

THE WEEKS BILL IN CONGRESS

The Story of Its Passage in the House of the Sixty-first Congress, and of the Senate Filibuster

IN THIS magazine (then known as *Conservation*) for May, 1909, there was published a brief history of "The Fight for the Appalachian Forests," bringing the story up to that time, and closing with this statement: "The issue is now clearly before Congress and the country. It rests on the vital principle of conservation of natural resources, and will not down. The people have unmistakably asked for legislation on this subject. They will demand it of the Sixty-first Congress."

The first session of the Sixty-first Congress has closed, and it is possible now to write another chapter of this history—unfortunately, not the final one.

Mr. Weeks took his bill which had been before the last Congress and eliminated one or two features which, while they seemed wise to him, were unimportant and made enemies for the bill—especially the provision designating the income from the national forests as the source of the funds for purchasing the new forests. This modified bill, agreed to by the best friends of the proposed legislation in both houses, was introduced during the extra session in the House by Mr. Weeks, and in the Senate by Senator Gallinger. In both bodies it was referred to the committees on agriculture, but the Senate reference was later changed to the committee on forest reservations, the committee which had previously had charge of it, and of which Senator Brandegee of Connecticut is chairman. The Connecticut senator had been subjected to some criticism at home for lack of interest in this bill and was quite ready to take it into his committee and assume charge of it,

The policy of the senators was, however, to await the action of the House—a policy that proved to be a tactical mistake, however good the reasons may have been for it. It produced a feeling in the country outside, where interest in the bill was keen, that the Senate's interest in it was perfunctory. The senators who were most actively enlisted for the bill, however, gave assurance that the bill could be reported and passed in that body at any time. The statement was repeatedly made, up to the last hours of the session, "We have the votes." The policy of delay was encouraged by the President, who wished the bill to wait until what he regarded as the more urgent administration measures were disposed of.

Meanwhile, action dragged in the House. The members of the committee on Agriculture were known to be divided eight to seven, with three new members whose position was unknown. Of the seven one was Chairman Scott, an uncompromising enemy of the bill, who would do everything within the limit of the law to defeat it. The committee did not find time for the hearing that had been asked for on the bill until February 23. This resolved itself largely into a discussion by experts, chiefly Professors Swain, Roth, and Glenn, of the pronouncements of Willis L. Moore, chief of the Weather Bureau, and certain officers of the Engineer Corps, in regard to the influence of forests upon streamflow. So effective were the attacks upon the views of these officials that they were given an opportunity to appear before the committee on the 1st and 2d of March to defend their own position.

Reports of these discussions and papers more fully presenting the case, were published in this magazine in March and April, and it is not necessary to review them at this time.

Some time elapsed without any further action being taken by the committee. Finally, a vote was taken and all of the new members voted for the bill, making the standing of the committee eleven for and seven against. It is interesting to note in this connection that the advocates of this measure have never failed to convince a majority of any committee they have appeared before in either house that the measure is a good one and should become a law.

Within a few days of the action by the committee, the report of the majority, which had been put in charge of Mr. Lever of South Carolina and Mr. Plumley of Vermont, was ready to submit to the House, but that of the minority was delayed several days. This was in charge of Chairman Scott, and his reason for the delay was pressure of other work, but every day's delay hindered the passage of the bill, which Mr. Scott was certainly not anxious to further.

There are many times in the course of legislation when a minority can be just as effective as a majority, if obstruction is all that is needed.

On the 15th of April, the report was made and committed to the committee of the whole house on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed. It was then hoped that an early opportunity would come to bring it up on calendar Wednesday, when, under the rules, each committee in turn has an opportunity to call up bills for consideration. It soon developed, however, that the turn of agriculture on the calendar had passed and was not likely to come again, owing to the number of important bills to come from other committees that had the call before it.

The friends of the bill outside of Congress meanwhile grew anxious, and appeals for action began to pour in upon the members, especially those from the New England states. It had become evident that the only hope for

action was in a special rule, which must be obtained from the new rules committee of ten. It was no longer a question of securing the consent of the Speaker, who is not even a member of the new committee. Of the ten members only one, Mr. Lawrence of Massachusetts, was in favor of the bill, but so well was the case urged by Mr. Weeks, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Currier, Mr. Lever, and their supporters, that the committee consented to bring in a rule.

