Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif, relative to alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcohol and Liquor Traffic.

Also, passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif, favoring more stringent legislation affecting child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif, favoring a change in the citizenship laws as they affect women; to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, resolution of Napa County Viticultural Protective Association, St. Helena, Calif, urging repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif, favoring the Army nurse bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution favoring the establishment of a department of education, by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution favoring the league of nations by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of city commission of Pasadena; Normandie Avenue Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ceres; Southern California District Lodge Good Templars, Los Angeles; Friends' Temperance Committee, Pasadena; in the State of California, protesting against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of California, in favor of enforcement of national prohibition, and protesting against invasion of China by American brewers and distillers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring change in citizenship laws in favor of women, so they will not be secondary to their husbands; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring legislation for prevention of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring creation of Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring granting recognition and rank to nurses in the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, Friendly Circle of Pasadena; Boyle Heights Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Methodist Preachers' Association of Southern California; Bethany Baptist Church, Long Beach; Memorial Methodist Church; Lincoln Avenue Methodist Church, Pasadena; Highland Park Baptist Church; Pilgrim Congregational Church, Pasadena; 27 missionary societies of Long Beach, all in the State of California, against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of East Susquehanna Clauss, Goven City, Pa., representing 15,000 people, urging against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Potrero (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petitions of Allen & Nugent Co.; H. Jacobin & J. Paul H. Pelham; G. Leever & Co. (Inc.); M. Phillips, 1128 Bryant Avenue; M. McClure; E. Leap, 1332 Second Avenue; Daniel Currie, 222 West One hundred and thirty-second Street; A. von Kilie, 224 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; P. J. Dinan, 2184 Valentine Avenue; Edward M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Ed. M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Leo D. Fox, 1048 Kelly Street; G. Megroz, 222 Fourth Avenue; Mack Wolf, 313 West Forty-fifth Street; and H. T. Kramer, 913 Jackson Avenue, all of New York City; and A. V. Wahlberg, 627 Madison Street; S. Williams, 111 Ninety-second Street; V. W. Knaust, 639 Thirty-second Street; E. E. Overman, 490 Bernard Avenue; E. J. Lambert, 7205 Tenth Avenue; and Leo C. Lucke, 1353 Park Place, all of Brooklyn, and all in the State of New York, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Julius Jorgenson & Son, New York City, asking for repeal of section 905 of revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Woman's Trade Union League of America, for the continuation of the Woman in Industry Serv-

ice of the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of D. Auerbach & Sons, New York City, against continuation of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Goodfellow Bros., New York City, engineers and contractors, and F. C. Martin, contractors, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry residents of Mary, N.Y., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Herkimer, N.Y., for the repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

And petition of Slovenian Lodges, No. 329, and St. Joseph's Society, No. 53, of Little Falls, N.Y., for recognition and justice for the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Lyman Shedd and of the residents of Bolster Mills, Me, asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cecil H. Mitchell and others residing in the town of Byron, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENA TE.

WEDNESDAY, June 4, 1919.

(LEGISLATIVE DAY OF TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is absent a quorum.

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

Asburh Harding McLean Smith, Md.
Ball Harris McNaury Smith, R. C.
Beckman Harrison Miles S. C.
Binkig Henderson Nelson South Carolina
Brookvilie Hitchcock New Beverley New York
Cable Johnson, Calif. New Beverley New York
Capper Jones, N. Mex. New Beverley New York
Chamberlain Jones, Wash. New Beverley New York
Currie Kendrick New Beverley New York
Dillingham Keys New Beverley New York
Elihu King New Beverley New York
Eliot King Page Woodard S. D.
Ellis Lake Page Woodard S. D.
Euler Link Page Woodard S. D.
Frelinghuyser Lodge New Beverley New York
Freunlein Ramsey New Beverley New York
Grouna McCreary Simmon S. C.
Hale Carter Tidworth Va.
McKee, Col. Smith, Ark.
Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on important business.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Rossman] on public business. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Heumstead, its enrolled clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, and for the use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment of the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the amendment read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the amendment be read.
The President pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I beg to offer the words "the legislatures of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "conventions in," so that the paragraph will read:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Borah], I represent in part a State which has extended the franchise to women residing within its borders. In view of that fact and my decision to vote against the proposed amendment to the Constitution, as I have done upon two prior occasions, I desire to make my attitude clear before the Senate.

No vote of mine cast upon this amendment will deprive any of the electors of the State of New York of any privilege which they now enjoy. The people of that State, as the people of several other States, have decided for themselves, in an orderly and constitutional manner, to extend the franchise to the women. I feel so strongly on this question that the people of the several States should be permitted to decide this matter for themselves that I desire to say that were this amendment, instead of being drafted for the purpose of extending woman suffrage all over the country, drafted for the purpose of forbidding the extension of the franchise to women, I would vote against it.

The Senator from Idaho yesterday discussed the right of the people to settle their own affairs, particularly in matters which would extend to the entire country. My feeling upon that subject is somewhat like his. The people of the several States when they organized their governments and adopted their constitutions delegated certain powers to their legislatures and to their executive departments to settle things that concern the welfare and safety of the people of their States, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the society to determine for itself what it shall do in the various matters over which it has jurisdiction.

When a society organizes itself to do business, about the first thing it does is to prescribe the qualifications of its voting members, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the process of formation to prescribe in its constitution that the voting membership shall not be extended or restricted except by a majority of voters of the society concerned. I think that both the legislative and executive departments should keep faith and should not transgress the limits set by the people.

When a society organizes itself to do business, the first thing it does is to prescribe the qualifications of its voting members, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the process of formation to prescribe in its constitution that the voting membership shall not be extended or restricted except by a majority of voters of the society concerned. I think that both the legislative and executive departments should keep faith and should not transgress the limits set by the people.

Mr. President, I stand upon the principle of the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land, and when I discuss this subject, I am primarily interested in what the Constitution says as to the extension of the franchise. If the Constitution does not specifically authorize an extension of the franchise, I think it is the function of the Senate and of every legislator who desires to extend the franchise to make a constitutional amendment for the purpose of extending such franchise.

When a society organizes itself to do business, the first thing it does is to prescribe the qualifications of its voting members, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the process of formation to prescribe in its constitution that the voting membership shall not be extended or restricted except by a majority of voters of the society concerned. I think that both the legislative and executive departments should keep faith and should not transgress the limits set by the people.

As a member of the Senate and as the people of the several States have voted upon this question, it is incumbent upon the Senate to provide for the protection of the franchise.

Mr. President, I am of opinion that the amendment, as it is drafted, relates to the extension of the franchise in a particular State, whereas it is the function of the Senate to provide for the protection of the franchise in a general way. If we are to provide for the protection of the franchise, we must provide for the protection of the franchise in a general way.

Mr. President, I am of opinion that the amendment, as it is drafted, relates to the extension of the franchise in a particular State, whereas it is the function of the Senate to provide for the protection of the franchise in a general way. If we are to provide for the protection of the franchise, we must provide for the protection of the franchise in a general way.
said, as free citizens, they do not require or desire. Is it unreasonable to ask that they be permitted to continue to govern their own affairs in this respect? Is it contrary to the spirit of American institutions that they shall be left free to decide these questions for themselves?

Other States besides those I have named have voted to extend the franchise. The State of Michigan did it but a few months ago; the State of South Dakota did it but a few months ago. No man can logically complain against a system which permits such a practice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have shown again and again in the Senate that I am not opposed to any fair and honest proposal to extend the franchise, in case we believe it will be to the advantage of the country. But how is it possible to govern a State except by the vote of the people when you have agreed to have a law of the United States except the Congress of the United States—except the Congress of the United States, that act of the legislature within a few months after it had passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women—except the Congress of the United States, that act of the legislature within a few months after it had passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women, we are quite restricted to the opinions of that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country.

That same spirit has been made manifest in the recent discussion of the last amendment to the Constitution which was ratified to-day. To-day there are thousands of people all over the United States who are attempting to contrive ways and means by which the prohibition amendment to the Constitution can be evaded, showing an utter lack of regard for the instrument that was held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country.

Unlike the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I voted against the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, because I believed that such a proposal had no place in the Constitution, and, second, because I believed that the people in important communities of this country were competent to decide that matter for themselves; and I feared the very thing that is making itself so apparent to-day—a settled determination upon the part of the people in all these communities to evade the prohibition amendment, at all costs. That is a spirit which is abroad in the United States to-day. That same spirit has been made manifest in the recent discussion of the last amendment to the Constitution which was ratified to-day. To-day there are thousands of people all over the United States who are attempting to contrive ways and means by which the prohibition amendment to the Constitution can be evaded, showing an utter lack of regard for the instrument that was held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated at the time that my recollection was imperfect and that there might be other States besides the ones I mentioned which had repudiated the proposition; and I now remember, of course, that the State of Missouri is in that category.

Now, without discussing the merits of woman suffrage as such, the question is simply this: Why is it that this power, resting in the people of this country in their several States, is to be taken away from them and lodged elsewhere? What is the reason? Is the principle faulty? Is it undemocratic? Is it un-American? Does it fail to satisfy the people themselves? I think not. No such contention has thus far been made. Let us speak frankly. The advocates of this movement—and I do not describe for the first time these instances they may find ready at their hand to bring about their purpose—the advocates of this proposal for the extension of the franchise all over the United States through a Federal amendment believe that that is the easiest way for them to achieve their purpose. To them it has become a purely practical question. Regard for the spirit of our institutions does not enter into their discussions. The Constitution of the United States means nothing more to them than that it shall be used as a vehicle for the expression of their ideas upon another group of people who desire to impose their ideas upon another group of people.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not blind myself to the fact that this is the tendency of the day; I do not blind myself to the fact that slowly, but surely, not so much by constitutional amendment perhaps, although this is a glaring instance of it, but by statutes passed by the Congress and by statutes passed by the State legislatures, we are whittling away the sense of responsibility of the individual citizen. We are teaching more people every year that the Government owes them a living; we are teaching more people every year that the Government should and can do things which they as individual citizens can do for themselves; we are urging the "easiest way." Scarcely a year goes by but what that tendency becomes more marked, and when we look at the State legislatures, we have seen that since the national referendum their honest second judgment will agree—that it is easier to persuade a legislature to ratify a proposal of this sort than it is to get the people in a State to take some step to come to this in a popular referendum. It can be done more quickly and with a less outlay of money in the matter of propaganda, and, as was said here yesterday on the floor, the members of legislative bodies—and I do not except the members of the Judiciary Committee, who are particularly susceptible to pressure, to insistent and persistent agitation and propaganda.

