

ice as nurses back of the very front lines have received any unusual consideration at the hands of our Government. This fact prompted me to address a communication to the Secretary of War the other day, of which the following is a copy:

JANUARY 29, 1919.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
The Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY BAKER: I observe that the War Department is awarding to a number of officers and enlisted men, both in France and in this country, medals of honor for meritorious services performed during the war, all of which, in my judgment, were well earned; but it occurs to me that there are many women who served with the Army in France in our hospitals who are equally entitled to consideration for services rendered, and if medals of honor can be awarded to these women under the law, I trust that they will not be overlooked.

If, however, you can not do this, I will be pleased if you will prepare and send to me a bill that will cover the situation. This country has reason to be proud of its women, particularly those who have made such great sacrifices to take care of the men who have been wounded in battle.

Yours, very truly,

This letter was published in many of the New York newspapers, and as a result I have received a number of responses, among them the following, which I am much pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate as an evidence of the sympathy existing between the boys who fought overseas and the girls who took care of them when they were sick and wounded:

Mr. President, I now desire to read the following letter:

UNITED STATES EMBARKATION HOSPITAL No. 3,
New York City, January 30, 1919.

Senator CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To-night I read with interest your letter to Secretary Baker regarding medals to be issued to women war workers. Nothing would please the overseas boys more than to see our overseas and home girls receive the service medals so well earned. I know the home girls have done wonderful work in supplying our overseas Army with all the comforts possible. Here in New York they are treating us royal, but, Senator, it brings tears to my eyes when I think of the hardship the girls endured on the other side—the long hours they worked, the conditions they worked under, and the miserable accommodations they had. God bless them. Senator: you have got to be there to fully appreciate what the girls have done for us. I for one will never pass up the big drum again, and I will always honor the Salvation Army. I have seen the Red Cross hospital raided by the Huns and several nurses who gave all—much more than I. I hope the people as a whole will honor all women war workers, as they most surely deserve it.

It is true we left many of our boys over there, but is it not true that we left some of our girls over there as well?

This is one subject Congress can and will agree upon, and I know our President will be more than pleased to award the medals.

How I wished that I commanded words to express my appreciation of all war workers.

Thanking you for your interest taken on behalf of our girls—you know, Senator, we overseas boys call all lady war workers our girls, and we love to think of them as such—and that the honor that is their due will soon be theirs, I am,

Yours, very truly,

Pvt. GUSTAVUS A. BETTS.

Hospital, 1084914.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that in the hurry and rush of war we have failed to pay the tribute due these wonderful women who were willing to make every sacrifice for their country. Thousands of our best women have been with our Army from the beginning of the war, at times under most difficult circumstances, and some have been under fire repeatedly. I have in mind one Miss McDonald, a nurse, who went over with a unit from the Presbyterian Hospital, of New York City. Miss McDonald was wounded at Ypres, losing an eye, and was treated for several months, but returned to service again. I am informed that she received a British decoration, but, so far as I can learn, she has not yet been cited by her own Government. This should not continue a day longer. These splendid women ought not, under any circumstances, to be overlooked. They did more than they were asked to do, not only in France but here in this country as well.

No war was ever won by any nation without the united support of its women, and it is true, indeed, the American women have rendered every service in their power for their country. I call this matter to the attention of the members of the Military and Naval Committees especially, and hope, if legislation is required to properly honor these women, that such measures as may be necessary be immediately brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution was pending before the Senate last fall I offered the following amendment to it:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "sex," insert the following: "but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress shall exercise such right."

At that time, in speaking upon the amendment, I said:

"I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty under our oath as Senators to pass an amendment that will do this."