Even then so much business intervened that days passed before the rule was reported, and it was not until the afternoon of June 24 that Mr. Smith of Iowa introduced the rule for the committee and yielded the floor to Mr. Lawrence of Massachusetts, who made an admirable speech, brief, clear, and pointed, in support of the rule and the bill. Concluding, he said:

It would be interesting to consider at length just what is being done for the preservation and development of forests in France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany, and Japan. Such consideration would convince us that America has been very slow to realize the importance of this work. We are much behind other first-class countries.

But we are waking up, and the passage of this bill will be a long step forward. I wish it might have carried a larger appropriation and provided for work covering a longer period. Its advocates, however, are sure that the expenditure here provided for will remove all doubt as to the wisdom of the policy and that it will be followed by much larger appropriations, which will permit more rapid and thorough development. This is practical conservation. It proposes to save what the people want saved, and the proposition should receive the hearty and unanimous support of the members of this house.

The rule was adopted on a roll call, 154 voting in favor of consideration and ninety-nine against. Twenty-two answered present, and 114 did not vote. Several opponents of the bill were fair enough to vote for its consideration, but others fought the measure even at this point, and Mr. Rucker of Missouri began the dilatory tactics with which he endeavored up to the final passage of the bill to obstruct it and to tire out

the House. Conference reports also intervened, and it was late in the afternoon of a very hot day when the bill finally came up in committee of the whole. Mr. Rucker continued his dilatory tactics, but Mr. Weeks and Mr. Lever held control of the committee and of the House through it all, and to Mr. Weeks, when he was given the floor by Mr. Lever, to speak for the bill which has been known by his name and to which he has given so much patient effort, diplomacy, and parliamentary skill, was accorded the rare tribute of genuine applause from all over the house.

Following his brief and straightforward statement, an attempt was made to put the matter over until the following day, but the men who had determined to pass that bill could not be shaken, and it was only when an agreement to go on in the evening was secured that a recess was taken until eight o'clock.

A large number of members took part in the general debate and in the debate under the five-minute rule. The principal argument against the bill was by Mr. Scott of Kansas, chairman of the committee on agriculture. Mr. Scott based his objections chiefly upon the allegation, which he claimed was supported by the most competent engineering testimony, that the forests at the headwaters of streams do not exercise any appreciable effect upon the navigability of the streams. Mr. Scott reached this conclusion by the simple and convenient intellectual process of eliminating all conflicting testimony and accepting only that which fitted his prejudice.

Mr. Tawney of Minnesota discovered a peril to the structure of our government in the make-up of the commission under the bill, in that it included members of the executive and legislative branches, thus transgressing the complete separation decreed by the fathers.

A point made much of in the House debate and by Senator Burton in his filibuster in the Senate, was the fact that the bill was brought forward in the closing hours of the session and

an attempt made to rush it through without adequate discussion. This taunt came with bad grace from the men who for years have used every means in their power to prevent the consideration of this or the similar measures that preceded it, and have only yielded when they were fought to a finish by a majority that was the final product of ten years of extraordinarily full discussion in Congress and outside, years in which several official government investigations have been made by Congress, resulting in reports which have been available in printed form for varying periods of time.

If there was not sufficient information, and if there had not been sufficient discussion, these opponents of the bill were the responsible parties, and the ignorance which they claim argues their own failure to do their duty in considering a great public measure. There has been no desire on the part of its friends to hold it back. The truth is that the opponents of the bill were driven to the last resort of opposition in fighting a plan which had ample precedent and ample warrant in the history of our governmental activities, and was so strong that it could only be beaten by delay. They had found arguments against it, not by a survey of all the evidence, but by choosing their own witnesses and belittling those on the opposite side. The speakers in opposition to the bill were, beside Mr. Scott and Mr. Rucker: Mr. Englebright of California, Mr. Howland of Ohio, Mr. Beall of Texas, Mr. Parker of New Jersey, Mr. Sims and Mr. Garrett of Tennessee, Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Cox of Indiana, Mr. Focht of Pennsylvania, Mr. Southwick of New York, and Mr. Tawney of Minnesota.

The general character of the speeches for the bill was of a higher order. The speeches were more dignified, dealing with facts rather than with abuse of the other side, and always holding steadily to one purpose, to make the strongest possible case for the bill. The closing word for the bill in general debate was a brief, clear, snappy speech by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, who had

charge of the bill for the majority of the committee on agriculture. Those who spoke in favor of the bill, in addition to those who have already been mentioned, were: Mr. Currier of New Hampshire, Mr. Guernsey of Maine, Mr. Small of North Carolina, Mr. Burnett of Alabama, Mr. McCall of Massachusetts, Mr. Austin of Tennessee, Mr. Keliher of Massachusetts, Mr. Thomas of North Carolina, Mr. Cole of Ohio, Mr. Tilson of Connecticut, Mr. Tirrell of Massachusetts, Mr. Gillett of Massachusetts, Mr. Fordney of Michigan, Mr. Mann of Illinois, Mr. Keifer of Ohio, Mr. Saunders of Virginia, and Mr. Davis of Minnesota.