There have been instances in this very matter of the extension of the franchise which illustrate that very thing. The people of Ohio on two separate occasions voted down the proposal for the extension of the franchise to women. The year following the second defeat by the people of Ohio the legislature of that State, in the face of the mandate of the people, promptly passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women—an exact illustration of how much easier it is to persuade or coaze a State legislature than it is to get the people in a State to take some step to come to this thing in a popular referendum. It can be done more quickly and with a less outlay of money in the matter of propaganda, and, as was said here yesterday on the floor, the members of legislative bodies—and I do not except the members of the Judiciary Committee, who are particularly susceptible to pressure, to insistent and persistent agitation and propaganda.

There have been instances in this very matter of the extension of the franchise which illustrate that very thing. The people of Ohio on two separate occasions voted down the proposal for the extension of the franchise to women. The year following the second defeat by the people of Ohio the legislature of that State, in the face of the mandate of the people, promptly passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women—an exact illustration of how much easier it is to persuade or coaze a State legislature than it is to get the people in a State to take some step to come to this thing in a popular referendum. It can be done more quickly and with a less outlay of money in the matter of propaganda, and, as was said here yesterday on the floor, the members of legislative bodies—and I do not except the members of the Judiciary Committee, who are particularly susceptible to pressure, to insistent and persistent agitation and propaganda.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri.
paraded lines, and therefore the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth are justifiable. But the trouble is, Mr. President, that as we proceed in taking away the sense of responsibility from the people in their communities year after year and decade after decade we do not proceed along parallel lines, but the pieces of legislation slowly converge, and when they reach the point of convergence the citizen will have become the servant and dependent of government instead of government being the servant and protector of the people. And it is truly for this reason and for this converging lines that this amendment of the Constitution is proceeding.

Our people of 30 States, if this constitutional amendment is ratified, cease being the masters of their governments, and the franchise is absolutely taken away from them. And that, according to my way of thinking, is contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the historical references which I have quoted indicate that the action of Missouri is true. It was some years ago. Perhaps it might be fair to add that the vote of Missouri taken some years ago is hardly a fair indication of to-day, because in the legislature just adjourned both houses were in accord with the granting of suffrage to women in Missouri. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has so fittingly addressed to the people of Missouri is, in disregard of the last mandate of the people of Missouri and in defiance of it, passed a statute authorizing votes by women at presidential elections. That exactly proves the case. It demonstrates that legislatures can be handled when the people cannot. It was because of the notorious incompetency of legislatures, and because of the fact that they are not the representatives of the people, that the people took from legislatures the right to elect United States Senators and declared that the people alone should exercise that high right. It is because of the fact that legislative bodies very frequently do not represent the sense of the people, that they are very often composed of men grossly incompetent, that protest is now being made against taking away from the people of the State of Missouri the right of setting this question for themselves.

Since my distinguished colleague has seen fit to challenge me to this question, I want to ask him if he is willing by his vote to deprive the people of the State of Missouri of a right to do justice to the qualifications of Negroes and which they have held and which Negroes and of which they have been made so splendidly by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and emphasized this morning by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

In our dual form of government the principle of its duality is the one that makes it possible for people of this section of ours to progress as conditions justify. Were we a homogeneous people, were the local conditions, both social, commercial, and industrial, the same, it might be less destructive of the spirit of democracy for us to take the principle that underlies democracy and emasculate it as this will emasculate it. But when the conditions are so divergent, when local conditions throughout the United States are so different, the splendid principle invoked in the Constitution becomes of the greatest importance.

I referred a moment ago to another amendment, incorporating exactly the same principle and that was made into our country. The fifteenth amendment that was passed was passed in a moment of heat, passion, sectional strife, and bitterness. There is not a man in America to-day capable of exactly the same principle. And I refer to that amendment, passed when and how it was passed, jeopardized the civilization that you and I represent in a section of our country. The alien population amongst us was not like it was in other States. Even if the franchise had been granted to them in other States, their weakness of number would have been impossible for those States to absorb them without danger to their civilization.

But unlimited franchise in certain other States would have deluged and destroyed with a hoard of ignorance and incompetence the civilization that it had taken all of these years to build up and perfect. It placed a burden upon those States that they were not equipped by any one else to shoulder. And this is the main cause of the retardation of the progress of the South. It has caused that section, in every line of endeavor and in every line of work, to be retarded, because unless there was a united front to this measure there was neither social nor political edifice was threatened. So that the work of the South for years has been not one of the unified attention of the people to productive work but one of unified operation to save.

Now, I want to appeal to some of my southern colleagues. We contended that the passage of the fifteenth amendment was a crime against the civilization of the white men of America. Those on the other side, when naively assumed its domination over the minds of men, recognized that fact. We bussed ourselves with the passage of such laws as would minimize the disastrous effect of unlimited suffrage to the Negro in the South. Be it said to the honorable Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that those African Negroes in the South when they were given the franchise recognized, as we recognize and as the world recognizes, that local conditions there have to be met by such laws and such acts as will absorb and preserve the civilization that characterizes the white man.

That was your reason, founded as it was in justice and in righteousness. Those men from the South who are sitting here to-day, who are going to vote for the ratification of this amendment or vote to submit this amendment to the people, by that vote ratify and confirm the fifteenth amendment, because I maintain to-day that there is no difference whatever between the fifteenth amendment and the property or the property and the suffrage or the Anthony amendment. The Susan B. Anthony amendment is the fifteenth amendment with the insertion of one word alone, namely:

The right of a citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex.

Those of us from the South, where the preponderance of the Negro vote jeopardized our civilization, have maintained that the fifteenth amendment was a crime against our civilization. Now, when a southern man votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment he votes to enfranchise the other half of that race, and ratifies, not in a moment of heat and passion, but in silence, and with the support of those States and of the Senate which they have expressly reserved to themselves in their constitution—to take that power from the people of the State of Missouri, and confer it upon the Negro. Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as others have said before me, nothing that I can say, perhaps, can change a vote; but in view of the pending amendment and the vital issues that are now at stake, I should be deeply to the duty if I did not enter my protest against the passage of this amendment, which to all intents and purposes is exactly similar to one that has already been passed, the result of which is an illustration of the point that has been made so splendidly by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and emphasized this morning by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Here is exactly the identical same amendment applied to the other half of the Negro race. The southern man who votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment votes to ratify the fifteenth amendment. Senators on the other side have acquiesced in silence when in desperation we passed such laws as would minimize the disastrous effect of the fifteenth amendment. If the Southern Senators voting for this amendment puts them without excuse to still further withhold their hands.

The ground found by those from the East, viewing it strictly from his own local impression, might get the idea that we ought to extend it to all, but those of us from the South who have seen the evil effect upon our section of country from this measure worse than poverty, worse than any local evils that we have ever years combated and overcome. How southern Senators can vote to turn loose upon the South another era similar to that through which we have passed I can not understand.

Now, Sir, but that remark amply remarked by those who propose to vote for this amendment. "You found a way to keep the Negro man from voting and you will find a way to keep the unworthy Negro woman from voting."
We found the way because of the recognition on the part of our colleagues the proposed constitutional amendment that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteen amendment? When the clamar comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, that they have the right to determine their franchise for themselves? I say: are you the Senator from South Carolina? The constitution which the Senator from South Carolina has placed before us, and which is being argued for, the amendment that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteen amendment? When the clamar comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, that they have the right to determine their franchise for themselves? I say: are you the Senator from South Carolina? The constitution which the Senator from South Carolina has placed before us, and which is being argued for, the amendment that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteen amendment? When the clamar comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, that they have the right to determine their franchise for themselves? I say: are you the Senator from South Carolina? The constitution which the Senator from South Carolina has placed before us, and which is being argued for, the amendment that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteen amendment? When the clamar comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, that they have the right to determine their franchise for themselves? I say: are you the Senator from South Carolina? The constitution which the Senator from South Carolina has placed before us, and which is being argued for, the amendment that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.
voters of my State is upon that question other than the individual opinions that people may entertain upon the question. From the provision that I have just quoted, it is evident that the framers of the Constitution were in pretty close touch with the sentiment of the State—I believe that a vast majority of the present voters of the State who are men are opposed to woman suffrage in the State of Connecticut. I am absolutely certain that a vast majority of both the women and the men of Connecticut are opposed to woman suffrage in the States. If three-quarters of the other States of the Union telling them what the qualifications of the electors of the State of Connecticut shall be.

I believe that this country has become prosperous and great partly by the exercise of home rule and the people of the different localities in this country minding their own business and, by minding it, developing a capacity to manage it. I may be wrong about that. It may be that the various localities of this country should transfer all the powers which the States which formed this Union reserved to themselves to the Federal Government here in Washington, but I do not believe it. I do not believe in the world that we will get stronger by abandoning the exercise of these functions than we would be by exercising them. It contradicts the laws of history and experience.

In my judgment the framers of the Constitution designed that instrument to be the broad charter of our liberties and the definition of our form of government. They never expected the use of the process of amending the Constitution for putting into the Constitution of the United States a provision which will force the ideas of Congress and three-quarters of the States concide with the ideas of Congress, upon that State and their ideas of what the qualifications of the electors of the other quarter of the States shall be. I believe that this country has become prosperous and great partly by the exercise of home rule and the people of the different localities in this country minding their own business and, by minding it, developing a capacity to manage it. I may be wrong about that. It may be that the various localities of this country should transfer all the powers which the States which formed this Union reserved to themselves to the Federal Government here in Washington, but I do not believe it. I do not believe in the world that we will get stronger by abandoning the exercise of these functions than we would be by exercising them. It contradicts the laws of history and experience.

Sen. BRANDEGEE. Mr. Kirby, in your judgment, do you believe the framers of the Constitution designed that instrument to be the broad charter of our liberties and the definition of our form of government. They never expected the use of the process of amending the Constitution for putting into the Constitution of the United States a provision which will force the ideas of Congress and three-quarters of the States concide with the ideas of Congress, upon that State and their ideas of what the qualifications of the electors of the other quarter of the States shall be. I believe that this country has become prosperous and great partly by the exercise of home rule and the people of the different localities in this country minding their own business and, by minding it, developing a capacity to manage it. I may be wrong about that. It may be that the various localities of this country should transfer all the powers which the States which formed this Union reserved to themselves to the Federal Government here in Washington, but I do not believe it. I do not believe in the world that we will get stronger by abandoning the exercise of these functions than we would be by exercising them. It contradicts the laws of history and experience.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Poynaxxxr in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator from Connecticut regard the adoption of the prohibition amendment by 45 States as conclusive proof that it is a local sentiment and there is no sentiment in the country in their respective subdivisions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I regard it as a violation of the principle about which I am talking, and I say that you Senators voted to perpetrate that which I regard as an outrage upon the States that have not the amendment. I say that if you have the amendment in 45 or 47 States wanted it. The great Empire State of New York, with about 20,000,000 people, does not want it; it never had a constitutional amendment in it, but because you said that other States want it for their States, you think that you ought, in the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law of the land, to force your views upon the Empire State of New York, or any other State. I think that the amendment, except in the States, which is managed by the prohibition lobby.