* * * * *

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize the fact that this is a House joint resolution, and that if any amendment, no matter what it might be, should be offered to it and passed by the Senate it would send the resolution back to the other House for concurrence, and, therefore, it would be impossible to pass the measure during this session of Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That may be a prophecy of the Senator from Colorado, but I am not aware that the ordinary processes of legislation should be stopped by reason of such a prophecy. I want to point out to the Senate, and to make it emphatic, that either we should amend this joint resolution or we should immediately address ourselves to amending our immigration laws before the proposed amendment to the Constitution is ratified in the event it shall pass the two Houses of Congress. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Colorado will allow me to continue, inasmuch as I wish to be placed on record in regard to this resolution—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey decline to yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I trust the Senator will bear with me for just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from New Jersey may not have been in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that no amendment whatever would be in order to the joint resolution, because in the parliamentary status of the joint resolution it has been read a third time, which is the final action that can be taken before the passage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I was in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that ruling; I am aware of it; but I know of no ruling which will deprive me of speaking on the joint resolution, which I am doing at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In my remarks on the occasion referred to I continued:

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4 of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore, the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that a woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization,' said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed around the procurement of citizenship

through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not 'a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government,' and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners, and if the court so directs he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law.

* * * * *

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureaus I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the entire address I delivered on that occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 30, 1918.]

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a few days ago I proposed an amendment to the pending joint resolution. While I realize that the Senate is fatigued, I shall be forced to be away to-morrow if I can arrange a proper pair, and I would like to speak briefly upon my amendment. I ask that the Secretary may read the amendment.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

"The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution add the following:

but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress shall exercise such right.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the avowed and the obvious object of the resolution now pending before the Senate is to place women who are citizens of the United States upon an equality with men who are such citizens in the matter of the exercise of the right to vote; to confer suffrage upon female citizens of this country throughout the length and breadth thereof. My object in proposing an amendment to that resolution is to make it possible, in what seems to me the best way open to us, for the resolution actually to accomplish that obvious purpose and to avoid what seems to me to be the very serious danger that, in the very act of conferring the right to vote upon women and of abolishing the inequalities in that re-

gard which have heretofore existed we shall perpetuate and increase evils already existing and create new ones that will prove a constant and increasing source of embarrassment to us in the future administration of governmental affairs.

"At the outset I desire to make it perfectly plain that I am not opposed to the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment—on the contrary, I am distinctly in favor of its adoption—but my attention has been attracted to the situation which I shall now endeavor to explain to the best of my ability, and I have felt that this situation is so serious that I should be derelict in the performance of my duty as a Member of this body should I fail or neglect to call its dangers to the notice of each and every Member of the Senate.

"With this by way of preface, I shall proceed to state the purposes of and reasons for the additions to the proposed constitutional amendment which I have offered in the form of an amendment to the resolution. My first object is this: To place in the Constitution itself a provision which will safeguard the country against the exercise of the right of franchise in Federal matters by aliens residing or sojourning within our midst. And it has seemed to me that not only is this of such great importance as to justify efforts toward the accomplishment of the reform at any and all times, but the pendency before the Senate of the resolution under discussion affords an opportunity for its accomplishment in an appropriate and efficient manner that ought not by any means to be overlooked.

"Under the constitutions of seven States of this Union aliens now exercise the right of franchise in connection with every elective office candidates for which are ordinarily voted for in the other States, to wit, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Texas. Recognizing the menace to the safety of government of such a policy as this, a number of States have recently amended their constitutions so as to allow only native-born persons and persons who are fully naturalized under the regular legal process to vote therein, to wit, Alabama, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and others that I can not recollect.

"To show the abuses which arise under such a policy, which is contrary to the very spirit of the Federal naturalization laws, attention might be directed to the fact that the following methods have recently been applied in a certain Western State where the declarations of intention made by aliens in the course of a year would hardly approximate two dozen and the declarations made within 30 days preceding and including election day—made under the influence of vote manufacturers—have approximated a thousand or more in several of the courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction in the State. The ambitious candidate has his henchmen line up all the foreigners in the district whom he can enlist. He makes his drive through the industrial plants, foregathers with the aliens in their club organizations, extols the virtues of his candidate—and this applies regardless of party—and by various inducements and blandishments prevails upon the foreigners to assemble at convenient places and in the day and night time the accommodating clerk of the court supplies the necessary blank forms and accepts the statutory fees coming from an appropriate source. Up to and including election day this business continues. All day long, in the presence of Government officials, the stream of aliens has been seen to enter the room where the clerk of the court is located and to leave that room with statements from the clerk showing that the aliens have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and, in the light of the provision of the State constitution, showing also by implication that such aliens have become clothed by the mere act of declaring an intention to become citizens with such character, intelligence, and understanding of our institutions that they are entitled to exercise the franchise in the same way and with the same effect as a person born in our midst.

