this great question. He should not be censured because he may have a new idea once in a while.

While we are spreading democracy throughout the nations across the seas let us spread more of it among our own good people at home. Irrespective of what their condition may have

been in years gone by, to-day the women of this Nation possess in equal measure with the men of the Nation all the elements of education, intelligence, and character which go to make up good citizenship. Let us, then, in the spirit of true democracy, in the spirit of justice and equality, pass this resolution, so that the quickest means may be provided to give to the women of this Nation the full right of suffrage, which has so long been unfairly and unjustly denied to them. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 20 minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in the introduction to my remarks I intend to read what everybody is to-day trying to forget, and following that I shall ask that the Clerk read my letter to the Republican city committee in St. Louis, in which they ask that I vote for this amendment. I am going to read the plank from the Republican platform of 1916, and there has not been a man on the Republican side to-day who has denied that that plank was against this proposition. There will not be a man to go back to his constituents, who violates this pledge, but what must give as an explanation political expediency.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Not now.

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in the government of the people, by the people, and for the people as a measure of justice to one-half of the adult people of the country, favors the extension of suffrage to women—

I happen to remember that when the Senator from Massachusetts read that plank at the Republican convention he stopped right there, and there was great applause from the suffragists. When they had finished the applause the Senator finished the plank—

but recognizing the right of each State—

Not of the States, but of each State—to settle this question for itself.

There was no further applause from the Federal suffragists. The Republicans did what the Democrats failed to do. The Republicans specified that it as a party recognized the right of each State—and that means New York and Ohio and Michigan and individual units, and not the States collectively—of each unit, including every last State of this Union. No man can now or hereafter repudiate that plank in the platform and go to the people of his country and say that he kept the faith of that campaign. I now ask that my letter to the Republican city committee be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1917.

Mr. JOHN SCHMOLL,
Chairman Republican Central Committee,
St. Louis, Mo.

MY DEAR MR. SCHMOLL: The petition of the Republican city central committee, in which Representatives and Senators of Missouri are requested to vote for a Federal suffrage amendment resolution, which is now before Congress, has come to me, bearing your signature as chairman of the Republican city central committee.

In reply I must say that I feel in honor bound to vote against the resolution. I deem myself so bound because of the following facts:

1. In the campaign of 1914, both prior to the primaries and prior to the election, I stated publicly that I would consider the vote of the tenth district on the suffrage question as instructions as to how I should vote should the question come up in Congress. The tenth district went overwhelmingly against woman suffrage. As I remember, there was but one ward in the city and two precincts in St. Louis County that indorsed woman suffrage.

2. The national Republican platform of 1916, upon which I was elected, was for leaving the question of woman suffrage to the individual States. I again stated my position and said that I stood squarely on the national platform on that question.

3. I believe that there is no more vicious practice than that of legislative candidates violating their public pledges, unless some emergency may arise which will make it apparent to every fair-minded man that an immediate change of front is justified. I do not believe such an emergency now exists in this particular instance. As I have said repeatedly, I am against all domestic agitators while we are at war with a foreign foe.

Should, at a coming election, the tenth district vote favorably to woman suffrage, I would consider that as an instruction for me to so vote here, and I would so vote. But, in casting that vote, I would state that it was against my best judgment as to the welfare of the women of our country and of the Government, and that I voted thus solely because of the majority vote in the tenth district.

I trust this makes my position absolutely clear. I believe I express the feelings and desires of an overwhelming majority of the quiet home women of my district when I voice my protest against dragging them into politics. It is true, they are not as insistent as are the proponents of suffrage, nevertheless, I believe the wishes of these women are as genuine and are as worthy of consideration as are those of their suffragette sisters.

Sincerely,

JACOB E. MEEKER.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested, and I will not use any stronger term, to-day, when men

have stood on the floor of this House and talked about what the women of this country are doing in this war, and saying that they should be given the ballot because they are doing it. I have yet to hear one man on this floor say one word voicing the protests of the women who, instead of standing in front of the White House with banners have been making sweaters for the boys and who do not want this suffrage. It seems that the woman with the hatchet is the one that attracts attention to-day, while the woman with the needle is forgotten in this discussion.

I want to say to my friend from Missouri who was talking some time ago about his mother, and his tribute was a beautiful tribute, that I happen to have a mother, as most of us have, and incidentally I think we all have fathers, although a father does not count for much any more. My mother has forgotten more political history than he ever knew, and she knows more about the American Government and American political economy than he has ever shown symptoms of knowing, and for the good of mankind as well as the country she is opposed to women getting into politics.

This talk that you Members are putting up here about the women of the United States wanting suffrage is not a fact. Take your own State of New York when on the 8th of January a telegram came from your own State capital at Albany as follows:

[Telegram from Albany, N. Y., Jan. 8, 1917.]

MISS MINNIE BRONSON, Secretary,
Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred antis met at Hotel Ten Eyck this afternoon, Miss Henrietta Church presiding. Were addressed by Mrs. Henry Preston White. Telegrams were read from 19 State auxiliaries indorsing resubmission. Resolutions unanimously adopted by the Albany branch and delegates for resubmission. The appointment of various committees—legislative and publicity and organization—with headquarters at Albany. The New York Legislature does not meet until Wednesday evening.

HENRIETTA CHURCH.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. No; I will not yield. I want you to think of another thing when you talk about the political advantage of women voting. There were two candidates for the Presidency last year, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. Hughes, favored a Federal suffrage amendment; and yet every suffrage State voted against it. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman who is now in the White House passed out the word that he kept us out of war, and if he had depended on the suffrage States Germany would be here now. It was a pacifist vote.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. I do not yield. That is trickery in argument. If there was ever a chance given for the women to stand by the man who was for Federal suffrage, it was in the Federal suffrage States last year on the Hughes-Wilson vote, and the man who came out for Federal suffrage was beaten unmercifully in the State of California to the tune of three hundred and so many thousand that we never could count it—we just gave it up. Now, you men come up and tell me that the women of this country want this. When you talk of mothers, are the quiet mothers of this country who to-day, instead of saying if we do not get suffrage, we will not help win the war, but who are knitting at home for the Red Cross, and sending their work to the boys—are they not mothers just the same as these women in the parade? Are they to be forgotten or ignored?

I ask you, what agitation, forgetful of reason, in the last seven months has been carried on in this country? The spectacle in front of the White House during these months has been a disgrace to the Nation, but it has met the applause of a large part of the suffragists. During all this time those 61 women were breaking into jail, where they got common treatment with others, and then did not want equality of treatment. They came out and have been lionized, while those hundreds of thousands of women who, when the men on the floor of this House voted for war, were willing to believe in the virile judgment of the men who so voted, and who since that hour have with their toil and their sorrow stood behind the boys that are to the front, seem to have been forgotten.

Instead of parading the streets of the Capital, insulting the Executive when he had his guests here from abroad, they have kept on with their work. Gentlemen, let me give you just one thought in closing. There is an old character in Bible history into whose charge one day was given a prisoner of war. After awhile his general came to him and found the prisoner gone. When he asked the man who had lost the prisoner why he was gone, the man replied: "While I was busy hither and thither, lo, he was gone." This Congress has spent more time, and this Congress has been bothered more since the war was declared by the nagging, by the agitation of domestic questions that will not whip the Kaiser in a million years, than we have

in settling our minds to the one gigantic problem of holding this Nation together until victory is ours. Whatever it may be that tends to draw the attention of the American people from this herculean task, a task the like of which this Nation has never before undertaken, a task that will call for the resources of all the money and all the blood and life of the whole Nation. Here we are, still pottering around over these questions that have nothing to do with this war. While we are here now, talking these things, the boys at the front in France are not botnering their heads nor wondering what we will do on prohibition or woman suffrage, or any other domestic problem. They say, "Won't you come on and hustle the game up for us." The conduct of this campaign, as you well know, as in every other domestic question, means the taking of money and time and strength and thought and energy away from our great task.

If ever there was a time when this Nation should say with all of its soul and all of its being, "This one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind, pressing forward to the prize of the high calling," it is now. This Nation in this hour of trial should lay aside and repudiate every domestic question that tends to divide and distract the attention of the people here at home. [Applause.] You talk to me about England granting suffrage. England is close enough to the battle field to say, "After the war, but not now." You quote the King of Belgium, and the King of Belgium says, "After the war, but not now." You quote all these stories of France, but France says, "After the war, but not now." Our suffragettes in this country are the only group anywhere who say, "We first; the war next." The American Government as yet is practically playing at this war program. Every relative I have who is old enough and physically fit is in uniform somewhere between here and France, and the only boy that I have will soon be gone if the war lasts. And yet we men to-day on the floor of this House, for the second time since war has been declared, are getting ready to throw a bone of contention amongst the people of our own country, to disturb and to distract their thoughts and energy. We hear the call of the Red Cross and of all organizations for money with which to win this war. We ought to be willing to answer that call. Shame on the men on the floor of this House who voted for this war and then found time to take weeks of vacations and go fishing, forgetting the work we might have done while the boys are over yonder. We are talking to-day and working in terms of human blood, and it is the blood of the sons of America. Whatever may come out of this vote I pray to the God of all nations that when it does come it will be forgotten in an hour afterwards, and that we will devote our undivided attention to taking care of the lives of the boys who are at the front. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] has just made a fervid plea to you to defeat this amendment because its submission will interfere with the winning of the war. The President of the United States, charged with the prosecution of the war, sends you word to pass the amendment in order to aid in winning the war. [Applause.] It is for the membership of this House to decide now whether, on the important question of winning the war, they will follow the leadership of Mr. MEEKER, of St. Louis, or Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. [Applause.] For my part, I am willing to take it for granted that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of this country knows what he is about.