You may think that is democracy. I do not. I think it is tyranny. I think it is tyranny, because I do not think that class legislation by the Federal Government which forces the Constitution to be put into the Constitution of the United States. I think they regarded them as rules and local laws to govern the people in their respective localities as they wanted to be governed. Having a prohibited amendment put into the Constitution of the United States, I think it rather difficult to refuse to put this woman suffrage amendment into the Constitution of the United States, and because certain States have adopted it, we do if you think it is your duty to impose your notions upon that question upon States which do not desire it and to which it is not adapted, provided you can get three-fourths of the States to concur.

Mr. President, if the people of this country want to be governed in their local customs, to be told what they are to eat and what they are to drink and how much, and when they are to go to bed, and what language they are to use, and to be regulated in every move they make in their daily lives and in their personal habits by a constitutional amendment In the United States Constitution that can never be got out except by a two-thirds vote of each branch of Congress and then a vote of three-fourths of all the State legislatures in addition, you have made a set of police regulations of the Constitution of the United States, and, as the Senator from New York has wisely warned you, it is a process that is calculated beyond all others to drag the Constitution of the United States into the mire and to destroy all respect for it, because you can not enforce a law or even a constitutional amendment against any part of the country. If the arguments against this process will not prevail in the case of two such shining abuses of the exercise of this power, simply because you have the power, as are furnished by this suffrage amendment and the prohibition amendment, they will not prevail in other cases where the clamor is sufficiently strong to intimidate people to violate their traditional policies and the historical traditions of their party. Mr. President, the best explanation of the convention of both the Republican and Democratic Parties was opposed to this constitutional amendment. Both political parties declared after the national convention that the United States was not the place for these amendments, but, of course, like every other issue with which he deals, he says the other way, too; and there has not been a single issue of importance before the country, and there will not be during his administration, upon which he would not split equally for facility and sincerity take either or both sides. Now, having resided for the last six months in a foreign country, he cables to his subversive idolaizers here how they shall vote on this constitutional amendment, they will "come here" with due humility, I have no doubt.

Mr. President, if this process goes on of governing this country by constitutional amendment, we will be at the mercy of an amendment by 45 States at all of constitutional size or of constitutional quality. I for one say that if the people are to be governed by constitutional amendment in their daily habits and life then it becomes necessary that the United States should be governed in the same way, and that shall be the constitutional amendments to which they are to bend the knee and have the yoke adjusted to them. Is there anything unfair or unreasonable about that? We know perfectly well that after Congress by a two-thirds majority of both branches has submitted a proposed amendment to the legislatures of the States that, although it has been extorted from Congress on the supposition that we need not appear to ourselves to it, but simply not obstruct it and pass it along to the legislatures for their action, that immediately we have taken them at their word and shied ourselves into the honorable footsteps of Congress, of being a yoke. We have been far removed sentiment without responsibility to the various legislatures of the States which are of so much superior ability and knowledge to us, and then they immediately turn around and say, "Congress, by a two-thirds majority, has submitted a proposal to us. Do you now demand that your State pass a similar amendment?" Then they use us as the instrument in favor of a thing that was unfair and unwise about it.

It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate that a Senator of the United States is to be lorded over, as it were, by the stars and bars. Mr. President, which, thank God, still waves and sparkles back of your chair, and holds up his right hand and takes a solemn oath to support and sustain the Constitution of the United States without question or condition, that the minute an embarrassing question is presented to him...
he runs like a dog away from it and says, "I do not know anything about it; but there is a cry in my district that I shall not stand in the way of it; and while I do not believe in it, while I respect the right of the people to have any amendment that they may want, it is for people and not for bodies to say that I did not vote for it, and therefore I will stifle it along on to somebody else."

There was one advantage that the United States was not always composed of men of that backwoods and calibre and virility. In the days of Calhoun and Webster and Clay, Senators of the United States were not too proud to think nor too cowardly to stand for their convictions, and they were not supposed to have the right to say that it was not so under that system can be presented under that system can be imposed on the wealth of the country are imposing their will upon the people, and they have a right to do the franchise to the best of their ability. I do not think it will make much difference politically. I suppose the women will probably divide as their husbands and fathers and brothers do, and they will divide upon the issues that are presented to them probably about as the men do.

I have deplored from the beginning the dragging of politics into this question. I have regretted the unseemly and undignified haste of political managers to get themselves in front of the public; the demonization of the position I take. I believe the great majority of the women of this country are opposed to it. When it comes, of course, I know they will vote for the franchise to the best of their ability.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, until the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made his very interesting speech yesterday, it had not been my purpose to take any part in this discussion; for I am as anxious as any one to reach a vote, and thus finally dispose of the subject, as it undoubtedly will be disposed of on this occasion. I think, however, in view of the argument submitted by the senator from Idaho, which unquestionably impressed his audience as it did myself, something should be said in reply to one or two of its features.

During its delivery I asked the Senator how he differentiated between his position at this time and that taken by him on the occasion of his vote upon the prohibition amendment; and his explanation, if I correctly comprehended him, was that inasmuch as he voted for that amendment as he said the people of the States can be better determined by this Congress than it can be by the local States.

I believe that the great majority of the women of this country are opposed to it. When it comes, of course, I know they will vote for the franchise to the best of their ability.
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tection of the individual in his fundamental rights in the States can only be secured, and sometimes not then, by Federal interference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it will not interrupt the Senator, does he think the Federal Government has afforded any better protection against the great aggregations of capital than the States?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it has done so; but that does not affect the soundness of my proposition.

Mr. REED. I am not questioning that at all.

Mr. THOMAS. My proposition is that the States are passing on this duty to the Federal Government, which I think they could more effectively perform if they would do it themselves.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, there has been a measure which clamored for recognition at the last Congress, which proposes that the States shall release themselves from still another burden and require the Government of the United States to assume the duty and bear the expense of educating the people of the country. If there is a phase of the duty of local self-government more obligatory than any other, it is that of the State to educate its citizens and to assume the financial obligations necessary to effectuate that great obligation. Yet members of this body during the expiring days of the last session and since the commencement of this one have been deluged with letters and petitions from associations and individuals who are confronted with a measure which clamored for recognition at the last Congress, which proposes that the States shall release themselves from still another burden and require the Government of the United States to assume the duty and bear the expense of educating the people of the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt it will pass, because it brings Federal money from the various districts of the country, and that is unfortunately regarded as a cure-all for every subject of public discontent.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. REED. It has not been the experience of the Senator from Colorado that many of the movements which look to the extension of the activities of the Federal Government into the States, and the destruction of the State government by Federal employees who want to extend their authority and agrandize the Federal Government increase their compensation, and extend their opportunities into the States, and to that extent diminish the power of the State Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, there is no question that Federal employees, who are now organized, seem to indicate a desire to encourage every movement that increases the number of Federal employees and extends the activities of the Federal Government. That is one of the beauties of civil service in its ultimate stages of development.

But, Mr. President, I do not think it would be fair to place all these on one class of people. Every city in the United States, every community, incorporated or unincorporated, so far as I know, sooner or later comes clamoring to Congress for appropriations for the accomplishment of things that ought to be done, and to say that we have learned a little from the experience of the Federal Government and not become a mere numerical addition to our electoral franchise whose influence and whose power will be extended in some of our larger cities, or why not?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this question, and shall do so but briefly.

My remarks are chiefly provoked by the statements of the Senator from New York. [Mr. Brandegee] that the action of this Congress and the action of the people of the 45 States in the adoption of the prohibition amendment has a tendency to bring the Constitution into disrepute has a taint and less make the people have less regard and respect for the Constitution.

When I heard the statement of the Senator from New York that there were many men in the United States who already now for the sake of disrepute of the Constitution, and that they are proceeding to avoid or evade the effect of this amendment, and that such action would have the effect to bring the Constitution into disrepute with the people of this country, I could not help but think of an instance remembered from away back yonder in the days of my youth when I used to read the Scriptures with my mother, and she now feels aggrieved because of the prohibition amendment.

For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines to Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen.

Whom so called together with the works of Demetrius the silversmith, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.

And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

And the whole city was filled with confusion.

And so on.

The adoption of the amendment to the Constitution, complained of by the Senator from New York, interfered with the business of those engaged in this prohibited traffic, as did the preaching of Paul in ancient days with the sale of images of the idol by Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen.

They have listened in this business that had Government support, a kind of business that had debauched the people of the United States of America; that was entrenched with special privileges; that the people of this country said, "No, this is too long; let it be done.

And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

And the whole city was filled with confusion.

The sentiment crystallized. It spread and extended throughout the country, and it demanded to be voiced, and that the opportunity be given for the States to ratify the amendment that should be proposed. They proceeded with the amendment through the Congress of the United States, according to the rules laid down by the Constitution. It came here from these representatives of the people everywhere. Then it was proposed by Congress, two-thirds of the Members voting for it. It was submitted to the States of the Union, and 45 of the 48 States of the Union voted for it overwhelmingly, according to the rules laid down for adopting amendments to the Constitution.

And now the Senator from Connecticut comes upon the floor and says it was in effect a willful interference with the rights of the people of the other States of the Union and preference to the South. That is the sort of idea he has.

The Senator from New York, because the liquor interests' gain has been taken from them, because they have stirred up this confusion or attempted to, because they have attempted to bring the Constitution of the United States into disrepute on account of their gain having been affected, says now you ought to be careful about adopting this proposed amendment lest you increase that sort of feeling, lest you cause it to spread throughout the country. The saloon people and the liquor traffic do not appear to recognize that the world has progressed. They seem to be in the attitude of the man who stood still; and yet they have learned a little, and should not regard all keepers of saloons as traitors to the cause who refused to close their saloons during the three or four hours in which the parade was expected to march. They learned that they should not have made any demonstration without closing the saloons, the agencies that all the people have insisted shall be closed for all time.