"Under the resolution pending before the Senate, unless the part of my amendment directed to this situation, or some similar amendment, should be adopted, the evils and abuses to which I am calling attention will not only be perpetuated but will, perhaps, be practically doubled; for if and when the amendment proposed in the resolution is ratified by the requisite number of States, each and every foreign woman now living in the seven States I have mentioned and each and every one who shall take up residence there later who has attained the statutory age will be able to declare her intention, if she is unmarried, and by that simple act will be clothed with the right to vote alongside of the man.

"With this situation existing, any unmarried woman coming from the most anarchistic section of Russia, from the fastnesses of Bolshevism, from the I. W. W. ranks, or from any other source inimical to our interests or even believing in the utter destruction of our Government—any unmarried woman,

matter what her character may be, might be induced in the States mentioned to declare her intention to become a citizen, whereupon she could proceed to stamp the impress of her views and of her character, through the exercise of her right to vote, upon the laws of this country. This is an illustration none too extreme; but even if it should be regarded as extreme, the answer is that we must think through to the very depths of the possibility of an evil if we are correctly to measure the extent of such evil.

"Is it desirable or wise to lay a foundation in a constitutional amendment for the perpetuation of such a situation as this, especially when it may be so easily guarded against? I think not, and because of that view I have inserted in my proposed amendment the provision—

"But no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States.

"And have, in addition, so worded the remainder of my proposed amendment, the direct purpose of which is to meet another situation, to the description of which I am about to proceed, that the same result will be accomplished with regard to females.

"The second object which I have in view is this: To insure that, in conferring the right to vote upon women who are citizens, we do not create a legal situation in which foreign women might, through the operation of the almost universally recognized principle that a married woman's citizenship follows that of her husband, qualify to exercise the franchise in Federal elections, although wholly unfitted by character, education, residence within the country, and knowledge of and regard for its institutions, or otherwise, to have a voice in public affairs. My second object, in other words, is so to change the wording of the resolution before us that it shall be made actually to confer upon women rights equal to those enjoyed in this regard by men, and not greater than those enjoyed by men.

"Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

"The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator rises to ask me a question, I would be very glad to answer it after I conclude. I know the Senate wants to adjourn, and I hope the Senator will not interrupt me now.

"Mr. CALDER. Very well.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I have already remarked, the object of the pending resolution is to place women on the same footing as men so far as the right of franchise is concerned. I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty, under our oath as Senators, to pass an amendment that will do this.

"I do not know who prepared the pending constitutional amendment, but I believe it has been drawn without proper consideration or study of the Constitution and conditions that exist under our naturalization statutes, the careless disregard of them, the abuses that have crept into the making of citizens, and the apparent indifference of some authorities to the grave menace to the institutions of popular government that thus arise.

"In giving to this subject that careful study which its gravity demands, my attention has been attracted to two circumstances in particular. The passage of a resolution of this kind is closely related to the precarious situation in regard to aliens which has been brought about by the war and our participation in it. Congress has been forced to pass drastic laws at the eleventh hour to protect this country against sedition, treason, and deep-seated disloyalty, arising from the fact that so many foreigners reside amongst us and that Germany has carried on a surreptitious propaganda here ever since the war and evidently, from latter-day developments, even for many years before the war. It is not necessary for me to recite the many outrages, bombings, dynamitings, murders, committed by the disloyal foreigners residing here. The consideration of this amendment conferring upon female citizens the right to vote necessarily brings up at this critical time the grave question of our immigration and naturalization laws and policies, especially in their relation to and effect upon women of alien birth already here or who may hereafter come.