The gentleman has intimated that the women who are here to-day pleading for justice, pleading for democracy here at home, have fallen short in the performance of their patriotic duties. I would ask you where did Newton Baker, Secretary of War and president of the Council of National Defense, turn for assistance when he needed woman's help? Did he turn to the organization known as the Antis? No, my friends; he went to the National Woman Suffrage Association. [Applause.] And to-day at the head of the woman's branch of the Council of National Defense, placed there by your Secretary of War, is Anna Howard Shaw, the honored leader of this movement. [Applause.]

And when your Secretary of the Treasury desired to float the great issue of liberty bonds, where did he turn in order to secure the assistance of the women of this country? Did he go to those who were petitioning Congress to deny women the right to vote because they did not want to vote themselves? Not at all, my friends. He turned to Carrie Chapman Catt; turned to the women who lead the National Woman Suffrage Association.

And did these women fail to respond? Why, my friends, we have the testimony of the Secretary of War himself; we have the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury himself—that

not only did they respond but that they were in large measure responsible for the success of those great enterprises. My friends, upon this issue I prefer to follow the leadership and to accept the advice of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Treasury rather than follow the leadership of the gentleman from St. Louis. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I favor woman suffrage because I believe in democracy—the old-fashioned kind of democracy—the kind the fathers of the Republic wrote into the Declaration of Independence when they gave mankind the "American idea," that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; the kind for which ten million men are fighting, freezing, and dying in the trenches, from the North Sea to the Adriatic; the kind for which we are pouring out our treasure and for which we are preparing to shed the best blood of America.

Surely, my friends, if we are willing to make these supreme sacrifices in order that Englishmen and Frenchmen, Germans and Austrians, Russians and Serbians may have democracy we will not deprive millions of our own citizens of the same precious gift.

I hold that every human being, unless a convict or an imbecile, has an inherent, God-given right to a voice in his or her government.

Colorado has had equal suffrage for a quarter of a century and our women are not Amazons and our men are not molly-coddles.

They told us women would not vote, but our official records show that women vote in about the same proportion as men.

They told us the women of the underworld would go to the polls while the wives and mothers remained at home. Experience has proven that the reverse is true. The percentage of women voting in the downtown precincts of the large cities in suffrage States is very much smaller than in the residential sections.

They told us that the American polling booth was too vile a place for a respectable woman to enter. The women of the suffrage States replied by taking the polling booths out of the back rooms of saloons and placing them in schoolhouses and churches.

They told us that equal suffrage would disrupt the home, but the court records of Colorado show that in 24 years not one divorce has been granted because of political differences.

They told us that under equal suffrage the women would combine and take all the offices away from the men, thus compelling many worthy patriots to earn an honest living. Again experience has confounded the prophets. Many women have held high office in suffrage States, but the men continue to hold down 80 per cent of the jobs. And here is an interesting fact: Occasionally—only occasionally—we have been compelled to arraign a male official at the bar of justice charged with criminal misconduct, but no female officeholder has ever been investigated by a grand jury.

Of course, the people of the suffrage States are not unanimous in their support of woman suffrage. There is opposition. Ask the saloon keeper who put him out of business and he will answer, with a curse, "The women."

Ask the gambler who stopped the roulette wheel and closed the faro bank and he will tell you, "The women."

Ask the political boss why his power is disappearing and he will tell you, "Those confounded women insist on scratching their ballots."

Equal suffrage by Federal amendment may be delayed, but it can not be defeated.

In the next presidential campaign both great political parties will be compelled to indorse the proposition.

No Republican can be elected without the vote of the States where women are enfranchised. No Democrat can be defeated if he can secure those votes.

Fortunately for us the Republicans wobbled on this issue in the last campaign. If they had indorsed the Federal amendment, Charles E. Hughes might have succeeded Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States.

They will not repeat the blunder, and if the Democratic Party is to continue to rule this country it must display a willingness and capacity to meet this issue.

The greatest living Missourian, CHAMP CLARK, of Bowling Green, once said: "Two things are coming as surely as death and taxes: One is prohibition and the other is woman suffrage."

A few weeks ago Congress submitted the prohibition amendment. Now let us fulfill the remainder of the prophecy by casting a two-thirds vote for the suffrage amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that my duty as a Massachusetts Congressman calls upon me for something more than merely recording my vote on the referendum that will place the woman-suffrage amendment to our Constitution before the legislature of my State. Merely to vote in favor of referring this question to the Massachusetts Legislature might leave a doubt as to my views on the merits of the question itself, and I now address myself to the fundamental rights, privileges, and duties of the women of America, as I see them reflected in the mirror of Massachusetts history.

To my mind woman suffrage—equal rights under the law—is sound Massachusetts doctrine. It was in Worcester, Mass., over a half century ago that the first woman suffrage convention in the world was held. The call for that convention was signed by Lucy Stone, Lucretia Mott, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Ralph Waldo Emerson—an array of intellectuals whose thoughts are now spread upon the pages of the world's history. It was at that convention that Phillips, at the zenith of his powers in epigrammatic statement, speaking on democracy said: "The granting of suffrage to women is the corner stone."

Since then we have seen the great progress of the movement, State after State, nation after nation coming into line. Always some opposition to meet, but never a step backward. Woman suffrage has always held its ground. It has never been on the defensive. The efforts of the antisuffrage forces have failed to stop the movement. The suffrage bugle has never sounded retreat.

Mr. Speaker, while it is true that the great States of the West have taken the lead in granting equal suffrage to their women citizens, I maintain that the inspiration came from the State where the first blows for liberty were struck. When Dr. Anna Howard Shaw made her masterly argument before the Suffrage Committee a few days ago she was voicing the views of a Massachusetts coeducationalist. Her collegiate degree, her degree in medicine and in theology, were granted by Massachusetts institutions. Her first pastorate as America's first woman preacher was in a little town on Cape Cod. She has preached Massachusetts doctrine all over the world. What question is too big for Dr. Shaw to discuss or to vote upon?

When Julia Ward Howe, of Boston, penned the Battle Hymn of the Republic, that sent its patriotic thrill through the Nation in an hour of national stress, she was committed to the side of equal suffrage. Who to-day would dare question the right of Julia Ward Howe to vote on any question involving the welfare of our people?

Twenty-five years ago, when I was a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, a sweet-faced little woman appeared before legislative committees on many occasions. That woman was Lucy Stone Blackwell, known throughout the English-speaking world as "the guiding star of the woman-suffrage movement." Although her life was given over to suffrage, her voice was heard on any and all matters affecting child labor, women in factories, and on educational, humane, progressive legislation of all kinds. I have yet to recall a measure which she advocated or indorsed that has not since been written into the statute laws of my State except that of full suffrage to women.

The life of Lucy Stone was as inspired as that of Joan of Arc. Born in the little farming town of West Brookfield, she yearned for an education, and while quite young put the matter before her father. Faced with the problem of educating his sons, the father was compelled to turn down her appeal. "Women don't need an education," was the way he expressed it, "and boys do need one." I can't afford to do anything beyond the district school for you." But the young girl persisted and finally prevailed upon her father to let her go to college if she earned the money herself.

"I would be glad to have you go to college, Lucy, on your own money, but there isn't a college that will take women." "Oh, yes, there is," answered the young girl. "Out in Oberlin, Ohio, they allow women to get a degree."

It was the only college in America at that time that would accept women for degrees. So Lucy Stone taught school and made shoes by hand and picked berries for preserving and saved her money to go away out to a little Ohio college for the education that her brilliant mind craved. She did not go there on the Twentieth Century Limited, seated in a parlor car, with a limousine to meet her at the station. Oh, no! The young woman of whom I am speaking went there in a slow steamer, over the Great Lakes, and when she was told that a stateroom would cost her a dollar she decided to sleep on deck to save the money. Think of it—one of the world's greatest teachers sleeping under the stars to save a dollar in order to get the education that she later gave so freely to the causes

which she loved. No "gold-coast" dormitory for Lucy Stone! Only the cheapest room at Oberlin was hers. And there she spent four years—washing clothes, mending dresses, tutoring—doing anything that an honest young girl could do in order that she might pay the bills for her education.

When graduation day drew near and the coveted degree was in sight, she wrote a brilliant essay on civil government and submitted it to the faculty. It was highly commended, but the president explained that while Oberlin granted degrees to women they "could not allow them to speak in public, and Lucy Stone must allow some member of the faculty to read her essay at the graduation exercises." But the Lucy Stone of four years ago had changed. She was going ahead. Looking the president of Oberlin proudly in the eye, she said, "I am from Massachusetts, the home of liberty. If I can not read my essay in public, then nobody will read it for me." And she graduated with her essay unread.

The world moves and with it the suffrage movement. Years later, when Oberlin College had reached its fiftieth anniversary and the faculty wanted to observe, in a fitting way, the first half century of Oberlin's achievements, they met and asked each other, "Who of all our graduates will we select to deliver the leading address on this anniversary?" And the answer came, "Why, there is only one choice, Lucy Stone is our greatest graduate. She stands up like a mountain peak among the public speakers of America."