The Senator from New York thinks we will bring the Constitution into disrepute by adopting an amendment as provided in the Constitution.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood] has offered this amendment, and he has offered it not to improve the condition, but the condition of the South. That is the sort of idea he has. He is not in favor of the proposition of permitting women to vote. He makes no concealment of that fact. He
has not been in favor of it. He is not in favor of it now. He offers this amendment to injure the cause and not to help it. Why on earth should this amendment be rejected? No other amendment of the 17 amendments to the Constitution of the United States has ever been submitted to conventions in the States. It has never been attempted to be done before. It is permitted under the Constitution, but it has never been attempted. It has never been done heretofore, and why should it be employed now on this question, and why should it be proposed by an enemy of the resolution and expected to be indorsed by those who are its friends? I say it is to vote in comparatively a very few States, and in this way they laid down when the Constitution was made for amending and changing it. That seems to be the idea some of them have.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Brandegee] inveighed against the degeneracy of the times. He talked about those ancient Senators of great ability and great courage who stood and the way they laid down when the Constitution was made for amending and changing it. That seems to be the idea some of them have.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Brandegee] inveighed against the degeneracy of the times. He talked about those ancient Senators of great ability and great courage who stood there and took the same oath that those Senators in those degenerate days take. He said they were courageous, that they were patriotic, that they regarded their oath when it was taken. I do not know whether the Senator thinks he is more loyal and more patriotic and more courageous than the Senators who were supporting this amendment or not. He may be more able, but I will not even make any concession on that point.

That is the condition we are confronted with here to-day. No other amendment to the Constitution has ever been proposed in such a way as it is attempted to propose this. It has never been done. All the legislatures in the States are elected by the people. They are sent to their different assemblies representing the people. They will vote on this question, and if you had a convention and elected these representatives for this particular purposes they would be no more representative of the people than they are now. You are attempting here an innovation, so far as the right to vote is concerned.

As to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] has said, the Senate still seems to be in the unconstructed period. I live in the South. I have lived under the Constitution since I was born, and I have known the country in future that we have no further amendments to the Constitution, that the way they laid down when the Constitution was made for amending and changing it. That seems to be the idea some of them have.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Brandegee] inveighed against the degeneracy of the times. He talked about those ancient Senators of great ability and great courage who stood there and took the same oath that those Senators in those degenerate days take. He said they were courageous, that they were patriotic, that they regarded their oath when it was taken. I do not know whether the Senator thinks he is more loyal and more patriotic and more courageous than the Senators who were supporting this amendment or not. He may be more able, but I will not even make any concession on that point.

The President, Mr. President, I simply want to add a word in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Uxsonwou]. We are already informed through the newspapers that the people in the Union who are protesting against this amendment are the people who are the people for the purpose of passing upon this issue shall pass upon it before the people even have the opportunity to elect a legislature.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator suggests that there is a purpose to call the legislatures of the different States to get immediate ratification. Where does the Senator get any such idea? Where is there anything upon which to base such a statement as a fact?

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator. I have already stated it, if the Senator had been listening. I said it had been repeatedly stated in the press that that is the purpose of the leaders of this movement. I have seen what professes to be quotations by those who have been leaders of the movement. I have generally found that the newspapers have been pretty able to prognosticate the movements to a reasonable extent in the future of the large propositions which has been the citizen of the State of Texas that two of the great papers of Texas are already advocating the calling of the legislature in extraordinary session for the purpose of ratifying this amendment, although the legislature in the State of Texas has defeated suffrage, I understand, the majority amounting to nearly 30,000.

So we may as well understand that it is the purpose of the proponents of this measure to do everything within their power to keep from submitting it in any way to the popular will and to obtain ratification in any manner possible. I expect to hear all of those propositions within the next few months loudly proclaiming their belief in the doctrine that the great people of the country shall in all respects rule. I wish they could bring themselves to an adherence to that doctrine to-day.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. President, only a few words. I have listened with interest to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Kirby] has just said. Of course, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution, and have been from the beginning, but that does not affect the question of the amendment to it, as to which is the better way to reflect popular sentiment in its adoption or rejection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Kirby] has just said. Of course, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution, and have been from the beginning, but that does not affect the question of the amendment to it, as to which is the better way to reflect popular sentiment in its adoption or rejection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, only a few words. I have listened with interest to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Kirby] has just said. Of course, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution, and have been from the beginning, but that does not affect the question of the amendment to it, as to which is the better way to reflect popular sentiment in its adoption or rejection.
Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have not been privileged to hear all of the debate upon the resolution under discussion, and the question I am about to ask may have been fully answered in the debate. The question which I desire to submit to the Senator is this: Is there any valid reason why the question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution now before the Senate, should not be submitted to a vote of the people of the States? For myself, if the Constitution is to be amended, I see no reason for denying to the people of the States the right to vote upon the proposed amendment. There is no question but that the proposed amendment to the Constitution materially changes the framework of our organic law and commits to the Federal Government authority which now belongs to the States.

The proposed amendment is a limitation upon the powers and rights of the States, and likewise is a restriction upon the rights of the people within the States. To deprive them and the sovereign States in which they reside of rights now enjoyed by the States and the people is a very serious matter. If I may be pardoned for further occupying the time of the Senator, I would like to state, because I do not intend to discuss this question, that I cannot bring my judgment to approve of the plan to amend the Constitution of the United States to grant woman suffrage through the Federal Government. While I have for many years been an advanced and earnestly advocated within my State the right of women to vote, and urged that in the State constitution they should have the same political rights as men, I have always entertained the view that the question was one to be determined by themselves. It has been the view of all Democrats and those who believed in our form of government: The proposition now is to overturn the principles held sacred for so many years, and to further intrude upon the rights and the reserved rights of the people. Under our form of Government the States alone have the right to determine the qualifications of electors. If States may not establish their own constitutions and determine their own domestic and industrial affairs, the Union will soon be destroyed. We often speak of the "sovereign States of the Union," and the Supreme Court of the United States has referred to the States as "indestructible." One of the indispensable attributes of State sovereignty is the power to determine who shall hold office within the State. An elector is an official, and therefore an elector holds an office within the State. To deprive the States of the right to say who shall vote and who shall hold office is an abridgment of the rights of the State. It seems to me that this proposed amendment is along the lines of centralization, which, if persisted in, will lead to disastrous consequences. However, I am in the uncomfortable situation of being unable to vote in harmony with my convictions. I represent, in part, a sovereign State; and the mandate of my party and the people of my State requires that I vote for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution for woman suffrage. I am constrained to vote this amendment, I regret to say, because I am compelled to support a proposition by my vote which is so repugnant to my conceptions of the rights of the States, and, indeed, the rights of the people themselves, and which will prove to be a dangerous precedent and a continuing menace to the peace and welfare of this Nation. However, I rose merely to propound the question which I have submitted to the Senator, and not to argue the question so ably discussed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The only reason I have heard was the one advanced by the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Knox) that it was necessary to submit this amendment to the States for the purpose of the late amendments to the Constitution and for the purpose of the late amendments to the Constitution there were at least 10 amendments submitted when the method was new. Those amendments might very properly have been submitted in 1 each State, for there was a large number of them; but my recollection is that the fathers chose the other system. We have followed that system in 17 in this bill, and not the Senator; I think that that is a good reason why we should continue to do so.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that we have been admonished by him and by other Senators to remember the teachings of the fathers and to govern our country by their principles and teachings. Immediately upon the adoption of the Constitution there were at least 10 amendments submitted when the method was new. Those amendments might very properly have been submitted in 1 each State, for there was a large number of them; but my recollection is that the fathers chose the other system. We have followed that system in 17 in this bill, and not the Senator; I think that that is a good reason why we should continue to do so.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, first let me answer the Senator's statement. I have frequently said in this Chamber that I have great regard for the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution and that I did not believe that those policies of government which they had inaugurated and under which we had lived and by virtue of which we have become the greatest nation of the world ought to be discarded and treated lightedly or set aside without mature deliberation, and all of that I reaffirm. But as to questions of policy of government, such questions as the Monroe doctrine, such questions as the United States keeping herself from entangling alliances, to all of these ancient doctrines my distinguished friend and those who are with him have turned aside their faces. Now, the Senator comes to me and asks me, on a mere matter of procedure, not a matter involving the principle itself, that we should be bound by the procedure they took.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator stated he could not understand why the proponents of this measure insisted on the amendment being adopted regularly, as all other amendments to the Constitution have been adopted.

Mr. REED. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator made a statement practically to that effect.

Mr. REED. No; I did not make any such statement.

Mr. KIRBY. I am sorry. I do not understand that that is the position taken by the Senator from Missouri. I understand his argument is that it is a fundamental right of the people of the States in a referendum to decide this matter, rather than that it should be decided by the legislatures of the States. I
do not understand that the Senator has heretofore argued that this is a mere matter of choice between two procedures. I understand his argument to be that it is a question of substantive right of the people to pass upon these questions. I cannot see for the fact that the Constitution is a living instrument which must be adapted to the exigencies of the times. I think that the principles of government which we are considering at present are as important as those that were pursued by the fathers, for obviously they thought it was the better policy. Now, the Senator seems to think that at the present time, at least, the policy of the fathers is not the one we ought to follow.

Mr. REED. Oh, I do not think anything of the sort in the sense that the Senator puts it. There are really two questions presented here: One is, Shall the people of the States be permitted to determine the qualifications of the voters of their respective States—shall that right be taken away from them by a Federal amendment? Upon that I answer that it can and should be taken away, first, because to take it away is indicative of the very genius of our dual system of government, a government by Independent States and by a central nation at the same time. Upon that we have the wisdom of the fathers, for they so wrote the law, and we have the experience of the country and we have the principle of government that the people of every State ought to have the power to name their own electorate, especially when they are discussing a subject which is vital not only on national affairs, and that the Federal Government comes in, contrary to the wisdom of the fathers—to which the Senator from Montana now appeals for the first time in many months and which he has been assiduous in bringing up—depicts precisely what the States of the right they have reserved in their constitutions to themselves to change the qualification of voters, that is an impingement and an impairment of the very structure of our Government: that is the question. But when you come to the question how that Constitution shall be amended, the particular form to be followed is a matter of procedure and is not a matter of principle, except that you may follow a procedure which may be calculated to deny the people a right or calculated to extend to them a right.

It is true, I believe, that in the past we have followed the method of submission to the legislatures and it is legitimate to see what the fathers wrote the Constitution they provided two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am calling the attention of the Senator to the fact that, when they were called upon to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one we propose to follow while you propose another one.

Mr. REED. They proposed two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but when they were obliged to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one that you propose to cast aside.

They proposed two methods, and when they came to decide as to which extent you would propose to submit amendments to the legislatures of the States. Very well; let the precedent stand for whatever value there is to it; but let me call attention to the difference in the conditions. In those situations the population all over the country, the fact that every man was closer to the public questions of the day, the fact that every one of these questions had been discussed for years and years, that the principles of government which were then the constitutional amendments upon which the vote was about to be taken had been the subject of debate, and political alignments had been made, so that a legislature elected might be well advised to go there instructed and with a full understanding of what the people wanted, may have been very great factors in determining the question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think the Senator is quite right about that. The very subject before us, however, has been debated before the people of this country for 75 years or more.