"The other particular circumstance was not fully appreciated by me, in its relation to the constitutional amendment as drawn,

until I conferred with officials of the Bureau of Immigration and learned its extent and seriousness. It arises from the abuses that exist in connection with the traffic in women for immoral purposes. While our immigration laws have been framed with the object of protecting society against this traffic, nevertheless many women become citizens of the United States through pro forma marriages contracted simply for the purpose of giving the poor, unfortunate women a status of citizenship under our laws and preventing them from being deported. The pimp, the procurer, these vice scavengers of humanity, products of the swill barrel of foreign lands, carry on their immoral, unspeakable practices almost within the shadow of Ellis Island, the women being brought in from Europe, from the Orient, and from the Latin countries, and, except in the cases of Chinese and Japanese, a pro forma marriage contract can be entered into and these women become citizens of the United States and can not be deported unless the Government can show—under the most recent amendment to section 19 of the immigration act—that the marriage was contracted after the woman became liable to deportation under the law; and heretofore the enforcement of the act has been seriously impeded through the fact that a foreign woman, no matter what her character, can secure citizenship simply by going through with a marriage ceremony, the other party to which is an American citizen.

"The foregoing are the two respects in which, it seems to me, the importance of the second part of my proposed amendment is made especially apparent at this time. I desire now to proceed to a more detailed discussion of the matter in its legal as well as its practical aspects.

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4, of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that the woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization,' said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed round the procurement of citizenship through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not "a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government," and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners; and if the court so directs, he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law.

"What is the object of the resolution? It is to give men and women the same rights under the Constitution, to place them upon an equality in regard to the elective franchise. Does it do that? Will it attain its object?

"Under the Federal statute already quoted an alien woman who marries a man who is a citizen of the United States by birth or naturalization becomes a citizen, and under this resolution, as drawn, she would be entitled to vote; but a male alien or a female alien not married must be naturalized in a regular

court proceeding under our naturalization laws before he or she becomes a citizen qualified under this proposed resolution, as drawn, to vote. Is that equal rights?

"A male alien—a German, for instance—marries an American woman, but he does not thereby become a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment he could not vote by reason of that marriage relation. But a female alien—a German woman, for instance—marries an American citizen, perhaps a German who has been naturalized. She thereby, ipso facto, becomes a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment could vote. Is that equal rights? Certainly not. It is conferring upon married women rights not conferred upon unmarried woman or upon any man—rights which ought not to be conferred upon either women or men in any such haphazard, unregulated fashion.

"Again, the foreign man or unmarried foreign woman must reside here continuously for at least five years before the boon of citizenship will be conferred; but the foreign woman may by marrying a citizen become invested with all the rights and privileges of citizenship immediately upon landing upon our shores, including, if the constitutional amendment as proposed should be adopted, the right to vote. The foreign man or unmarried woman seeking in good faith, through the regularly ordained channels, to become a citizen of this country must be of 'good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.' But in the case of the foreign woman who marries a citizen no such standards are enforced; the marriage, ipso facto, confers citizenship, even though she is of bad character and even though she knows nothing and cares less about the principles of the Constitution. She does not have to be of good character, because the Supreme Court long ago held, in the case entitled Kelley against Owen, Seventh Wallace, 496, that the qualifying phrase, 'and who might herself be lawfully naturalized,' found in section 1994 of the Revised Statutes, means no more than that she must be of the general class—races—for which naturalization is authorized. Under this situation will the rights conferred be equal? Obviously not. Upon this fact too great emphasis can not be placed: If this resolution passes in its present form, foreign women married to citizens will become voters without any of the safeguards of naturalization through court processes.

"Mr. President, how many foreign women are there in the United States?

"The census of 1910 recorded 13,500,000 persons of foreign birth in our population. During the years 1911 to 1914, 3,000,000 more were added, according to the estimate of the Immigration Bureau. This is net—makes allowance for those who returned to their native lands. From 1915 to 1918 it is estimated immigration has been about 300,000 a year, making in these years of the war 1,200,000 immigrants added to our population. The total number of foreign-born persons here would, therefore, seem to be about 18,000,000.