So Lucy Stone, of Massachusetts, went out to Oberlin, where once they would not let her speak because it was not the right thing for women to speak in public, and delivered the "address of the day" to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of her alma mater.

And in this brief sketch of the life of Lucy Stone we can trace the onward progress of the equal suffrage movement. Women have advanced themselves. Their appeal for recognition has been won along the lines of greatest resistance. They have earned their place.

In my district in Massachusetts lives Alice Stone Blackwell, the daughter of Lucy Stone. Like her illustrious mother, she has devoted her entire lifetime to the cause of suffrage, and in answer to the specious argument advanced by the opponents of woman suffrage that women are not able to comprehend the questions that voters must face I offer in Alice Stone Blackwell one of the most brilliant writers on governmental affairs that this country has ever produced.

I am in favor of full suffrage for the women of my State because it is only fair to suppose that Massachusetts women are as much entitled to vote on all matters as are the women of New York State, which is just across the line from Massachusetts. I favor the Federal amendment because it equalizes the voting privilege of women and handles this great democratic question better than if it were left to each State to decide. The idea of a woman in a suffrage State moving into a nonsuffrage State and being disfranchised is settled only by Federal amendment.

A great Persian philosopher once said, "Dogs bark, but the caravan moves on." I think it is time to stop the barking of the antisuffrage dogs in this country, once and for all. Democracy can not live, half free and half female. [Applause.] Let the autocracy of sex pass into the discards along with the autocracy of divine right of kings that is now making its last stand before the forces of true democracy in the trenches "over there" in France. [Long-continued applause.]

At this point Mr. MANN entered the Hall and was greeted with applause.

The SPEAKER. I am certain we are all glad to have Brother MANN back with us. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall use the 30 seconds granted to me to say, as the Representative of the original woman suffrage State, the Representative of the State in which women have voted for 49 years, the Commonwealth of Wyoming, that this is a great and a glorious day, the day that shall see the adoption of the resolution for the submission of a Federal woman suffrage amendment. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a good deal of time has been taken in determining whether or not suffrage is a right or a privilege. From my own standpoint I look upon it more as an obligation and a duty than as either a right or a privilege. It is more a question of expediency, in my judgment, than it is a question of right.

We say to the lad of less than 21 years of age, "You are not entitled to vote, because it is unsafe from the standpoint of the

Government that one of immature mind should have a voice in the affairs of State." We say to one of infirm mind, "It is unwise to permit you to participate in governmental affairs." It is always determined from the viewpoint of the Government and not from the desire or the viewpoint of the individual. I have long, long since reached the conclusion that woman had reached that high mental estate which made it an imperative duty on the part of the Republic to give her the opportunity of making her contribution to the Nation by giving her the right of suffrage. [Applause.]

The statement has been made on the floor here that she should not be given this right because she can not bear arms. When did a physical essential become a determining qualification for mental activity? Some of the greatest statesmen in this Nation, some of the most useful men in public life to-day, are men who by reason of physical misfortune can not be soldiers, and yet no one would advocate that the right of suffrage be taken from such individual.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] says that she is a pacifist, that she was responsible for the election of the President, inspired as she was by the desire to keep out of war. My friends, when did the love of peace and the abhorrence of war become a crime? [Applause.]

If you are going to deprive one of the right of voting because he loves peace, you would deprive the President of the United States of that right, who for three years with infinite patience endured humiliation and injury in the effort to preserve the peace of 100,000,000 people. You would deprive a majority of the electorate of the United States, for they, by their vote, gave notice that they desired a continuation of peace. Such a test should not be made, as one's opinion as to a governmental policy can not determine one's right to vote. But it would be an emotional government if she participated, says the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]—a pacifist government—for woman is opposed to war. Gentlemen of the House, based on my own observation, let me give you this advice: Never determine one's courage by his eagerness to get into a fight. [Applause.] A safer test is to wait and see how he fights after he gets in. Judged by that qualification, what is the attitude of the ladies of America to-day? The mistresses of a million homes in the United States are conserving food to help the country. Nurses are on the front in the hospitals and in the cantonments. I have noticed on the boats, on the railway trains, on the street cars, on the streets, in the crowded galleries of this Chamber this afternoon, the loving, "praying hands" of American womanhood knitting garments to protect the soldiers. [Applause.] That is how they are fighting, now we are in.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL].

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my support to the cause of woman suffrage to-day. In two campaigns a crowd of suffragettes—the same crowd that have been picketing the White House—have tried to defeat me, and in both campaigns the women voters have rallied to my support. I mention this because those who have picketed the White House not only do not represent the women voters of the great West but are absolutely unrepresentative of voting women. I have just returned from the West; and I speak with the authority of the women of my district when I say that they unreservedly condemn these pickets in their actions. But the fact that a few misguided women have conducted themselves as they have must not be allowed to hinder or delay the passage of this amendment.

The women of America should be allowed to vote as a matter of plain justice. If a woman does not desire to vote, she will not be compelled to vote. But, if a woman does desire to vote, why should she not be permitted to do so? The people are made up of men and women. All of them have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If a woman violates the law, what man goes to jail for her or pays her fine? If she owns property, who pays her taxes? If she is sued and judgment is secured against her, who pays the judgment? A woman in this country can buy or sell, sue or be sued, own and convey property—in fact, she can do practically everything that a man can do except vote.

Why can not women vote? Simply because they are the one great part of the population to whom the franchise has not yet been granted. The history of the extension of the right to vote among free peoples is interesting and suggestive. Originally only the king could vote. Later a few of his lords were given the power to vote. A little later the clergy secured that right. Then the landowners were granted the franchise. Here in the United States we swept away the property qualification

and established manhood suffrage. Now we propose to extend this right to women. [Applause.]

All of this talk that suffrage will destroy the home has been answered a million times by the home-loving women who live in the West, where women exercise that right already. Gentlemen need not fear that women will neglect or destroy the home because women created the home. The home does not depend upon government but is the foundation of government.

The progress of mankind is measured by the progress of the women. In the state of savagery it was woman who provided for and protected her young while her cave-dwelling consort roamed the forest or engaged in battle. I have read that woman built the first human habitation and discovered how to start a fire. It was woman who first learned to prepare skins of animals for protection from the elements, and tamed and domesticated the dog and horse and cow. She was a servant and a slave and did these things because of the human instinct to lessen her labor and better the condition of herself and her children.

The distinctive feature of our time is the emancipation and individualism of woman. To-day she is the peer of man, not only in intelligence but in privileges and powers as well. With these privileges and powers are coming a new realization of the kind of dangers that beset herself, her husband, her home, and her children. She is learning that her assailants are no longer in the open, but that they lurk and hide in the results and products of social injustice and industrial greed. She can see that they exist because of laws and the absence of laws. She has found from bitter experience that sickness and death are concealed in impure food which is bought for pure, and in insanitary tenement houses of our great cities in which so many are compelled to live. In other words, she is coming to know that if she is to protect herself and the race she has borne from the assailants that beset and destroy she must be able to control the reservoir in which the water of life is collected as well as the faucet from which it is drawn. That is why all over this broad land of ours there is going up an irresistible demand for woman suffrage.

This theory that the man provides and the woman is sheltered is a living lie, as millions upon millions of women wage earners are proving every day. Sometimes a man provides and sometimes he does not. Sometimes it is the woman who must provide, not only for herself but for her children also. Never was that so true as it is to-day with America at war and millions of men being sent to the battle fronts and millions more to go. Let us remember that "Hunger knows no sex, want knows no sex, necessity knows no sex, law knows no sex, property knows no sex; only the ballot box knows sex."

But the ballot box once knew rank. It once knew income and money and title. The onward march of democracy has swept away all these paraphernalia of privilege and the disability of sex now must go. In the years to come the present reasons advanced against woman suffrage will seem as reactionary and as senseless as the reasons once advanced against the extension of manhood suffrage now seem. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. To see what has become of my time.

The SPEAKER. It has gone.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How did the gentleman get it? I have been trying to get recognition. I had three minutes left.

The SPEAKER. I know the gentleman would have three minutes left if it was not for the clock.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand.

Mr. RAKER. There are 19 minutes that I have not used.

The SPEAKER. Now, what does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] want?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I just wanted my time. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Of course, anybody who has ever observed things very closely here knows that in one of these long debates some time is lost. It is utterly impossible to stop a gentleman who is in the middle of a sentence. When he is rapped down he goes on and finishes the sentence. This rule provides that the debate goes on until 5 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this resolution for several reasons, all of which I can not in the short time at my disposal enumerate. Many Members have hesitated upon this question because of the fear that it interfered with the rights of the States to fix the qualifications of voters. However,

It occurs to me that this is a confusion resulting from a misinterpretation of the amendment itself.

It does not disturb any qualifications already or hereafter fixed by the States except as to the matter of sex. All educational, property, or other qualifications as fixed by the States will remain as they are now, unless changed by the States themselves. This amendment simply says to the States or to the Federal Government, "You may not deny to a woman the right to vote simply because she is a woman."

There is no question of the right of the Federal Government to deal with the question of suffrage. The framers of the Constitution dealt with it in framing that instrument, afterwards adopted by the States. It so happens that they dealt with it by adopting those qualifications which were fixed by the States. But they might have dealt with it by fixing any other standard which they thought wise. The fact that they dealt with it in that way makes certain their power to have dealt with it in any other way, and makes certain the power and right of the National Government to deal with it in this way by submitting this amendment to the States to determine whether the people still desire the States to have exclusive jurisdiction in this matter. There can be no question that the people have the right to change their Constitution if they desire. The only chance they have at it is by the submission of amendments by Congress. I believe the States have a right to pass upon this amendment, and thus believing, I shall vote to submit it to them. [Applause.]