Mr. REED. Now, I will answer that. The very subject before us has been debated by the people of the United States—by a few of the people of the United States—for a good while; it has been debated by a few agitators.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator think that as many have participated in that debate as participated in the debate of the fundamental principles expressed in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. REED. I will tell you how the debate has been conducted in my State. I know something about what has gone on there. It has been the subject of laughter and jest more than of any serious consideration. There have come, in the past few years, all kinds of people asked to address audiences that were called together by Democrats or Republicans. They have been accorded the platform and have spoken their little piece, bowed themselves out, and the business of the evening went on. Nobody regarded it in a very serious way. We had a vote on it. There was not any debate during that campaign on woman suffrage, except on one side. Some of the ladies turned out and spoke for it. I believe I state the truth when I say that the great mass of the people were not interested, and when they got through the people voted it down by 140,000 majority.

In the days when the Constitution was first amended, when the Bill of Rights was added, when Thomas Jefferson was publishing in his two hands, figuratively speaking, the lovers of liberty and moulding them into a tremendous force for the perpetuation of liberty, the burning issues of liberty were flaring in the hearts of all the people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And he submitted them to the legislatures of the States.

Mr. REED. Yes; he submitted them to the legislatures. They are the full benefit of that. Now, I am going to show you a reason that ought to appeal—and would appeal to anybody but a suffragist—why this ought to be distinguished from the ordinary method of submission. Several States of the Union had the original right to fix the qualifications of their voters, and they proceeded in nearly every instance to write those qualifications into their constitutions. They did so for the purpose of depriving the legislatures of any power or right ever to change the qualifications of the voters of the States. Upon such a submission as that, and we have reserved to ourselves in our constitution the right to fix the qualifications, the least that this body can do is to preserve to the people in the form and manner of submission the rights that are reserved to the legislatures of every other amendment, and the line of demarcation and of distinction is so plain that any man, except a suffragist, can see it; and a suffragist can see it, but will not admit it. That is the reason.

I will take a concrete case. I went over it yesterday, but I venture to repeat it in substance. My own State, with 3,500,000 people, has an electorate of about a hundred thousand. Those people have written a constitution and said, "We will not again change the qualifications of voters; the legislature shall not do it." Now, we propose to say to those people, "The legislature shall or may do it; and not only to those rights and privileges which were taken away from the people to show that the Constitution was amended, but it is to be taken away if you do not submit it to the legislatures of other States."

Mr. REED. I am quite content to stop, but I will yield to the best.
holding over for four years—many of them were selected with reference to local issues, with reference to questions not involving woman suffrage at all; so that in submitting to the legislature in many of the States the proposed amendment it will be difficult to show that the question of woman suffrage and the other issues were made up in the same package. The question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution under consideration, was not an issue when they were elected, and they were chosen without reference to their views upon this question.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his statement; it is very clear. That is not all, Mr. President. In ordinary elections in the States, when there is no matter of special importance, it is a very fair guess that the case is not good in getting anybody to go to the legislature who amounts to very much. I do not think that I would be guilty of a breach of courtesy even if I stated the plain fact that there have been those elections in which it is really the best grand jury that can be found, and that in getting the people to the legislature you must have something of the nature of a great joke.

We have the virtues of both, and the vices of neither. I do not know in how many Southern States were so susceptible to influence, because so many scandals broke out in them, that the important matter of the election of United States Senators was taken away from the legislatures altogether. In the Senator's own State of Montana one conference of the two parties I know that the Senator and his colleague took a distinguished part in favor of a direct vote of the people. I do not remember whether it was decided by the Senate what the amendment should be; I do not know, if we keep on having these expensive elections, whether we will have improved the moral tone of the method of election. That is a question to be determined in the future.

Mr. President, there are some Senators here from the South. I want to talk to them for a minute, not on the lines pursued by my friend Mr. Sumr this morning. I leave that argument to Senators from distinctly Southern States. Montana is in the twilight zone, in a way, between the North and the South. We have the virtues of both, and the vices of neither. I do not know how many Southerners in the Senate have improved the personnel of the States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question in a moment, and let me pursue for the present the line I was on?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad then to answer it; and if I start to take my seat without answering it, I hope somebody will call my attention to it, because I think the answer is very simple, plain, and easy.

Now I address myself to other Members from Southern States.

We all know that it has been the commonly understood situation that in the South the women have not desired the right to vote, and hence the sentiment in favor of a direct vote was simply a belated attempt to keep the women from the ballot box. There have been more reasons than one for that. One of those reasons undoubtedly arises out of the race question. Another reason is probably found in the fact that for the most part the ladies of the South are incidentally wedded to their home life, and are but little inclined to thrust themselves into public affairs; and I think I can say, without disparaging the women of other parts of the country, that at least in the South it is the common belief that womanhood that ever beautified and rendered sweet and lovely this old earth is the women of the South. Down in the South you have taught State rights—a doctrine which was originally for the sake of the ladies of the South. It has been always thought the South gave too extreme a construction, that resulted in the endeavor of the South to withdraw from the Union, for I do not believe that right ever existed; but, if I recall aright, a few years ago, when I was serving on the executive committee of the national committee, I think the gentleman from the South said that it was not only the limitation that the State otherwise would have had as a complete sovereignty—that doctrine was a splendid doctrine. It has been close to the hearts of the people of the South. It has been very close to the hearts of all men who have understood the dangers of centralized government. How can men from the South be found who will vote to take away the very thing that constitutes the control of the destiny of every State, that thing being the electorate itself? How can you, who have sought to retain as large a measure of power and control in your own States as possible, go back to your people and justly argue that right which is yours; that right which you have always had; that right which in all your rights, and which, when legislation follows, may be found to constitute the means by which the entire election machinery of the State will go first, and that you may expose to the people of the South that they are not being permitted to vote, and the sisters of the North who belong to the political party that feels that it is losing votes down South get aroused, I want to say to you, that if you are very likely to get some legislation compared with which the force bill will be a gentle and merely persuasive measure. So I say that men of the South ought at least to give their people a chance to vote on this question.

We might just as well look this question in the face. When politics run high, as they will again, and when passion rides in its chariots of fire across this land, as it will again, and when the clamors go up from the dark sisters of the South that they are not being permitted to vote, and the sisters of the North who belong to the political party that feels that it is losing votes down South get aroused, I want to say to you, that you are very likely to get some legislation compared with which the force bill will be a gentle and merely persuasive measure. So I say that men of the South ought at least to give their people a chance to vote on this question.

In the argument to-day—and I am occupying the floor when I did not expect to stand here more than a moment—to which I want to allude, because of the fact that people of the different parts of this country know little of one another. I want to call the attention of the Senators who are from the South to the fact that the people from the different parts of the South are much, much less in the dark than are some of those States than it is to be elected from a great, big State, where they do not know the men so well.

A formation in those States, where their environment and their surroundings, are closer to public affairs than they
are in the great, congested centers. I suppose there is not a lady of any intelligence in the State of New Mexico who does not know all about the distinguished Senators from that State. They know about their past and their present and, as nearly as anything human can judge, they know about what is going to be. They know who are the members of the legislature. They know the questions that are arising out there that affect them and affect their State. They have all been talked to the loudest manner possible that they have not anything else to do, but the life of the whole State is close to them.

Let us take New York City. I do not pick it out as a place of ignorance, but as a place of great numbers. The average lady in New York City does not know the Constitution, and does not know the legislature, and does not know the Senators from Texas. She is not intensely ignorant at that. The problem is not to make any legislation of the Western States. Nobody ever heard me parage the Western States. Nobody ever heard me say that there is a good many people of one State to try to force their views upon another State. Nobody ever heard me say that they have not anything else to do, but the life of the whole State is close to them.

What right have I as a citizen of Missouri, or what right have the people of Missouri, or what right has the Legislature of Missouri, to demand that the people of any foreign State or Texas, when the people of Texas by their vote have just decided that question? And what right has Texas to say who shall vote in Missouri, when the people of Missouri are capable of deciding that question for themselves? I have heard it argued that in recent years--What right have I to go down into Mississippi—a State where I have never had the privilege of visiting, but a State which I respect, and whose people I respect—and try to tell the people down there whom they ought to allow to vote? What right have I to insist that the question shall be submitted to a legislature composed in most of the States of the Union, where we are picked up at ordinary by-elections, of men who have very little to do, and who are sent to the legislature to fill out a ticket? Why, I tell you, sirs, that I have attended many political conventions in my State—and I cite it because it is as good a State as there is anywhere—and I have attended many political conventions where, when we got through making up the rest of the ticket, we would have to canvass the convention to find men who would let us put their names on the ticket for the legislature. Now, why not give the people of these States a chance to elect delegates to a convention, at least? Why not give to the people of the State of Texas the right, before there is any fixing of the qualifications of voters, shall be taken away from them, at least, the right to express their opinions through delegates elected by the people and sent to a convention? How can any man justify a denial of that right?

The Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh] asked me a question, which was—Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me remark that the Senator apparently felt that I was endeavoring to ask him a hard question. I am sure that it was a very easy one for the Senator to answer. I did not intend to put it as a poise to the Senator at all.

Mr. REED. Oh, I know the Senator did not, and I did not mean to ask any reply that would give the impression that the Senator had. I am unfortunate when I talk in doing it in a sort of a hasty way, I guess. I do not mean it. My opinion is that the problem is very easy of solution. All that is necessary in the world is for the legislatures of the various States, when they meet, to pass a simple statute providing for the selection of delegates to a convention, to be held at a certain time, to consider and pass upon the amendment. That machinery may be easily called into play by simply employing the ordinary machinery of elections for the purpose of the purpose. Of course, if that was said, as I said in the matter of preference, just my opinion that comes to me on my feet, that probably could be done best at some general election when the people would turn out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. But, of course, the elections could be held before that, if the legislatures of the States should meet in time, or, if the people of the States, they could be convened for that purpose as well as the other.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the legislature could or could not call a convention, as it saw fit.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And, of course, legislatures that were against woman suffrage would not call a convention.

Mr. REED. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would be the natural political tendency, would it not?

Mr. REED. I would not say so. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it not a fact that it would result first, in a contest before the legislature over the question as to whether a convention should be called, then a contest would occur before the people over the election of delegates to such a convention? What contest would ensue before the convention as to whether it should be adopted or not? And does it not mean there would be three fights over this matter, and that is the reason why the Senator desires to pursue that matter?