"Mr. President, there are in the United States to-day 5,821,757 women of foreign birth. They are mostly in the large industrial States. I shall not read the statistics relative to them now. Suffice it to say that New York State has 1,296,849; Massachusetts, 526,922; Pennsylvania, 586,085; but that number has been increased by reason of the fact that the figures that I have read are from the census of 1910, and since that time immigration has increased by over 3,000,000. Therefore it is safe to assume that there are nearly 7,000,000 women of foreign birth in this country. I ask to have the letter which I hold in my hand from the Department of Labor giving these statistics inserted in the Record.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter referred to is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"Washington, September 24, 1918.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 23d instant requesting certain data regarding alien women in the United States, and will reply to your inquiries seriatim.

"1. Table 15, page 259, volume I, of the Census Report of 1910, gives the number of foreign-birth white women in the United States as 5,821,757, divided as follows:

New England:	
Maine	52,165
Vermont	21,939
Massachusetts	526,922
Rhode Island	87,442
Connecticut	151,691
Middle Atlantic:	
New York	1,296,849
New Jersey	301,652
Pennsylvania	586,085
East North Central:	
Ohio	251,104
Indiana	62,139
Illinois	528,995
Michigan	261,867
Wisconsin	222,130

West North Central:	
Minnesota	222,521
Iowa	116,052
Missouri	97,040
North Dakota	63,528
South Dakota	40,392
Nebraska	74,284
Kansas	54,096
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	7,496
Maryland	49,857
District of Columbia	11,434
Virginia	9,900
West Virginia	13,773
North Carolina	2,197
South Carolina	2,335
Georgia	5,554
Florida	13,137
East South Central:	
Kentucky	18,442
Tennessee	7,312
Alabama	7,130
Mississippi	3,431
West South Central:	
Arkansas	0,302
Louisiana	22,139
Oklahoma	14,414
Texas	103,162
Mountain:	
Montana	27,081
Idaho	12,345
Wyoming	7,063
Colorado	48,777
New Mexico	7,822
Arizona	16,238
Utah	27,447
Nevada	4,172
Pacific:	
Washington	80,476
Oregon	33,241
California	191,833

"2 and 3. Section 1994 of the Revised Statutes provides as follows: 'Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.'

"Section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 1228), which is merely declaratory of section 1994, Revised Statutes, provides as follows:

"That any foreign woman who acquires American citizenship by marriage to an American shall be assumed to retain the same after the termination of the marital relation if she continues to reside in the United States, unless she makes formal renunciation thereof before a court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens, or if she resides abroad she may retain her citizenship by registering as such before a United States consul within one year after the termination of such marital relation.

"4. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution defines those who shall be deemed citizens by virtue of their birth. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution gives Congress power 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' * * * The various provisions of law under this authority will be found in the Revised Statutes.

"Yours, very truly,

"JOHN W. ABERCROMBIE,
"Acting Secretary.

"HON. J. S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
"United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

"MR. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, it will be seen from the foregoing that we already have here a very large number of foreign-born women. Of course, many of these are illiterate, many have had no educational advantages. Another fact that should not be overlooked is this: The tendency to enter into marital relations is marked among these immigrant races. Of course, we know little or nothing about their loyalty and the real allegiance of these women and less about their character; many of them may be anarchists, nihilists, polygamists, yet these women may, simply through the performance of a marriage ceremony, become citizens of the United States.

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureaus I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been

expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it.

"To hold that it can be tantamount to holding that the Congress can by statute compel a woman who has already been naturalized by marriage and who has by that process of naturalization become as full a citizen as though born here, to go through another process of naturalization—the court process—before she will be allowed to vote, notwithstanding a provision in the Constitution prohibiting the United States or the several States from denying or abridging on account of sex the right of a citizen to vote. No law will or can be passed hereafter in that regard that will protect the electorate against the unworthy or unqualified women who are given this right under this constitutional amendment unless you lay the foundation in the amendment itself by the use of words that will confer upon Congress the power to do so.