Already in 18 States women have the right to vote for Members of Congress and for President of the United States. These are in a sense national offices, because they deal with national conditions and policies. It seems to me an anomaly in political science and economy that the women of 18 States may have a voice in the election of a President of all the people of the Nation, and therefore may determine who he shall be, without the women in the other 30 States having any voice whatever in the selection of the Chief Executive of the land. If we could, for illustration, imagine the disqualification of all the men in the country for any reason we would have a situation where the voters of 18 States would choose the Government for themselves and the other 30, without giving the latter or any portion of them any voice in the result. Therefore, considering the present situation in all the States, we must admit that the women in 18 of them have the balance of power and may say who shall govern all the men and all the women in all the States. This condition leads me to believe that the States of the Union have a right to determine whether the Constitution shall be amended so as to give the women of the other States an equal voice with those already enfranchised in determining the policy of their Government, as well as its character and personnel. They have the right to say whether they will do it by Federal amendment. But they can not do it unless the amendment is submitted to them. I therefore believe it my duty to vote to submit this amendment to the States in the interest of that theory of democracy in whose behalf we have become the leaders of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the time expired?

The SPEAKER. Yes. It is 5 o'clock. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment. All gentlemen will take their seats. All gentlemen will refrain from conversation, and likewise the people in the galleries.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia rose.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I was seeking recognition on this section.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana got recognition. The Chair did not see the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I was trying to get recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would have been glad to recognize the gentleman. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORES of Indiana: After the word "to," in line 4, strike out the words "the legislatures of"; and after the word "ratified," in line 6, strike out the words "by three-fourths of said legislatures" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by conventions duly called by authority of law in three-fourths of the several States."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by Article V of the Constitution it is provided that the Constitution may be amended by the submission, by a two-thirds vote, of a resolution for its amendment to either the legislatures or conventions of the States. Article V provides for amendments and provides for their alternative submission either to the legislatures or to conventions of the several States. An adoption or ratification by three-fourths of the States, either by convention or the legislatures, will be a ratification as fixed by the resolution of submission.

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

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to have the gentleman explain what he means by authority of law. Would it be within the power of the legislature to fix a law that would call this convention, or would Congress have the right to do it?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. The legislature would have the right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose the legislature provided no law for calling this convention. Then there could be no convention.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Congress could supplement it by a provision calling for conventions in the States refusing to call conventions. There is no question about that as a matter of law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman think that Congress in submitting the amendment ought to leave any possibility of confusion like that to arise in the future?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I do not think it would create any confusion or any possibility of confusion. I do not believe there is a general assembly in the Union that would refuse to submit this resolution to its people in a call for a convention.

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking in any spirit of hostility to this constitutional amendment. A change in the fundamental law of the United States at any time is a most serious question, and should have serious, earnest, and faithful consideration at the hands of the people. At this time, when another proposition for constitutional amendment has been submitted to the legislatures for adoption, I do not want to have so important a question as this, involving, as it does, the change of our whole electoral system, submitted to our legislatures to become involved in dealing in crookedness, in possible rascality, in getting votes from people who are not for it and in losing votes of people who are for it by a trade. It is not right that we should throw the Constitution of the United States into a pot to be scrambled for by the people. It is not right that this amendment, going to the very foundation of our Government, should be either passed or defeated by a deal, should be passed in one State possibly by a deal with the opponents of prohibition and in an adjoining State by a deal with those who are for prohibition. It should not be involved with railroad legislation. It should not be involved in a multiplicity of contentions. The convention idea is the true and the only true referendum. An amendment to the Constitution should go to the people for consideration upon its own merits and should not be tied up and bundled up and hampered with a thousand other measures which occupy the brief time of a legislature's session.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen do not expedite the business of the House by yelling "Vote!" They delay it.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close in two minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I object.

Mr. RAKER. I move that all debate be now closed on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know whether the rule does not permit five minutes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Why, yes; unless debate is closed. It is entirely in the hands of the House. The question is on agreeing to the Moore's amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays. I had the floor, and I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right. Nobody is trying to deprive him of the right. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-two gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. A sufficient number—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. The other side.

The SPEAKER. The other side is called for. Those opposed to taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-three Members have risen in the negative. It requires one-fifth. A sufficient number have seconded the demand for the yeas and nays, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 131, nays 273, not voting 21, as follows:

YEAS—131.

Almon	Freeman	Lufkin	Sherley
Ashbrook	Gard	McLemore	Sisson
Aswell	Garner	Mansfield	Slayden
Bacharach	Garrett, Tenn.	Martin	Small
Bankhead	Gillett	Meeker	Snook
Bell	Gordon	Merritt	Stafford
Black	Gould	Miller, Minn.	Steagall
Blackmon	Gray, Ala.	Montague	Stedman
Brand	Gray, N. J.	Moon	Steele
Browning	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Pa.	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ind.	Stevenson
Burnett	Gregg	Nicholls, S. C.	Sumners
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Oliver, Ala.	Switzer
Candler, Miss.	Harrison, Miss.	Olney	Tague
Cannon	Harrison, Va.	Overmyer	Talbott
Carew	Heflin	Overstreet	Tinkham
Carlin	Helm	Paige	Venable
Clark, Fla.	Houston	Park	Vinson
Classon	Howard	Parker, N. J.	Voigt
Claypool	Hull, Iowa	Platt	Walker
Coady	Hull, Tenn.	Polk	Walsh
Collier	Jones, Va.	Pou	Ward
Connally, Tex.	Keoh	Price	Watkins
Crisp	Key, Ohio	Quin	Watson, Pa.
Dent	Kinchele	Ragsdale	Webb
Dewalt	Kitchin	Ramsey	Whaley
Dies	Larsen	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Dominick	Lazaro	Riordan	Wilson, La.
Doughton	Lee, Ga.	Robinson	Winslow
Dupré	Leshner	Rouse	Wise
Eagle	Lever	Sanders, La.	Wood, Ind.
Estopinal	Loneragan	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Focht	Longworth	Saunders, Va.	

NAYS—273.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Kahn	Raker
Anderson	Elston	Kearns	Ramseyer
Anthony	Emerson	Keating	Randall
Austin	Esch	Kelley, Mich.	Rankin
Ayres	Evans	Kelly, Pa.	Reavis
Baer	Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, Iowa	Robbins
Barkley	Fairfield	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts
Barnhart	Farr	Kettner	Rodenberg
Beakes	Ferris	Kless, Pa.	Rogers
Beshlin	Fess	King	Romjue
Bland	Fields	Kinkaid	Rose
Blanton	Fisher	Knutson	Rowe
Boeber	Flood	Kraus	Rowland
Borland	Flynn	Kreider	Rubey
Bowers	Fordney	La Follette	Rucker
Britten	Foss	Langley	Russell
Brodbeck	Foster	Lea, Cal.	Sabath
Browne	Francis	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Frear	Lenroot	Sanford
Burroughs	French	Linthicum	Schall
Butler	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Scott, Iowa
Byrns, Tenn.	Fuller, Mass.	Littlepage	Scott, Mich.
Caldwell	Gallagher	Lobeck	Scott, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Gallivan	London	Scully
Campbell, Pa.	Gandy	Lundeen	Sears
Cantrill	Garland	Lunn	Sells
Caraway	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Shackelford
Carter, Mass.	Glass	McArthur	Shallenberger
Carter, Okla.	Glynn	McClintic	Sherwood
Chandler, N. Y.	Godwin, N. C.	McCormick	Shouse
Chandler, Okla.	Good	McCulloch	Siegel
Church	Goodall	McFadden	Sims
Clark, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Sinnot
Connelly, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Slemp
Cooper, Ohio	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Sloan
Cooper, Wis.	Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Copley	Hadley	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, C. B.
Costello	Hamill	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Cox	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Snell
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Snyder
Cramton	Hamilin	Mapes	Steenerson
Crosser	Haskell	Mason	Stephens, Nebr.
Currie, Mich.	Hastings	Mays	Sterling, Ill.
Dale, N. Y.	Haugen	Mondell	Sterling, Pa.
Dale, Vt.	Hawley	Morgan	Stiness
Dallinger	Hayden	Morin	Strong
Darrow	Haves	Mott	Sullivan
Davidson	Heaton	Mudd	Sweet
Davis	Helvering	Neely	Swift
Decker	Hensley	Nelson	Taylor, Ark.
Dempsey	Hersey	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Colo.
Denison	Hicks	Nolan	Temple
Denton	Hilliard	Norton	Templeton
Dickinson	Hollingsworth	Oldfield	Thomas
Dill	Huddleston	Oliver, N. Y.	Thompson
Dillon	Humphreys	Osborne	Tillman
Dixon	Husted	O'Shaunessy	Tison
Dooling	Hutchinson	Parker, N. Y.	Timberlake
Doolittle	Igoe	Peters	Towner
Dowell	Jacoway	Phelan	Treadway
Drane	James	Porter	Van Dyke
Dyer	Johnson, Ky.	Powers	Vare
Eagan	Johnson, Wash.	Pratt	Vestal
Edmonds	Jones, Tex.	Purnell	Volstead
Elliott	Juni	Rainey	Waldow

Walton
Wason
Watson, Va.
Weaver

Welling
Welty
Wheeler
White, Me.

Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, Tex.
Wingo

Woodyard
Young, N. Dak.
Zihlman

NOT VOTING—21.

Capstick	Dunn	Ireland	Reed
Cary	Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Smith, Idaho
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	LaGuardia	Woods, Iowa
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Mann	
Doremus	Holland	Miller, Wash.	
Drukner	Hood	Padgett	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to have read in my time the paper which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. ALBERT F. POLK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Understanding that the vote upon the amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage throughout the United States is to be submitted to the House of Representatives on January 10, we, the undersigned, desire, as citizens of Delaware and of the United States, to protest through you against the adoption of such an amendment. We believe that the people of this State of both sexes are overwhelmingly opposed to this momentous and basic change in the structure of our Federal Government, and that, if finally adopted, it would do wanton violence to those principles of local self-government in the several States which have so long been held sacred in our dual scheme of government.

In this view it is unimportant whether our individual opinion be for or against woman suffrage. Nothing that so vitally concerns the political and social well-being of a State as the proposed fundamental change in the seat of political power should be arbitrarily imposed upon the people of any State without their consent, and we can not but consider the initiation of such a change by the vote of the two Houses of Congress as an abuse of the power conferred upon them by the Constitution.

From the very beginning and during the long period of our national existence it has been held as a cardinal principle not only by the framers of the Constitution but continuously by the intelligent public opinion of the country, without distinction of party, that suggestion by Congress of change in the organic law of the Union should only be made with extreme caution and in response to a well-recognized emergency requiring the same. The few amendments ingrafted upon the Constitution during this long period (for the first 10 amendments were almost contemporaneous with the adoption of the Constitution itself) testify to this fact, and most of them, including the fifteenth, grew out of the emergencies created by the Civil War. The historical circumstances were exceptional and the exigencies overwhelming. They were the outcome of a social and political revolution and seemed to the actors in that bloody drama necessary to safeguard civilization itself.

No such emergency now exists. No grievances on the part of the women of the country cry out for redress so drastic and so dangerous to State autonomy. There is only a desire of a portion of the women of the country to share in political power, and its propaganda is comparatively of recent growth. There is no compelling reason for imposing it by constitutional edict on the whole country and invading so important a province of local self-government.

There is nothing in the manner in which the States have dealt with this question to justify the impatience of the protagonists of woman suffrage. On the contrary, they have reason to be satisfied with the progress made of their cause by the somewhat slow but considerate action of the peoples of the several States. In the face of all this it seems to us absurd to say that there is any such exigent demand as would justify this momentous change in our organic law. Every uncalled for amendment to that law weakens its stability and encourages the recurrent frequency of such demands.

Yours, respectfully,

Geo. Gray, Thomas F. Bayard, S. D. Townsend, George A. Elliott, Alexis I. du Pont, H. H. Ward, W. W. Laird, Henry P. Scott, D. W. Corbit, John P. Nields, David T. Marvel, T. W. Wilson.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the pro forma amendment and simply say that this protest was presented in behalf of Judge Gray, a distinguished citizen of Delaware, and many other distinguished citizens of the same State.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to go in as section 3.

Mr. RAKER. But section 2 has not been read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read section 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States as provided in the Constitution within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I merely desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the language used in the new section 3 as offered by me is the identical language contained in the article of amendment adopted on December 10, having been passed in so far as everything except the time is concerned by the Senate of an amendment by the House adding one additional year, accepted by the Senate. So that it is the exact language

which this House voted for and which the Senate ratified in connection with the so-called prohibition amendment.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does it contain the other provision that the amendment shall not be effective until one year after the ratification?

Mr. GARD. It does not.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does not the gentleman want to include that?

Mr. GARD. It is not here included.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. If the amendment is adopted, would the gentleman vote for the resolution?

Mr. GARD. For the resolution in its entirety? I am frank to say that I could not support the resolution. I made a speech to that end. I am offering this with the purpose of perfecting the bill because it seems to me and to many other gentlemen that it is both idle and unwise, to use the words of another, to send an article of amendment out before the people without any time fixed when it shall be returned.

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

Mr. GARD. I can not yield. It has been said in the history of this Republic that there is one so-called amendment which has been wandering around the country for over a hundred years, and surely it should be the policy of this legislative body to impose on every constitutional amendment a time limit. There should be something in the law or in the article of amendment, rather, which shall make it compulsory to be acted upon within a certain time. As I have said, this is exactly the language which the House accepted, with the addition of one year, which was ratified by the Senate. It is to my mind and to the mind of many others a most important and necessary addition to any article of amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment, and I want to say a few words upon it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Idaho begins, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments to the resolution close in five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all other amendments close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object to that.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Gard amendment. I am in favor of the resolution as it has been reported from the committee. I am opposed to this particular amendment, because it can do no good and may prolong the fight looking to the granting of suffrage. One of the reasons why I am in favor of the amendment to the Constitution as it is proposed is because of the difficulties in the several States in amending their constitutions. Here is a proposition that, if it shall prevail, will make it necessary that a sufficient number of the States ratify the amendment within a period of seven years. If they fail then, this question must be submitted to the States again. Here is a question that is virile. It will not be pending for a hundred years and then forgotten, as the amendment to which the gentleman from Ohio referred. Here is a question that if it shall not prevail within seven years will be submitted again by another Congress, and the work of ratification will have to be done over again in the several States. Because of that I urge it as the part of wisdom to omit the time limit in its entirety.

Gentlemen, seven years is a short time in the life of a State and in the life of our Nation. If we are to have a time limit it should be not less than 20 years. Why, the Legislature of Alabama meets in regular session in four-year intervals. In Vermont the constitution can be amended not oftener than once in 10 years. Other States have time limits of 4, 5, or 6 years. Again, I say a period of 7 years is a short time in the history of our country. This amendment may not be ratified within 7 years, but in my judgment it will be ratified within a time that is altogether reasonable.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman voted for the prohibition amendment, did he not?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; I voted for the resolution in spite of the fact that it had attached to it this particular provision.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. How can the gentleman differentiate between the two?

Mr. FRENCH. I would vote for this resolution with the time limit upon it, but I prefer to vote for it without any limit as to time.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the amendment tacked onto the prohibition amendment was put there by enemies of the prohibition cause?

Mr. FRENCH. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. BLANTON. And this is attempted by enemies of this cause?

Mr. FRENCH. Undoubtedly; and it was admitted by the gentleman who offered it that, even if his amendment should pass, he will not support the resolution.

But let me ask you to consider for a few minutes another phase of the situation. In my judgment, one of the strongest reasons why we should pass the resolution granting suffrage to women is because of the harsh and sometimes unworkable conditions imposed in State constitutions that have to do with their amendment. Gentlemen, in spite of overwhelming majorities and unquestioned sentiment, it is well-nigh impossible for many State constitutions to be amended. Ought we not to adopt a simpler means, and ought we not to provide a reasonable time within which action may be had?

In examining the question I shall merely refer to the States where by constitutional amendment suffrage has not been granted.

Take the State of Illinois. No one familiar with the situation doubts that the people of Illinois are overwhelmingly in favor of woman suffrage. Then, why do they not amend their constitution?

Let us see. The legislature meets biennially, and let us suppose that a legislature favorable to suffrage will be elected. Now, suffrage is not the only thing that the people of Illinois are in favor of. Suppose they want to pass a prohibition amendment. Suppose the people favor State ownership of certain public utilities that can only be acquired by constitutional amendment. The opponents of suffrage can join with the friends of the public utilities amendment and force a vote upon it. The vote is forced before action can be had on the suffrage amendment; and, once passed, its passage defeats the suffrage amendment. And why? Why, because only one constitutional amendment can be placed before the people at a time. Remember the legislature meets only once in two years.

Remember, again, that a two-thirds vote of the legislatures is required to pass the amendment, and that it must be ratified by a majority of the people voting at the election. And so your suffrage amendment may not even come before the people. Suppose at the next legislature prohibition has right of way, then the suffrage amendment is again postponed. Well, Illinois is not the only State so hampered. In Kentucky all the legislature would need to do would be to submit two constitutional amendments to crowd out suffrage, and in Arkansas only three.

But let us go further. Suppose South Carolina favors suffrage overwhelmingly. Well, the legislature meets annually. But the suffrage amendment must pass by a two-thirds vote of both houses; then it must be submitted to the people and receive a majority of the votes of the people voting for representatives. Then with this ratification has the suffrage amendment passed? Not at all. The whole question must go to the next legislature and there it must pass by a two-thirds vote of both houses. In Mississippi it is even worse, for the legislature, although on the second vote a majority may ratify the amendment, meets quadrennially and not every year, as is the case in South Carolina.

In Connecticut, Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Vermont the amendment, aside from being ratified by the people, must run the gantlet of two separate legislatures, and pass them both by at least a two-thirds vote of one or both houses in at least one of the sessions.

In Indiana, Iowa, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin the amendment must not only be ratified by the people but must pass two separate legislatures by majority votes. In Rhode Island the people to the extent of three-fifths of all voting at the election must vote for the amendment. Remember, too, that all of the States in this group, excepting New Jersey and Rhode Island, have biennial sessions of their legislatures.