Mr. REED. No; that is not the reason, not as the Senator puts it. It is true there might be a contest as to whether the convention should be called, but if there was any large sentiment in favor of the proposition I have not the slightest doubt of its being called even by a legislature that upon a vote on the main question might be against it, and for this reason—Mr. WALSH of Montana. But, Mr. President—Mr. REED. Permit me to complete the sentence. The argument that the people have the right to express their opinion, and this is a means provided for the expression of that opinion, would be a very potent argument.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Senator with the Senator, but he will bear in mind that is exactly what we are now asking and what he is resisting.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We are asking that the people be given an opportunity, and he is objecting even to the submission of it. If he were a member of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, how could he be consistently, with his record here, vote to call a convention?

Mr. REED. The Senator does not state my position with the fairness he usually manifests. You are not asking that the people of Montana have to attend a convention to have a chance to vote. You are asking that the legislatures be given a chance to vote, and we, by this amendment, are asking that the people should be given a chance to vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to ask the Senator just one further question. If this joint resolution had been originally introduced with a proposition to submit it to conventions called in each of the States, would the Senator have voted for it?

Mr. REED. I would have declined to vote for it and for the reason—Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. I say it is a question that belongs exclusively to the people of each State. That is well known to be my position. But if I was a member of my State legislature and the question was presented among the people of the State of Texas, I would have the right to vote on suffrage, and there was any considerable sentiment in favor of it, I would vote to give the people a chance to have that vote and decide that question. Now, I follow the Senator along in his objection. I do not think there would be any difficulty in getting the legislature to pass a law for submission; at least, there would not be any difficulty if there was any considerable sentiment in favor of the measure. At least there would be no difficulty in getting a convention called by any legislature that would ratify this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. Therefore you will not lose an hour or a second there.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The question would be presented in exactly the same way. Those legislatures that are in favor of the amendment would call conventions, and those that were against it would not call the convention.

Mr. REED. Very well. If you had three-fourths of the legislatures of the States in favor of suffrage, you would get your conventions in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly, and you would have three fights to make instead of one.

Mr. REED. Let us discuss the fights as a separate proposition. That point I am making now is that there is no foundation whatever in your claim that you would be delayed because the legislatures would not be called by calling the conventions, because every legislature that would vote for suffrage, that would
vote to ratify this amendment outright, would certainly vote to call a convention. So you do not lose a minute. You do have to go and ask the legislatures to cast that vote, and if you do, that much delay is to be lost while the people of the United States are going down town on business and she knows you are going for a game of poker. [Laughter.] Well, looking for a game of pinochle, then.

Do you want it to be lost by reason of mental attitude, not from lack of mentality, as well qualified for suffrage as men, but when it comes to the question of knowing what you are up to and seeing clear through you, they can see through the little shadiness in the dark of the night and make you look like a star shining when you could not see through them if you had a microscope that magnified a thousand times. They know exactly what you are trying to do here to-day. They understand what you are doing, and they play you one against the other just as women have played with foolish men since Eve and Adam met in the Garden of Eden.

How thrilling it was yesterday when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], standing at his full height and speaking in a round rich tone, said as he waved his finger in the air in true dramatic style, "I shall insist that the Senate remain in session to-morrow until this great measure is passed." Did he see the women flocking to the polls in Indiana and demanding ballots for Watson for anything he wanted? But I warn him. "True Women" are the real champions of referendum democracy. They are fleeing from Indiana if they come to vote will have the right to vote at least to the extent that is provided by the Underwood amendment. How can you deny it to us?

I know some people think this is a political question that ought to be settled so that we can play a little politics. Witness the ambitious rivalry of Democratic and Republican leaders. Democrats got together in the last days of the last session saying if we do not put this through the Republicans will put it through at the next session. So we will put it through regardless of the merits, in order that we may get the votes of the women.

Mr. PHelan. Mr. President.

Mr. REED. And when this session is convened, behold the spectacle! Before the new committees were organized the Democratic chairman rushed forward with this bill, without a report from a committee, standing here like another Ajax, not defecting the lightning, not giving the Republican Party ready to give you suffrage," all in the hope of getting the votes of the women.

Then upon the other side there is the little filibustering tactics to delay action by the Democrats, so that committees may be organized and the Republicans can bring in the bill and they can coddle the ladies and deceive them by the ardor of their advances. Although there is business of the most pressing character, and although appeal after appeal has come for hearings, they have set aside all that, and the manly form of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], stretched to its fullest height, is visible upon the floor demanding unanimous assent, by attitude and manner at least declaring to all these ladies, "behind, I alone am the true lover of women. The Republican Party has always opened its hearts and its arms and its embrace to your cause, and we are the real champions of this measure."

Why this performance? For the cheap clap-trap political purpose of getting some votes, not because of the merits of the cause, and have understood your motives from the first, and we know as well what you are up to as your wife knows when you tell her you are going down town on business and she knows you are going for a game of poker. [Laughter.] Well, looking for a game of pinochle, then.

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

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to say that my view of the situation is that jewelry is vulgar. The diamond is useless entirely on who wears it and how it is worn. Of course, a diamond on a dirty shirt front does not look well, but I have seen diamonds so worn that they shone with a brighter luster than diamonds in the unpolished state. I venture the prediction that, whereas you may gain some-
The Senator asks me whether a better result could have been obtained if the people had had a direct vote. I can only answer "yes." I believe that the people would have acted more wisely and the benefit of the State. I think California is progressive enough to have the referendum vote.

Mr. PHelan. Mr. President—

Mr. Reed. I will gladly yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHelan. I was about to interrupt the Senator a moment ago. Mr. President, to ask him if it is not true that Congress would provide for the calling of conventions or in order to secure an expression from the people of the States. The Senator seems to assume in his argument, in answer to the Senator from Montana, that it would be necessary for the legislatures to call conventions. I did not so intend. I said it was the way it could be done. I did not mean to say that Congress could not provide it.

Mr. PHelan. That would defeat your purpose if it was only possible for the legislature to call the convention?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; it would not defeat it.

Mr. PHelan. You seem to have a poor opinion of the legislature.

Mr. REED. I have not a very exalted opinion of them. There was a time when men like Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson sat in the assemblies of their States, but really and candidly I do not know of any body of that caliber who is running for the legislature in any State just now.

Mr. PHelan. The Senator seems to have interrogated me on the question of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. It is run under the referendum and will probably support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. California is the home of the referendum. We have perfect confidence in our people and we consult them, and in this amendment before the Senate I have no question of doubt as to the response which California will make, because it is already a suffrage State. I believe in the principle of the referendum and therefore shall support the amendment.

Mr. REED. I am delighted to find the Senator of that opinion.

Mr. PHelan. May I be permitted to finish my statement?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. PHelan. I wish it were incorporated in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama that Congress should provide for the calling of the conventions. I would not like to leave it to the legislatures, because you first have to secure the legislature before you can secure the convention.

Mr. REED. Would you think, if we may just converse a moment about it, that there would be any question of your legislature calling a convention?

Mr. PHelan. The people instructed our legislature—that is to say, by referendum—against prohibition, and the legislature the other day voted for prohibition. There seems to be no question of the people's will on that score.

Mr. REED. So much the more reason then for submitting this question and any other question of importance to the people.

Mr. PHelan. The people are always right. Of course, they make mistakes, but the people have the right to say. I think we should agree on that, and if the people make a mistake they can correct it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President. The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Missouri seems to be rather severe on legislatures. Did not the legislature of Missouri once elect the Senator to the United States Senate?

Mr. REED. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. MYERS. No; I have another question. Do you think any better result would have been obtained if there had been a direct vote of the people?

Mr. REED. I will answer both questions. First, the legislature elected me to the Senate after the people had a primary that instructed them to elect me—a State-wide primary, where we were also primary.

Mr. MYERS. A primary of your party only?

Mr. REED. Yes; a primary of my party held under the law under which every man running on the ticket that I was on was entitled to vote in the legislature. I would vote for the Republican candidate. I got a majority of the votes of the State, and I likewise got a majority of the votes in the legislature.

The Senator asks me whether a better result could have been obtained if the people had had a direct vote. I can only answer "yes." I believe that the people would have acted more wisely and the benefit of the State. I think California is progressive enough to have the referendum vote. I do not know but both of them made a mistake. [Laughter.] I do not claim infallibility for either of them. I do not claim the legislative process always to be right. I would not be so understood. Many splendid and very patriotic men get into legislatures; very stupid men get into legislatures; many men who act for selfish motives, and would not vote, along with me, voted to take the right away from the legislatures to elect Members of the Senate. I believe he voted with me on it; I know if he did he stood with me on it, for legislatures have been freed from the bond of conventions.

Now, I am delighted to find what the Senator from California says, and if I was understood as meaning that Congress could not provide the means, I was misunderstood. I directed myself to the question of the Senator from Montana, and I answered him in part merely and answered otherwise, and thank the Senator for his correction.

Mr. President, if we could get one or two more votes of men who believe in the initiative and referendum, we would be all right here to-day.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me for an interruption?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to point out to the Senator that, even should the Senate adopt the amendment, it would be of no utility, I think I can say that in the present make-up of the committees of conference the conference would recede in five minutes from the Senate's amendment, because both the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate are opposed to this amendment or to any other amendment. The Senator from Missouri knows as well as I know it.

Mr. REED. Well, not the Senator—

Mr. ASHURST. Let me finish. Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. What I say here is as well known as any fact can be to anybody, that both the committees are opposed to any amendment of any character whatever; that the conferences would recede three minutes; the report would come back to this body; and the conference committee's report would not be received, but would be accepted. We would simply have lost a body which we have been fooling ourselves and other people in attempting to do a vain and useless thing.

I repeat, I am without sympathy for the amendment, but it is no practical use whatever to urge it now. Mr. REED. Has the Senator from Arizona concluded?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator brings me some information which always I knew as well as well, I did not know it. I did not know that the committee of either House of Congress would deliberately betray its instructions.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me there?

Mr. REED. Let me finish the statement, and then I will yield. Whenever the conferences go out from this body with their minds made up in advance that they will not endeavor to carry out the action of this body, they go out to betray the body—

Mr. ASHURST. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. And I am not prepared to say that is the situation.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is uniformly courteous, though a times he uses, as I myself do—I am a very frequent sinner in that regard—a word now and then that has a little sting to it. The conferences on the part of the Senate who would be appointed would not betray the conference of the Senate who would be appointed—goes very far from fulfilling the obligations of his position. I will put it in that way.