"Perhaps it might be thought that the second section of the article of the amendment proposed in the resolution, providing that the Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of the article, would lay a sufficient foundation for subsequent legislation dealing with the subject I am discussing. But I think that, obviously, such is not the case. The purpose of the second section of this proposed article of amendment is exactly the same as the purpose of section 2 of Article XIII, section 5 of Article XIV, and section 2 of Article XV of the Constitution. Its purpose is to indicate which of the three branches into which our Government is divided is to be charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of the particular article; and it confers a power to enforce—that is, carry out; not a power to modify, regulate, abbreviate, or extend. If it conferred a power of the latter character it would, moreover, be absolutely inconsistent with the first section of the proposed article of amendment.

"I contend that under this amendment providing that the right to vote shall not be abridged or denied on account of sex, the right being conferred when this constitutional amendment is ratified by the States, such right having been created through marriage—which marriage relation is possible because of sex—the moment you attempt to compel these women to go through any additional requirements before they exercise the franchise, you will be doing the very thing the amendment prohibits, because you will be abridging the right of a female citizen to vote. Any such statute, if passed, would be unconstitutional. Of course, I do not contend that Congress can not at any time, under the authority conferred upon it by the Constitution to pass uniform naturalization laws, either amend or repeal section 1994 of the Revised Statutes. The power of Congress in this regard is no doubt plenary. This fact might naturally lead some to ask the question, 'Why attempt to cover this point in a constitutional amendment? Why not leave it to Congress to repeal the statute lying at the foundation of the difficulty?' But to such a question there are two sufficient answers.

"In the first place, section 1994, although a statute and therefore open to repeal or revision, is simply declaratory of a principle of law that is almost universally recognized and runs infinitely into important legal questions of both a local and an international nature. It is not likely, therefore, that Congress will ever go so far in amending and extending the naturalization laws as to abandon this principle. And just so long as citizenship can be acquired by women through the performance of a marriage ceremony will there exist the inequalities and evils to which attention has been called.

"In the second place, by such a constitutional provision as that proposed by me, the past as well as the future can be cared for. There are, of course, now in the United States a great many women, formerly foreigners, who have acquired citizenship through marriage. It may be seriously doubted that Congress could legally divest these women of the citizenship already acquired in that manner. The Supreme Court has said, in the Wong Kim Ark decision, already mentioned, that 'the power of naturalization vested in Congress by the Constitution is a power to confer citizenship, not a power to take it away.' But wholly aside from this legal doubt, it would hardly be fair and just to pass a law changing the status of these women from that of citizenship to that of alienage—certainly it would not be just or fair in many of their cases. On the other hand, no unfairness or injustice—and nothing in any sense illegal—is involved in so qualifying the conferment of a constitutional right to vote as to make it possible for Congress

hereafter to enact legislation requiring those whose citizenship arises merely from marriage to meet, in every substantial respect, before they will be allowed to exercise the right of suffrage, the conditions that males and unmarried females are required to meet before citizenship is conferred upon them.

"Accordingly the purpose I have in mind in inserting in my proposed amendment the provision that 'no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by Congress, shall exercise such right' is to pave the way for the passage through Congress, in the event that the constitutional amendment should be adopted, of a law which would compel foreign women who acquire citizenship in the instantaneous and unregulated manner of going through a marriage ceremony to meet conditions and requirements similar to those now governing the conferment of citizenship through court processes before they would be permitted to stand alongside men and women born here and men and women born abroad and naturalized here in the regular safeguarded manner and cast votes having the same effect in determining the course of government as the votes cast by the native-born and regularly naturalized citizens.

"I repeat, Mr. President, I am in favor of adopting a constitutional amendment which will bring about equality between men and women citizens in the matter of the vote; but I am also in favor of so wording such amendment that we will not perpetuate and increase already existing evils and create new inequalities that could not hereafter be rectified otherwise than by the slow and uncertain method of adopting still another constitutional amendment.

"I ask to append to my remarks, without reading, a statement showing citizenship qualifications for voting in woman-suffrage States.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

"The statement referred to is as follows:

"CITIZENSHIP QUALIFICATIONS FOR VOTING IN WOMAN-SUFFRAGE STATES.