But let us examine a few more features. By the laws of Congress admitting immigrants to our shores, and by the laws of our States, not by constitutional amendment, we have endowed with suffrage thousands upon thousands of people who do not

know the meaning of the word, or who have criminal records, or who, barely escaping the doors of penitentiaries, are dragging society downward. We have endowed these, I say, with suffrage by simple statutes.

Yet the mothers of our land, women who teach our children, and from whom we all have learned the purest lessons of social conduct, the loftiest ideals of duty to society, to government, to God; the women of our land, cultured, educated, refined, toiling by the side of man, sacrificing in measure that man himself can not ask; the women of our land, I say, must attain their simple right to participate in government, not by acts of legislatures or of Congress but by constitutional amendment.

To attain suffrage in Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Ohio, the legislatures by a three-fifths vote of both houses must pass amendments to their constitutions. In Alabama and Kentucky the amendment must then be ratified by the people; in Alabama by a majority of all votes cast at the election; and in Kentucky by a majority voting on the amendment. In Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and West Virginia a two-thirds vote of both houses is necessary, while in Illinois, Mississippi, and South Carolina the people must ratify the amendment.

But not only are constitutions difficult to amend as a rule, requiring overwhelming votes of State legislatures, but many of our States require such majorities when submitted to the people for ratification as to make amendment next to impossible. When candidates aspire to office it is not required that for any one to be elected he shall receive a majority vote of all persons voting at the election. Plurality counts, and the person is elected who receives the greatest number of votes. Yet in at least the 10 States of Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Tennessee the amendment must be carried, not by a majority of votes for or against the amendment, but, in most of those States, by a majority of all persons voting at the election; in Rhode Island by three-fifths of those voting, and in Indiana, if we are to accept as correct what I believe is the latest interpretation of the constitution of the State by its supreme court, a majority of all the people of the State who are eligible to vote. Do you not see that in these States the man who is too ignorant to vote, or who is too indifferent, may have the same influence as the thoughtful man—the patriotic citizen who has earnestly and well pondered over the merits of a constitutional amendment?

But there are other limitations still. In Illinois when a proposed amendment to the Constitution has been defeated it can not be submitted again until after a period of four years.

In Kentucky, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania not until after five years. In Tennessee an amendment may not be submitted a second time till after 6 years, and in Vermont not until 10 years shall have passed.

Now, let us see how the women would go about amending the constitution of New Mexico. Here is a State in which no educational test may be imposed. Here is a State in which the vote of the ignorant peon or the illiterate immigrant counts for as much as the vote of the farmer, the miner, the business man, or man following a profession. Yet to pass the suffrage amendment it would need to be carried through both houses of the legislature by a three-fourths vote. That is not all. It would need to be ratified by three-fourths of the electors of the State participating. But that is not all. It would need to be ratified by two-thirds of the electors of each and every county of the State.

Let me ask those who talk of democracy, who talk of the rule of the people, how long it would take to attain suffrage in New Mexico? Why, 99 per cent of the people of New Mexico might be in favor of woman suffrage, but if in one single county one man more than one-third of the voters of the county voted against suffrage the amendment would fail to pass.

But some one says, Why not hold constitutional conventions in the several States and in that way make new constitutions? Gentlemen, in all States where conventions may be held heavy expense must be incurred and many problems besides suffrage would be opened to discussion that people have regarded as fixed and stable for many years. Why impose that burden, and why tie suffrage up with a multitude of other problems that would prevent a fair consideration, problems, maybe, that of their own dead weight would defeat the ratification of a proposed constitution containing full suffrage grants? Remember, too, that in at least 12 of our States there is no provision by which constitutional conventions may be held, and that in still another—Maryland—20 years must elapse after the holding of a constitutional convention before another such convention may be assembled.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said is not new. The State constitutions themselves tell the story, and it has been admirably worked out by Prof. W. F. Dodd in his Revision and Amendment of State Constitutions, and worked out in brief detail by Mary Sumner Boyd in her pamphlet entitled, "State Constitutional Obstructions." But the condition to which I have referred constitutes, in my opinion, a most powerful argument in favor of submitting the whole question to the several States in the way of a proposed Federal amendment to our National Constitution. It is well known that the opponents of woman suffrage are urging the sovereignty of the States in this great question. They apparently do not want the question voted upon when a fair vote and a clean decision may be attained. They want the advantage of archaic machinery. They want cumbersome methods of amending constitutions to supplement their lack of argument. They are like the gladiator who says, "I will enter the arena but the hands of my opponent must be tied behind his back."

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say this: The women of our land as part of our people are called upon to bear their responsibility in every walk of life. How nobly they bear that responsibility may well be the subject of the mightiest epic. More I need not say, only that to them, without question and without asking, should be accorded full measure of suffrage. I believe they will honor suffrage in exercising its responsibilities; but even this is beside the mark. Were it necessary for woman to begin at the lowest rung of the ladder and climb up, were it necessary for her to go through the pangs of birth of responsible citizenship, as the people of Russia are asked to do at this hour, then, still it would be our duty to endow her to the extent that is in our power with the means of full participation in the affairs of state.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 247, not voting 22, as follows:

YEAS—158.

Almon	Focht	Loneragan	Sisson
Ashbrook	Freeman	Longworth	Slayden
Aswell	Gallivan	Lufkin	Small
Bacharach	Gard	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snook
Bankhead	Garland	McLemore	Stafford
Bell	Garner	Mansfield	Steagall
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Martin	Steadman
Blackmon	Gillett	Meeker	Steele
Brand	Glass	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Stephens, Nebr.
Buchanan	Gordon	Moore, Pa.	Stevenson
Burnett	Gould	Moore, Ind.	Sumners
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray, Ala.	Morin	Switzer
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray, N. J.	Mudd	Tague
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Nicholls, S. C.	Talbot
Cannon	Greene, Vt.	Nichols, Mich.	Thomas
Carew	Gregg	Oliver, Ala.	Tilson
Carlin	Hardy	Olney	Tinkham
Clark, Fla.	Harrison, Miss.	Overmyer	Venable
Classon	Heaton	Overstreet	Vinson
Claypool	Heflin	Palge	Volgt
Coady	Helm	Park	Walker
Collier	Houston	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Connally, Tex.	Howard	Platt	Ward
Crago	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Watkins
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Humphreys	Price	Watson, Va.
Davidson	Igoe	Quin	Webb
Denison	Jones, Va.	Ragsdale	Welty
Dewalt	Kearns	Ramsey	Whaley
Dies	Kehoe	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Dominick	Key, Ohio	Riordan	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Kincheloe	Robinson	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Kitchin	Rouse	Winslow
Eagle	Kreider	Sabath	Wise
Edmonds	Larsen	Sanders, La.	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.	Woods, Iowa
Estopinal	Lee, Ga.	Sears	Young, Tex.
Fairchild, B. L.	Leshner	Sherley	
Flood	Lever	Sherwood	

NAYS—247.

Alexander	Brumbaugh	Costello	Dowell
Anderson	Burroughs	Cox	Drane
Anthony	Butler	Cramton	Dyer
Austin	Caldwell	Crosser	Eagan
Ayres	Campbell, Kans.	Currie, Mich.	Elliott
Baer	Campbell, Pa.	Dale, N. Y.	Ellsworth
Barkley	Cantrill	Dale, Vt.	Elston
Barnhart	Caraway	Darrow	Emerson
Beakes	Carter, Mass.	Davis	Evans
Beshlin	Carter, Okla.	Decker	Fairfield
Bland	Chandler, N. Y.	Dempsey	Farr
Blanton	Chandler, Okla.	Denton	Ferris
Booher	Church	Dickinson	Fess
Borland	Clark, Pa.	Dill	Fields
Bowers	Connelly, Kans.	Dillon	Fisher
Britten	Cooper, Ohio	Dixon	Flynn
Brodbeck	Cooper, Wis.	Dooling	Fordney
Browne	Copley	Doolittle	Foss