Mr. ASHURST. That might be true; but I will ask the Senator if he does not believe that what I have related would be exactly the thing that would take place? If we put this amendment on, does not the Senator believe that that would take place?
Mr. REED. No; I am not prepared to think that, because I think it would be discreditable on the part of the Senate to confer on themselves the right of saying that the great and mighty question the source from which the amendment comes. No man has a higher regard for the ability and the stalwart statesmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood] than have I, but it is true that, if I were to use the language of a legislative body, I should say that this particular one singled out and have it ratified in this way, I trust, however, that we shall pass a joint resolution submitting an amendment to the Constitution providing that hereafter no proposition shall be ratified by a State except by the vote of the people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Rezn] will allow me, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Ashurst] that the fathers some 125 years ago in writing this Constitution provided a method by which the voice of the people might be heard. I listened with deliberation and care to the proponents of this measure for many days, and I am ready to say, it seems stronger from the proponents of the measure, but when no one on that side, after advocating the submission of this question to the people, can find an argument by which the voice of the people might really be heard, I feel that it was not rushing in; that with due modesty I might myself propose it.

Mr. ASHURST. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Rezn], but I want to say again that for the statesmanship of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama I have the highest regard. Indeed, so far as I am concerned, this spirit of independence, I am inclined to overrule it at times.

Now, another thing—and I hope I am not offensive when I say it—I am very certain that, even if we should attach this article of amendment by consent to the Constitution, the propriety of the legislatures of the proposed constitutional amendment, neither the distinguished Senator from Missouri nor the able Senator from Alabama would vote for the joint resolution.

If the Senator from Missouri will pardon me for occupying his time, I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Arizona thinks that because some 15 or 18 amendments have been adopted by the legislatures of the States that foreclose the other method provided in the Constitution. Let us see if to that. Ten of the amendments constituted the Bill of Rights, which it was understood would be adopted in the beginning when the original instrument was agreed to. Three amendments grew out of the Civil War, settling a great contest between the people of the sections of this country. Necessarily there was no issue made as to the right of the people to vote on the adoption of those amendments. In the case of the first 3 amendments all of the States were for them, the people were for them; and in the case of the 3 amendments growing out of the Civil War the South was on its back and the North was determined to ratify them and put them in the Constitution. As to some of the later amendments—for instance, the one changing the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to an income tax—almost every man on this floor, every man in the State legislatures, and the people themselves recognized that the people had the right to levy an income tax, and that only by a divided court had that power been taken away from them.

As to the amendment providing for the election of Senators by the people there was an amendment in opposition. Why delay the situation in that case when everybody was for it? But when you come to an amendment of this kind, the second direct attempt to include the sovereign power of the State and the power to the Federal Government, It is not such a question as was
involved in the original amendments; it is a question that involves the very fundamental principles of our Government, a question that involves the people of the States. And is it not adroitly seen, and he is aware that the method of ratification by legislatures is so bad that he proposes to support an amendment to the Constitution which permanently takes away from them the right of ratification of amendments to the Constitution and confer that power upon the people. When the Senator comes forward with his amendment he will be met with the antiquity argument just as completely as he can now submit that argument will then be made, "You are trying to change something that has existed all these years." If it be true that the State legislatures and Congress together have perverted the very force of our Government that danger is great enough so that the Senator is willing to support a constitutional amendment to change it; and if that method is, as he described it, archaic and unfair, then why not one chance which is now afforded in the submission of the proposed pending constitutional amendment? Let us submit this proposed amendment in a fair way. Why submit it in an unfair way and archaic way? Why not submit it in a fair and modern way? The argument goes too far, but it is adroitly made.

I know the Senator from Arizona is distressed. He does not like to deny the people of his State a right to vote on any question that concerns them. He is the advocate of a Democratic party. Give them a chance to vote on it. Give the people of my State a chance to vote on it. I am begging for that; I am asking it in the name of over three and one-half million people. If you are going to amend the Constitution and force an amendment upon the people of my State, at least give those people a chance to express their opinion. They are a great people—enough greater than the people of other States, but as great. They represent the best there is in education, intelligence, patriotism, independence, and love of country. Let them have a chance to have a vote to select delegates to do the thing that you say ought to be done. Let us have a chance now, not to-morrow. If it is good and righteous and fair to change the Constitution so that the people of the States will always have the right—if that is a good thing to do—why not do it now? Why not do that good thing to-day? Why not deal with the question that is before us?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is one of the ablest lawyers I have ever seen, and he is aware that in running all throughout the law the word "prejudicial" of the rule of procedure shall not be changed nor the statute of limitations shortened while the cause is pending. Mr. REED. Ah; but the cause is not pending until the vote is taken here.

Mr. ASHURST. It has been pending, I think, if not technically at least practically for four years. One of the reasons why I would not at this time vote for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is that I think it would change the remedy while the case is pending. It would be unusual; it would be analogous to shortening the period of the limitation right after the notice of a trial.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; when the trial is on and rights have been fixed under the law then existing, of course, you can not change it; but this is a question that has not yet arrived at a point where it would be "become." When the cause shall submit it to the people, then it may be said to be in that shape; and if after it had been submitted we were to undertake to change the method of submission, there might be something in the Senator's argument; but it is more specious than it is persuasive.

But, Mr. President, because the question has been discussed, surely does not justify the Senator's position, for there is not a word that will be inserted in the amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the next 50 years that will not have been discussed in some form or other at some time. No; the Senator has not to go back on a referendum or else support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. I hope he will support it; I am begging him to support it; I am asking him in the name of the people of a great State who will not be given any chance to express their opinion and the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is adopted. If they are for it, they ought to be allowed to register their will; and if they are against it, no one ought to deny them the right to protest effectively.

There is another reason that I want to offer. I have often wanted to go to the Senator's State—I have heard so much about it—and I have been so pleased with the people of that State. I wish I had not to go there. I do not want to look at the Senator's State except as I hear about it and read about it. The Senator knows more about Arizona in a moment than I could learn by reading and studying for 5 years or 10 years, for the people of Arizona are distressed. He does not embrace the chance which is now afforded in the submission of the proposed constitutional amendment. Mr. Reed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood].

Mr. PHelan. Mr. President, the objection that has been made to the amendment is that the proposition for suffrage amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the next 50 years that will not have been discussed in some form or other at some time. No; he has not to go back on a referendum or else support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. I hope he will support it; I am begging him to support it; I am asking him in the name of the people of a great State who will not be given any chance to express their opinion and the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is adopted. If they are for it, they ought to be allowed to register their will; and if they are against it, no one ought to deny them the right to protest effectively.

There is another reason that I want to offer. I have often wanted to go to the Senator's State—I have heard so much about it—and I have been so pleased with the people of that State. I wish I had not to go there. I do not want to look at the Senator's State except as I hear about it and read about it. The Senator knows more about Arizona in a moment than I could learn by reading and studying for 5 years or 10 years, for the people of Arizona are distressed. He does not embrace the chance which is now afforded in the submission of the proposed constitutional amendment. Mr. Reed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood].

Mr. Reed. 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
Morgan
Mr. McNary
Smith, Md.
Bankhead
Harding
Mr. Moynihan
Smith, S. C.
Beauchamp
Bryant
Mr. Myers
Speier
Borah
Harrison
Mr. Nelson
Stanley
Brandegee
Henderson
Mr. New
Sterling
Calder
Hobson
Mr. Newberry
Sumner
Capper
Johnson, Calif.
Mr. Norris
Swanson
Chamblerson
Jones, N. Mex.
Mr. Nugent
Thomas
Chamberlain
Jones, Wash.
Mr. Overman
Trammell
Cummiskey
Kelley
Mr. Pauley
Underwood
Dial
Keaton
Mr. Peake
Wadsworth
Dill
Keay
Mr. Philbey
Welles, Mass.
Dingle
Keyes
Mr. Pettman
Walsh, Mont.
Fazio
Key
Mr. Peixoto
Warren
Fellows
Kellogg
Mr. Pinkston
Weatherford
Fall
La Follette
Mr. Reed
Welles
Fallall
Lemert
Mr. Reed
Woolcott
France
Lodge
Mr. Sherman
Woolcott
Frenchy
Logan
Mr. Sherman
Woolcott
Gay
McKellar
Mr. Smith, Ark.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood].
Those of us who are in favor of national suffrage, and also in favor of the determination of all questions affecting the amendment of the Constitution by a vote of the people, desire to see that the amendment shall be given to the people to vote on. I think that I have prepared an amendment to the amendment, with a view of facilitating the early determination by the people of their will upon this subject, so that there will be no needless delay.

I will read the amendment in order to comment upon it:

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama reads as follows:

Amended, etc., That the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in the several States.

The Constitution, as the Senate is aware, provides for ratification by three-fourths of the several States "by the legislatures or by conventions, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress." Therefore the Congress can propose, as the exclusive method of ratification, ratification by conventions; and I take it that the Congress can also propose the method by which these conventions may be called.

I would oppose leaving it to the legislatures for the very reason that the legislatures might, if unduly influenced, delay the ratification by delaying the calling of the conventions. So an amendment before me is to be called.

That is an arbitrary date, but it serves the purpose of expediting what is the will of the electors, and allows ample opportunity for the campaign of education. I therefore submit that as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama as the legislatures will not all meet for several years, this plan will, I believe, bring about an earlier ratification.

While I am on my feet, I happen to have here a very eloquent testimony of the wisdom of submitting all matters to a vote of the people. I do not know that it is entirely relevant; but it is doubtless interesting, and especially to Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

If California, the referendum has been frequently used. California was among the very first States that resorted to the Constitution by a vote of the people, desire to see has not been sufficiently.

It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama the following:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be voted for at large.

I shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

That is an arbitrary date, but it serves the purpose of expeditiously determining what is the will of the electors, and allows ample opportunity for the campaign of education.

Therefore I submit that as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. As the legislatures will not all meet for several years, this plan will, I believe, bring about an earlier ratification.

I therefore submit that as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. As the legislatures will not all meet for several years, this plan will, I believe, bring about an earlier ratification.

While I am on my feet, I happen to have here a very eloquent testimonial of the wisdom of submitting all matters to a vote of the people.

I do not know that it is entirely relevant; but it is doubtless interesting, and especially to Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

If California, the referendum has been frequently used. California was among the very first States that resorted to the Constitution by a vote of the people, desire to see has not been sufficiently.