"FULL SUFFRAGE.

"Arizona: Citizens only. (Const., VII-2.)
 "California: Citizens only. Naturalized citizens must have been admitted to citizenship 90 days prior to the election. (Const., II-1.)
 "Colorado: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1.) 'The same qualifications as to * * * citizenship * * * required by law to entitle male persons to vote shall be required to entitle female persons to vote.' (Courtright's Stat., 1911, sec. 2147.)

"Idaho: Citizens only. (Const., VI-2.)
 "Kansas: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens. (Const., V-1.) An amendment has been submitted to be voted on at the 1918 election limiting the right to vote to citizens of the United States. (Laws, 1917, c. 353.)

"Montana: Citizens only. (Const., IX-2.)
 "Nevada: Citizens only. (Const., II-1.)
 "New York: Citizens only. Must have been a citizen for 90 days. A citizen by marriage must have been an inhabitant of the United States for 5 years. (Const. amend., Laws, 1917, p. 2784.)

"Oregon (a senate joint memorial [Laws, 1917, p. 975] has been submitted to Congress requesting 'that equal qualifications be required of and equal privileges granted to each individual voter, irrespective of sex or the marriage relation in the States adopting woman suffrage'): Citizens only. (Const., II-2.)

"Utah: Citizens only. (Const., IV-5.)
 "Washington: Citizens only. (Const., VI-1.)
 "Wyoming: Citizens only. (Const., VI-5.)

"LIMITED SUFFRAGE.

"Illinois: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1913, p. 333.)
 "Michigan: Citizens only. (Const., III-1; Laws, 1917, No. 191.)
 "Nebraska: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens at least 30 days prior to election. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1917, c. 30.)

"North Dakota: Citizens only. (Const., V-121; Laws, 1917, c. 254.)
 "Rhode Island: Citizens only. (Const. amend., VII; Laws, 1917, c. 1507.)"

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I know that there has been a ruling by the Vice President that no amendment can be offered to the joint resolution, but I had heretofore prepared an amendment, after the word "sex," on line 11, to add the following:

Provided, That no married woman shall be entitled to vote who would not be so entitled if she were a single woman.

Unless we can pass an amendment to our immigration laws to enable us to correct the evil to which I have referred, this proposed constitutional amendment will enfranchise thousands—yes, millions—of alien women who have never taken the oath of allegiance which the male alien is compelled to take, and who have never been compelled to undergo the searching investigation by United States officials, who examine every male applicant for citizenship. We will, therefore, if the proposed constitutional amendment is adopted unamended, enfranchise, through the provision of the Revised Statutes to which I have referred, millions of women without throwing this protection

around the electorate. It is a mooted question whether an amendment can be made to the immigration laws, and therefore I feel that here and now is the place for us to write into the fundamental law of the land a prohibition against a condition that no patriotic American citizen wants to see.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment to which I have referred.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I object to unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to be heard before the Chair rules?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] having read the proposed amendment, I presume it is not necessary to have it read again at the desk.

This amendment was presented to the Senate last September, and on that occasion I stated at some length the reasons why I felt compelled to oppose any amendment to the joint resolution. Did I not feel the same way now I should be inclined to waive the parliamentary point of order and permit the Senate to consider the amendment, but it is quite obvious that the vote on the joint resolution itself would be greatly jeopardized if we were to amend it in any particular.

As has been stated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], if an amendment were made to the pending joint resolution, it would require it to be again passed upon by the House. The time of this session of Congress is very short, and we feel that the joint resolution itself would be jeopardized by attaching any amendment to it.

As stated on the former occasion, the proposed constitutional amendment in its present form is the same as that which has been presented to the Congress for many years in the past. In a sense it has become sanctified by age, and I know that it would lead to the opposition of the great masses of the women of this country who have been so faithfully and so persistently advocating the passage of this proposed constitutional amendment in its present form.