Foster	Keating	Mott	Sims	Ferris	Jones, Tex.	Nelson	Slomp
Francis	Kelley, Mich.	Neely	Sinnott	Fess	Juul	Nichols, Mich.	Sloan
Frear	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson	Slomp	Fields	Kahn	Nolan	Smith, Idaho
French	Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan	Sloan	Fisher	Keating	Norton	Smith, Mich.
Fuller, Ill.	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Smith, Idaho	Flynn	Kelley, Mich.	Oldfield	Smith, C. B.
Fuller, Mass.	Kettner	Oldfield	Smith, Mich.	Fordney	Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, N. Y.	Smith, T. F.
Gallagher	Kiess, Pa.	Oliver, N. Y.	Smith, C. B.	Foss	Kennedy, Iowa	Osborne	Snell
Gandy	King	Osborne	Smith, T. F.	Foster	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Shaunessy	Snyder
Garrett, Tex.	Kinkaid	O'Shaunessy	Snell	Francis	Kettner	Parker, N. Y.	Steenerson
Glynn	Knutson	Parker, N. Y.	Snyder	Frear	Kiess, Pa.	Peters	Stephens, Nebr.
Good	Kraus	Peters	Steenerson	Freeman	King	Phelan	Sterling, Ill.
Goodall	La Follette	Porter	Sterling, Ill.	French	Kinkaid	Platt	Sterling, Pa.
Goodwin, Ark.	Langley	Powers	Stiness	Fuller, Ill.	Knutson	Porter	Stiness
Graham, Ill.	Lea, Cal.	Pratt	Strong	Fuller, Mass.	Kraus	Powers	Strong
Green, Iowa	Lehbach	Purnell	Sullivan	Gallagher	La Follette	Pratt	Sullivan
Griest	Lenroot	Raney	Sweet	Gallivan	Langley	Purnell	Summers
Hadley	Linthicum	Raker	Swift	Gandy	Lea, Cal.	Raney	Sweet
Hamill	Little	Ramseyer	Taylor, Ark.	Garrett, Tex.	Lehbach	Raker	Swift
Hamilton, Mich.	Littlepage	Randall	Taylor, Colo.	Glynn	Lenroot	Ramseyer	Taylor, Ark.
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lobeck	Randall	Temple	Good	Linthicum	Randall	Taylor, Colo.
Hamlin	London	Rankin	Thompson	Goodall	Little	Rankin	Temple
Harrison, Va.	Lundeen	Reavis	Thompson	Goodwin, Ark.	Littlepage	Reavis	Templeton
Haskell	Lunn	Robbins	Tillman	Graham, Ill.	Lobeck	Robbins	Thomas
Hastings	McAndrews	Roberts	Timberlake	Green, Iowa	London	Roberts	Thompson
Haugen	McArthur	Rodenberg	Townner	Gregg	Lundeen	Rodenberg	Tillman
Hayden	McClinton	Rogers	Treadway	Griest	Lunn	Rogers	Timberlake
Hayes	McCormick	Romjue	Van Dyke	Hadley	McAndrews	Romjue	Towner
Helvering	McCulloch	Rose	Vare	Hamill	McArthur	Rose	Treadway
Hensley	McFadden	Rowe	Vestal	Hamilton, Mich.	McClinton	Rowe	Van Dyke
Hersey	McKenzie	Rubey	Volstead	Hamilton, N. Y.	McCormick	Rubland	Vare
Hicks	McKeown	Rucker	Waldow	Hamlin	McCulloch	Rubey	Vestal
Hilliard	McKinley	Russell	Walton	Haskell	McFadden	Rucker	Volstead
Hollingsworth	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.	Wason	Hastings	McKenzie	Russell	Waldow
Huddleston	Madden	Sanford	Weaver	Haugen	McKeown	Sabath	Walton
Husted	Magee	Schall	Wellington	Hayden	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.	Ward
Hutchinson	Maher	Scott, Iowa	Wheeler	Hayes	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanford	Wason
Jacoway	Mann	Scott, Mich.	White, Me.	Helvering	Madden	Schall	Weaver
James	Mapes	Scott, Pa.	Williams	Hensley	Magee	Scott, Iowa	Wellington
Johnson, Ky.	Mason	Scully	Wilson, Ill.	Hersey	Maber	Scott, Mich.	Wheeler
Johnson, Wash.	Mays	Sells	Wingo	Hilliard	Mann	Scott, Pa.	White, Me.
Jones, Tex.	Miller, Minn.	Shackleford	Woodyard	Hicks	Mapes	Scully	Williams
Juul	Mondell	Shallenberger	Young, N. Dak.	Hollingsworth	Mason	Sears	Wilson, Ill.
Kahn	Montague	Shouse	Zihlman	Husted	Mays	Sells	Wingo
	Morgan	Siegel		Hutchinson	Merritt	Shackleford	Wood, Ind.
				Igoe	Miller, Minn.	Shallenberger	Woods, Iowa
Capstick	Dunn	Hood	Reed	Jacoway	Mondell	Sherwood	Woodyard
Cary	Dupré	Ireland	Rowland	James	Moore, Ind.	Shouse	Young, N. Dak.
Cooper, W. Va.	Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Sanders, N. Y.	Johnson, Ky.	Morgan	Siegel	Zihlman
Curry, Cal.	Graham, Pa.	LaGuardia	Templeton	Johnson, Wash.	Mott	Sims	
Dent	Heintz	Miller, Wash.			Neely	Sinnott	
Drukker	Holland	Padgett					

NOT VOTING—22.

NAYS—136.

NOT VOTING—17.

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 2.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves to strike out section 2.
 Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not in order. We passed section 2, and a new section has been offered and voted upon.
 The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.
 Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the joint resolution.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.
 The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.
 The SPEAKER. The Chair has not announced that the time has come for that.
 The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.
 Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] ask for the yeas and nays.
 Mr. BUTLER. The Constitution requires this, anyway.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.
 The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 136, not voting 17, as follows:

YEAS—274.

Alexander	Brumbaugh	Connelly, Kans.	Dill
Anderson	Burroughs	Cooper, Ohio	Dillon
Anthony	Butler	Cooper, Wis.	Dixon
Austin	Byrnes, Tenn.	Copley	Dooling
Ayres	Caldwell	Costello	Doolittle
Bacharach	Campbell, Kans.	Cox	Dowell
Baer	Campbell, Pa.	Cramton	Drane
Barkley	Cannon	Crosser	Dyer
Barnhart	Cantrill	Currie, Mich.	Eagan
Beakes	Caraway	Dale, N. Y.	Edmonds
Beshlin	Carew	Dale, Vt.	Elliott
Bland	Carter, Mass.	Darrow	Ellsworth
Blanton	Carter, Okla.	Davidson	Elston
Booher	Chandler, N. Y.	Davis	Emerson
Borland	Chandler, Okla.	Decker	Esch
Bowers	Church	Dempsey	Evans
Britten	Clark, Pa.	Denison	Fairchild, B. L.
Brodbeck	Claason	Denton	Fairfield
Browne	Connally, Tex.	Dickinson	Farr

Almon	Garner	Lever	Saunders, Va.
Ashbrook	Garrett, Tenn.	Lonergan	Sherley
Aswell	Gillett	Longworth	Sisson
Bankhead	Glass	Lufkin	Slayden
Bell	Godwin, N. C.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Small
Black	Gordon	McLemore	Snook
Blackmon	Gould	Mansfield	Stafford
Brand	Gray, Ala.	Martin	Staggall
Browning	Gray, N. J.	Meeker	Stedman
Buchanan	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Steele
Burnett	Greene, Vt.	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Moore, Pa.	Stevenson
Candler, Miss.	Harrison, Miss.	Morin	Switzer
Carlin	Harrison, Va.	Mudd	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Heaton	Nicholls, S. C.	Talbott
Claypool	Heflin	Oliver, Ala.	Tilson
Coady	Helm	Olney	Tinkham
Collier	Houston	Overmyer	Venable
Crago	Howard	Overstreet	Vinson
Crisp	Huddleston	Paige	Voigt
Dallinger	Hull, Iowa	Park	Walker
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Dewalt	Humphreys	Polk	Watkins
Dies	Jones, Va.	Pou	Watson, Pa.
Dominick	Kearns	Price	Watson, Va.
Doremus	Kehoe	Quin	Webb
Doughton	Key, Ohio	Ragsdale	Welty
Dupré	Kincheloe	Ramsey	Whaley
Eagle	Kitchin	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Estopinal	Kreider	Riordan	Wilson, La.
Flood	Larsen	Robinson	Wilson, Tex.
Focht	Lazaro	Rouse	Winslow
Gard	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, La.	Wise
Garland	Leshner	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.

So (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD and Mr. REED (for) with Mr. DUNN (against).

Mr. IRELAND and Mr. LA GUARDIA (for) with Mr. PADGETT (against).

Mr. CURRY of California and Mr. MILLER of Washington (for) with Mr. HOLLAND (against).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for) with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia (against).

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. DRUKKER, of New Jersey, absent on account of illness, had he been present would have voted "nay."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. IRELAND, is absent on account of being in a railroad wreck. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the gentleman have to answer the question that he was in the Hall listening when his name was called?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask that the question be put to him in that shape.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman has made some inquiry as to my vote. I would state that I was in the Hall when the second roll call was called, and my name was not called at the proper time when it should have been called.

Mr. AUSTIN. I heard the gentleman's name called, Mr. Speaker. I ask that this question be put to him: "Was he listening at the time his name was called?"

Mr. DOMINICK. I was sitting by Congressman LEVER at the time, and I was listening, and my name was not called, the gentleman's statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. AUSTIN. I say his name was called. I heard it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, he qualifies.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will all keep still until the Speaker can rule. The gentleman brings himself within the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was. I thought I voted on the first roll call. It may be that I am not recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will look and see. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman state that he was in the Hall listening when his name was called and failed to hear it, or does he state that he voted?

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought I voted on the first roll call.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. RUSSELL, and he voted "aye."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of this vote. It is exceedingly close.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands a recapitulation of the vote, and the Clerk will recapitulate it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is that a matter of right for any Member to demand it?

The SPEAKER. It is a matter of right. It has been fought out here a number of times. It is in the discretion of the Speaker, but nevertheless and notwithstanding when any man demands a recapitulation he ought to have it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentlemen have the right to change their votes on recapitulation or cast their votes according to the original roll call?

The SPEAKER. It will simply be as the lists show. Members will please be seated. There is no sense in recapitulating the vote unless Members can hear.

The Clerk recapitulated the vote.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, how was my name called?

The SPEAKER. Mr. CARLIN voted in the negative.

The result was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAKER. I make the motion, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman can not make that motion. The gentleman can move to reconsider, but he can not move to lay on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] moves to reconsider—

Mr. RAKER. And lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No.