It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama the following:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The President pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The President pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The President pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The President pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.
So Mr. UNDERWOOD’s amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, in February last, when the vote was taken on the woman suffrage question, I explained my position briefly at that time. My position to-day, Mr. President, is the same as it was then. There is no doubt in my mind that women should be given the right to vote. There is doubt, however, that they will ever receive the privilege they are now asking by the methods which some of their supposed friends have adopted—a fact that they have finally secured the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment and to submit that amendment to the legislatures of the various States of the Union. The advocates of the Susan B. Anthony amendment have won a great victory and are justly entitled to all the praise and honor which comes with the winning of a battle which has been fought for so long a time. It is not my intention to attempt to delay this legislation, but I do desire to present here and now an amendment which I believe would be ratified by the necessary 36 States at the next meeting of their legislatures. I present this as a substitute for the amendment which is now before you. The amendment which I am about to present was drafted by the former first assistant attorney general of Louisiana and by the Democratic national committee men from that State when this matter was under discussion during the last session of Congress. It meets the objection that many have to the Susan B. Anthony amendment and is more liberal perhaps than the amendment which I have already presented for your consideration.

Section 2 reads that the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any law in conflict therewith, then Congress shall have the power to exclude from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

Mr. President, gives to the various States the right to enact such laws giving women the right to vote. It does not leave all questions to Congress, but puts the matter where those who believe in State rights consider the power should be vested.

I, Mr. President, only require 13 States to prevent the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and I predict that there are 13 States that will never ratify the amendment which the Congress of the United States is about to present to the American people. The last vote in the State of Texas shows full well how the wind is blowing. With the passage of the amendment which I am now presenting to you as a substitute for the other amendments which have been defeated or by which objection would be removed and the right of suffrage to those noble, patriotic, and splendid women of our country who have so long fought for this right and who so richly deserve the privilege. I offer the amendment which I ask the Secretary to read. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The Secretary. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute: 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. That the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. That the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any laws in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

Mr. GAY. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. TRAMMEEL (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last vote concerning my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay." That concludes the call.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained from the Senate by illness.
his family. He is paired as previously announced. He desired me to state that if present he would vote "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERSHING). Understanding, however, that if he were present he would vote just as I am about to do, I am at liberty to disregard the pair for the nonce. I vote "aye."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. ROBINSON), who would have voted for the joint resolution if present. He is paired and his pair has been announced.

Mr. McLEAN. I find that I can transfer the pair which I heretofore announced to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. POMEROY), which I do and vote. I vote "aye."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. POMEROY), for whom a pair has been arranged, is unavoidably detained outside the Capitol and unable to be here. I wish to announce that if present he would vote against the passage of the joint resolution.

The roll call resulted—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ashurst
Capper
Chamberlain
Collins
Cummins
Curtis
Edgar
Elkins
Fall
Fernald
Fernley
Frelinghuysen
Gresham
Hale

McComb
Harriman
Henderson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, N. Mex.
Jones, Wash.
Kellogg
Kendrick
Keely
Kirby
La Follette
Leverett
McCarran
Mccumber
Bosler
Lodwick
Rhoads
Johnson, S. Dak.
Pease
Sherman
Sherman
Sheppard
Smith
Smythers
Smythers
Smithson
Swanson

NAYS—25.

Banham
Beckham
Borah
Brady
Dial
Dillingham
Fletcher
Gay
Harrison
Hitchcock
King
Lodge
McLean
McCormick
McNary
McNary
Myers
Nelson
Norris
Owens
Pease
Pease
Pease
Pease
Pease

NOT VOTING—15.

Ball
Bancroft
Calder
Curtis
Davis
Delano
Doane

Owens
Johnson, S. Dak.
Pease
Pomerene
Reliance
Roosevelt

Treaty of Peace.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being Senate resolution 12, which will be stated.

The SENATE. Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California May 20, as follows:

WHEREAS the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

WHEREAS a synopsis only of the treaty has been given public notice in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents; and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

WHEREAS it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California whether he will be willing to have his resolution temporarily laid aside in order that a little routine business may be transacted?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My intention was not to press the resolution this evening, but to ask to have it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I thought that was the Senator's inten-

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the resolution can temporarily be laid aside we can transact some minor business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the suggestion is made by the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution be temporarily laid aside in order that some business which he has in hand may be transacted. As I understand the rule, in order that the resolution shall not be displaced it is necessary to secure unanimous consent to have that done. I am very agreeable to the request. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside temporarily to be taken up to-morrow as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside to be taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I would not want to exclude taking it up before 2 o'clock if other business before then is disposed of.

Mr. SWANSON. That would have to be done by motion. It comes up as the unfinished business at 2 o'clock. If it is taken up before 2 o'clock, it must be taken up on motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but if we agree to the unanimous consent that it can not come up until 2 o'clock, it could not be taken up prior to that time, even by motion.

Mr. SWANSON. It would come up at 2 o'clock at any rate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that anything in the nature of morning business can be done by unanimous consent without laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think if the Senator simply makes the request to lay the unfinished business aside temporarily, to hold his place, it will retain its place and then come up automatically.

Mr. LODGE. Then it can be taken up at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it may be taken up after the adjournment of morning business, to be taken up at 2 o'clock if the morning business continues that long. Then it comes up automatically. Is that understood?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Undoubtedly.

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator to withdraw that motion for a moment.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; I withdraw the motion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have read the resolution which I send to the desk, and that it lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska:

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

WHEREAS the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany, while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

WHEREAS the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LONG, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York, and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

WHEREAS the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are pecuniarily interested in the treaty, and that said interests are particularly interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same; to require the Senate for expenses therof, including the cost of travel, 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 recesses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to remind the Senator that the request of the Senator from California [Mr. Joubert] has been disposed of.

Mr. KING. I understand that it had been disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the request of the Senator from California had been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I understood there was no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate hears the request of the Senator from California. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what disposition was made of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska?
Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska goes, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

That provision is that it will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the rule.

Mr. FITZMAURICE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think it proper to go to the fight over Control of the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I presume it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. We have discussed that many times.

Mr. FITZMAURICE. I ask that the resolution lie over until tomorrow, if that is agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Branford, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch Connecticut Society of the Order of Columbus, of Hología of Suffield, Conn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Guilford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorial of sundry employees of the Oakville Co., of Waterbury, Conn., representing against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorial of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Waukegan, the Baptist Church of Plantsville, the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Manchester, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stratford, the Methodist Episcopal Church of New Britain, the South Farmington Holy Family Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Milford, of the North Methodist Episcopal Church of Manchester, of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Congregational Church of Norwich, and of sundry citizens of Ridgefield, all in the State of Connecticut, representing against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARDING presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 138, S. N. P. J., of Nottingham; of Local Lodge No. 153, S. N. P. J., of Youngstown; of Local Lodge No. 5, S. N. P. J., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 92, S. N. P. J., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 73, H. Z. J., of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 8, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 9, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 14, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 22, N. C. S., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 275, S. N. P. J., of Maynard; of Local Lodge No. 388, S. N. P. J., of Power Point; of the Slovenian Benefit Society, of Barbers; of Local Lodge No. 17, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 62, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 104, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of the South Slavic Catholic Union of East Palestine; of the St. Barbara's Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian Progressive Benefit Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian National Benefit Society, No. 55, of East Palestine; of Local Lodge No. 353, S. N. P. J., of Pavport Harbor; and of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. KELLOGG, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, having been presented, reported "A Joint resolution in addition to the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, reported it with an amendment as a Senate bill (No. 641) therefor.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

INCREASED INCOME TAXES.

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

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1874) to amend the Articles of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1874) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1875) for the relief of Catherine Grace; to the Committee on Claims.

REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Mr. HENDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1799) to amend sections 2257 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

Hearings before Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to draw from the contingent fund of the Senate the cost of reporting hearings held on Costa Rican matters by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, upon voucher to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, said payment to be made at the rate of 41 per printed page, and not to exceed the sum of $33.

COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufacturers, or any subcommittee thereof, and hereby is, authorized and directed to draw during the current session of the Senate and to print a report on the subject of the European and American War for the purpose of investigating the condition of the manufacturers of the United States, said payment to be made at the rate of 41 per printed page, and not to exceed the sum of $33.

COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to order and have printed 5,000 copies of the annual report of the United States Patent Office for the year ending June 30, 1918, together with the original draft, in Senate Document No. 7, presented by Mr. Putnam under date of March 23, 1919.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I renew my motion 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.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE WITH PANAMA.

The following treaty was ratified by the Senate and the inauguration of secret was removed therefrom June 4, 1919;

ConTENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PANAMA, SIGNED FEBRUARY 5, 1919, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES AND TO INCREASE THE EXCHANGE OF COMMODITIES BY FACILITATING THE WORK OF TRAVELING SALESMEN.

The Senate:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Panama, signed February 5, 1919, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

Woodrow Wilson.

The White House, Washington, March 1, 1919.

The President:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive its advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed February 5, 1919, between the United States and Panama,
1919.
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for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1919.

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama having desires to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Panama, Señor José Edgardo Lefèvre, chargé d'affaires of the Republic of Panama near the Government of the United States of America,

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants, and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the high contracting parties may operate as commercial travelers either personally or by means of agents or employees within the jurisdiction of the other high contracting party, in obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the high contracting parties shall be engaged in the duty of the right to prevent the operation within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this treaty, or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants, and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be verified by the consul of the country in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced in such manner that they can not be put to other uses shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the dispatch of samples.

ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be considered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agents which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

ARTICLE IX.

Any concessions affecting any of the provisions of the present treaty that may hereafter be granted by either high contracting party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or Panama within two years, or sooner if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned, this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunder affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this 8th day of February, 1919.

[Seal.]

FRANK L. POLK.

[Seal.]

J. R. Lefèvre.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. GLENN. Motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 3). 1919.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. E. Simmons to be United States attorney, southern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Wednesday, June 4, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplin, Rev. Henry N. Condon, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, never far from any of us, we call upon Thee out of the depths of the soul for courage, strength, faith, and grace to sustain us through the obligations of this day, that we may be the better prepared for whatever Thou dost lay upon us to-morrow.

Now is the day of salvation. If we live up to the high-water mark of Christian manhood to-day, now, in this world, we need have no fears for the morrow nor for the world that is to come.

To live, to act, to progress is the psalm of life in this world and the world to come.

Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Protect, guide, and strengthen us for the present moment, and all praise and gratitude shall be Thine. In the Great Exemptor's name, Amen.

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

Mr. SEARS rose.

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

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait a moment. Any Members who desire to take the oath of office will present themselves.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GLYNN, Mr. HUDDLESTON, and Mr. LEES of Georgia appeared before the Speaker's desk and took the oath of office.

PROPOSED SOLDIERS' HOME AT ST. CLOUD, FLA.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 3408) to establish an old soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla. I am going to send to the Speaker's desk some petitions that received in support of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not yet obtained consent. Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the subject?

Mr. SEARS. An old soldiers' home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?