If it were not for these considerations, Mr. President, I should not raise the point of order; but, under the circumstances, I feel compelled to do so. Therefore I raise the point of order that the amendment can not be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the joint resolution having been ordered to a third reading and having been read the third time, the amendment is not in order. The only question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, the question of woman suffrage has been discussed before this honorable body from every angle. Every Senator has his convictions and doubtless has well fixed in his mind just how he intends to vote when the roll is called; but, Mr. President, having only recently become a Member of the Senate, I desire to avail myself of the opportunity presented to briefly set forth my position on this great question.

I favor giving women the right to vote. As a member of the Louisiana Legislature I voted to submit the question to the people of Louisiana in the form of an amendment to the constitution of the State of Louisiana.

Following the legislative session of 1918 the senatorial campaign was waged for the seat made vacant by the death of Senator Broussard. The question of woman suffrage was not a vital issue in that campaign; but, as a candidate, I announced in public print and from the stump my intention to vote for the amendment to the constitution of Louisiana giving the women of my State the right to vote. I worked for its adoption and voted for it on November 5 last; but, Mr. President, during the campaign I told my people everywhere that should I be elected to the Senate I would vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I consider that statement as binding.

At an extra session of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana held in August, 1918, a joint resolution was adopted memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution, which joint resolution reads as follows:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the people of Louisiana (the senate concurring). That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to reject the so-called Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Federal Constitution requiring each State to grant suffrage to the female sex without choice or limitation, and authorizing Federal power to enforce the amendment, the said Congress of the United States to declare by this action that the democracy of each separate American State is safe against the force and power of a combination of other American States; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister States of the Union to likewise declare for State integrity and the safety of American democracy and vigorously oppose Federal interference or control with State franchise; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each House of Congress in the United States.

Mr. President, this, briefly, represents my point of view, and I heartily concur in the principles here set forth.

It is impossible for us who have the racial question to deal with to close our eyes and treat with indifference a problem which has been a boil upon the body politic for more than a generation, and which, happily for the welfare of both races, has been resting quiet for 15 or 20 years by the enactment of just laws in every State of the South.

Under these laws the South is prosperous. Crime has been reduced, and justice is meted alike to both races.

The passage of this amendment would again open an old sore, revive questions pregnant with dangerous consequences to the South, and would in time extend the power of Federal control to male suffrage and cause a most serious situation.

I have no patience with that little band of women, the militant suffragists, who seek notoriety and bring reproach upon the cause which so many noble women have espoused.

There is no denying the fact, Mr. President, that woman is entitled to the same authority in all questions governmental as man. She has risen even higher than ever before in the estimation of mankind through the wonderful sacrifices and patriotism which she has shown in this war, from which we have just victoriously emerged. She should have the same right and expression by the ballot that men to-day exercise, but let that right be given promptly by each sovereign State of our Union.

The eminent jurist from Louisiana, my distinguished predecessor, Senator Guion, stated on the floor of the Senate:

My objection to the amendment now pending in the Senate is that under our form of government the right to give or withhold the privilege of suffrage rests with the States and is not given to the General Government.

Suffrage is a matter of local or domestic concern, to be dealt with by each State, acting in its sovereign capacity in the exercise of the power reserved to the States under the Federal Constitution, and as may best subserve and accord with existing local conditions and without interference by the Federal Government.

Holding these views, Mr. President, and having pledged myself to my people, I will now fulfill that obligation and will record my vote against the pending amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Henderson	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Baird	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hollis	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Borah	Johnson, S. D.	Norris	Spencer
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Culberson	Kendrick	Penrose	Thomas
Cummins	Konyon	Pittman	Thompson
Curtis	King	PoinDEXter	Townsend
Dillingham	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Vardaman
France	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Saulsbury	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Shafroth	Warren
Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	McLean	Sherman	Weeks
Harding	McNary	Simmons	Williams
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll discloses the presence of 84 Senators. There is a quorum present. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. HOLLIS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S name was called). On this question the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oregon were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Missouri were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I am released from my obligation on this question, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. GOFF'S name was called). On this question the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] are paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oklahoma were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote "nay."