The SPEAKER. You can not.

Mr. FOSTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 11, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement showing the number of employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing whose compensation is paid from "Compensation of employees" as carried in the sundry civil bill, but detailed for duty in connection with clerical work of the bureau (H. Doc. No. 780); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative draft of a bill for the relief of certain pay officers of the United States Navy (H. Doc. No. 781); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain estimates, for inclusion in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, for post office and courthouse at Harrisburg, Pa., and bridge at Nogales, Ariz. (H. Doc. No. 782); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures by the Alaskan Engineering Commission from its appropriation for "Construction and operation of railroads in Alaska" to October 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 783); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8558) providing increased pensions for honorably discharged persons in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8559) to increase the membership of the visiting committee of the Bureau of Standards from 5 to 10 members; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8560) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 8561) for the relief of certain homestead and desert-land entrymen; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8562) to increase the compensation of bookbinders in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 8563) to amend the homestead laws in its application to Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8564) to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 8565) providing for the licensing of owners of privately owned automobiles run and operated by hired chauffeurs, fixing penalties, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 8566) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to erect at the entrance to the Philadelphia Navy Yard a suitable gateway and accompanying buildings; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 8624) extending the time for the filing of income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 212) authorizing the readmission to the United States of resident aliens applying therefor after having been enlisted or conscripted for

the military service of the United States or of one of the nations cobelligerents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Aunspaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Bumpus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8569) granting a pension to Catherine Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8570) granting a pension to Martin Randles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8571) granting a pension to Clem Bolan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 8572) granting a pension to Franklin A. Peters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 8573) granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Helen Larsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8575) granting an increase of pension to John Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting a pension to Margaret Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8577) for the relief of Sarah J. Ireland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 8578) granting a pension to William Leishing; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 8579) granting a pension to Emma K. Brockman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 8580) granting a pension to Robert Leigh Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8581) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stackhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8582) granting a pension to Peter McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) granting a pension to Henry R. Riner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8584) granting a pension to Mary E. Mott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 8585) granting a pension to Eugene V. Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8586) granting a pension to Joseph L. McLean; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8587) granting a pension to S. C. Broden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting a pension to William Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 8589) granting a pension to Genevra M. Lamb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8590) granting an increase of pension to William Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8591) granting an increase of pension to William C. Runyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8592) granting a pension to Dalbert Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 8593) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8594) granting a pension to Cornelius J. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8595) to correct the military record of Ell F. Westfall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 8596) granting a pension to Nicholas Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 8597) granting an increase of pension to Albert Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) granting an increase of pension to Albert Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8599) granting an increase of pension to William Way; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8600) granting a pension to Calvin H. Klapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8601) granting a pension to August Lehn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8602) granting an increase of pension to James Mohan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8603) granting a pension to Arthur D. Warden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) granting a pension to Lucy C. Range; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to John Alford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 8606) granting a pension to Burton Cure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 8607) granting an increase of pension to George H. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8608) to credit the accounts of certain officers of the Engineer Department; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) providing for the payment of certain claims arising under the Engineer Department for services, losses, damages, etc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 8610) granting a pension to Elizabeth Messer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 8611) for the relief of the heirs of Lot Quinn, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8612) for the relief of S. Reamey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8613) for the relief of Jennie Bell Cox, Robert Isaac Clegg, and Thomas Neel Clegg, children and only heirs of Thomas Watts Clegg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Elrod; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) for the relief of the heirs of Nathan Pumphrey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8616) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennie Hunter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8617) for the relief of the legal representatives of Stephen Courtney, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8618) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Hibbard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8619) for the relief of the legal representatives of Archer Hays, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8620) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. H. Moseby, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8621) granting a pension to G. W. Granberry, sr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8622) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer F. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 8623) for the relief of Henry Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Ada L. James, and of the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council, representing 30,000 trade-unionists, urging the submission of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a resolution of the Wisconsin Teachers' Association (7,000 strong), urging Congress to submit and secure the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Erie County, Pa., favoring Federal suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Hayward Veterans' League, Hayward, Cal., indorsing increase in pension allowance to veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: Evidence to accompany House bill 3591, granting an increase of pension to Matthew Stamets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 5410, the purple cross bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Nineteenth Century Club, of Oak Park, Ill., and the De Kalb (Ill.) Woman's Club, favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the National Council of Women, United States of America, favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Delaware Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, against the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of Marshall County, Iowa, in favor of equal suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Memorial of the Civil War revenue cotton-tax claimants; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of Fred Steele Post, No. 70, San Luis Obispo, Cal.; of Sheridan-Dix Post, No. 7, San Jose, Cal.; of R. L. McCook Post, No. 26, Grand Army of the Republic, Watsonville, Cal.; and of E. O. C. Ord Post, No. 82, Los Gatos, Cal., all urging an increase of pensions to all Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Telegram from Womans' Council of Defense for Colorado, by Mary Turner Pope, its corresponding secretary, urging the adoption of the national suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Margaret Long, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Huff, Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Feagans, Mr. and Mrs. H. B. Dinwiddie, Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Strong, Mr. and Mrs. W. N. Vaile, Col. and Mrs. Edward Verdeckberg, Mr. and Mrs. Ready Kehehan, Mrs. Mary Montgomery, Rabbi W. S. Friedman, Mrs. Ray David, Mrs. E. W. Burris, Mrs. Mildred L. Thomas, Mrs. C. S. Keys, Lewis Searing, Lucia Hadley, Mrs. Lizzie Forrester, Mrs. Frances Walden, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Malone, Mabel C. Haynes, Mrs. George Miller, George E. Nightingale, Frank E. Shephard, Ida Hands, Augusta Rothwell, Mr. and Mrs. George Campion, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Boyd, Mrs. Fred Kerns, Mrs. Mattie O. Peoler, Mabel Forrester, Leilia Kinney, John W. Watson, J. G. Scott, Dora Phelps, Beull Jean Gale, Mrs. Agnes Bishop, Mrs. Florence Mack, Mrs. Dewey Bailey, Sen. Agnes C. Riddle, W. W. Torrence, Frank Kratke, Helen T. Miller, Eleanor Lawney, Margaret Conway, Fannie Dore, Florence Green, Kate Russell, John L. Russell, Annie Raglan Randall, Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Flint, Ira Dunklee, Nona L. Broiks, Ida J. Booth, Mrs. R. W. Speer, E. L. Doyce, Clarence Hawkins, Samuel D. Nicholson, Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Bennett, Laura C. Holtschneider, Clara Mosser, Charles E. Tibbits, Mr. and Mrs. J. Nolan, Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Leckenby, Mrs. Gertrude Lee, Alice B. Clark, Mrs. J. H. Teller, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Rothwell, Theodosia B. Raines, Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Barnett, and Mr. and Mrs. Chalmers Hadley, all of Denver, Colo., favoring the submission of the suffrage amendment by this session of Congress; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of J. E. C. Colt, of Bristol, R. I., urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Mary B. Anthony, Elizabeth G. Hale, E. B. Hale, Ruth A. Haskell, Frank Cale, E. C. Hodge, Alice A. Daggett, Martha B. Willson, Harriet I. Roworth, Katherine Johnson, Lucia K. Whitman, Louise C. Wheaton, Katherine H. Austin, Amey L. Wilson, Mary Schofield, Mrs. Anne L. Willson, Mary E. Carpenter, all of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Woman's branch of the Socialist Party of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Mary S. Packard, of Centerville, R. I., favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, resolution of Smithfield (R. I.) Equal Suffrage League, urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of J. F. Archibald, of Providence, R. I., urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters and telegrams from 18 men and women of Maryland, urging a favorable vote on the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, letters and telegrams from four men and women of the State of Maryland, protesting against the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Guy M. Eyttings, requesting support for the Chamberlain bill for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of a group of college alumnae, by Mrs. Bertha C. Moeller, secretary of the Woman's Party of Minnesota, urging the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting Congress to enact a law providing for the punishment of those found guilty of impeding or interfering with the United States Government in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Electric Short Line Railway Co., D. E. K. Hunter, general manager, Minneapolis, Minn., urging governmental action for the relief of intrastate railroads; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Resolutions of the Bronx Board of Trade and of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, protesting against the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube mail service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the excessive rates for second-class matter in the war-revenue law, and recommending that the law be amended by eliminating that section; to the Committee on the Post Office and Public Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of E. B. Hale and 16 other citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a resolution by the Newport County Equal Suffrage League, urging a vote in favor of the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn., urging bill for the payment of Federal taxes in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George N. Morgan Post, No. 4, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring bill increasing pensions of old soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of sundry citizens of New Haven County, Conn., favoring the submission of the Federal suffrage amendment to the States; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a petition of Ellen Strong Bartlett and others, protesting against the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Resolutions of the City Council of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, resolution of the City Federation, representing 300 women of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Mecklenburg County, Va., in favor of the woman suffrage constitutional amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Petersburg, Va., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 11, 1918.

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

Almighty God, we bless Thee for the assurance of Thy presence with us as a nation and Thy guidance—an assurance that keeps us calm under provocation such as never before tried a nation in the history of the world. We pray that Thou wilt still abide with us with the constant ministry of Thy Spirit, and while our spirits are unconquerable and we move forward in the midst of the conflict of the world yet may there be calm and peace in our hearts because of our oneness of life and purpose with Thee. Guide us this day in the discharge of our duties. For Christ's sake. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.