It was late in the evening when debate ended and voting began. Mr. Rucker of Missouri, tenacious in his hopeless attempt at delay, moved to recommit the bill to the committee, and

a roll call had to be taken on this motion, which was defeated by a vote of 112 yeas to 131 nays, with seventeen present and 129 not voting.

It was midnight when the final roll call on the passage of the bill ended and the result was declared, the bill having passed the House by 130 to 111. It had been a strong and courageous fight, in the face of odds and of the most determined opposition. At the same time, it detracts in no respect from the work done by members in the House to say that they would never have done it except in response to the vigorous expression of a widespread public demand for the passage of some measure that would make it possible to check the destruction of the forests of the Appalachian system, north and south. The vote is given below in detail, with an analysis:

THE ROLL CALL

The vote on the Weeks Bill in the House of Representatives, June 24, 1910, was as follows (this is a direct transcript from the *Congressional Record*):

YEAS—130

Ames	Esch	Hitchcock	Morgan, Mo.
Austin	Estopinal	Hubbard, W. Va.	Morgan, Okla.
Anthony	Finley	Hughes, N. J.	Murdock
Bell, Ga.	Fish	Hull, Tenn.	Needham
Bennett, N. Y.	Fordney	Johnson, S. C.	Nelson
Bingham	Fornes	Keifer	Nicholls
Borland	Foss, Ill.	Keliher	Norris
Boutell	Foss, Mass.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	O'Connell
Burke, S. Dak.	Foster, Vt.	Kinkead, N. J.	Olcott
Burleigh	Foulkrod	Kustermann	Padgett
Burnett	Gaines	Lamb	Palmer, A. M.
Byrns	Gallagher	Law	Plumley
Calder	Gardner, Mass.	Lawrence	Poindexter
Cary	Gardner, N. J.	Lenroot	Pou
Cocks, N. Y.	Gill, Md.	Lever	Pratt
Cole	Gill, Mo.	Loud	Rainey
Conry	Gillett	Loudenslager	Ransdell, La.
Cooper, Wis.	Graff	Lundin	Reynolds
Coudrey	Graham, Ill.	McCall	Roberts
Covington	Grant	McDermott	Robinson
Craig	Greene	McKinney	Rodenberg
Currier	Griest	McLachlan, Cal.	Saunders
Davidson	Guernsey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sharp
Davis	Hamilton	Madison	Sheffield
Denby	Havens	Maguire, Nebr.	Slemp
Dodds	Heald	Mann	Small
Driscoll, D. A.	Heffin	Maynard	Sterling
Durey	Higgins	Moon, Tenn.	Sturgiss
Ellerbee	Hill	Morehead	Sulloway

Taylor, Ala.
Thomas, N. C.
Tilson
Turnbull

Wanger
Washburn
Watkins
Webb

Weeks
Wickliffe
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, Pa.

Wood, N. J.
Young, N. Y.

NAYS—111

Adamson
Aiken
Alexander, Mo.
Barchfeld
Bartlett, Nev.
Beall, Texas
Booher
Bradley
Brantley
Burgess
Burlison
Calderhead
Campbell
Carlin
Cassidy
Chapman
Clark, Mo.
Cline
Collier
Cox, Ind.
Crow
Crumphaeker
Cullop
Dalzell
Dawson
Denver
Dickinson
Dies

Dixon, Ind.
Driscoll, M. E.
Dwight
Edwards, Ga.
Ellis
Englebright
Fassett
Flood, Va.
Flood, Ark.
Focht
Foster, Ill.
Fuller
Gardner, Mich.
Garner, Texas
Garrett
Goebel
Good
Gordon
Graham, Pa.
Hamer
Hamlin
Hammond
Hardy
Hawley
Hay
Helm
Henry, Texas
Hollingsworth

Houston
Howard
Howell, Utah
Howland
Hubbard, Iowa
Hughes, Ga.
Humphrey, Wash.
James
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, Ohio
Joyce
Kendall
Kennedy, Iowa
Knapp
Korbly
Lloyd
McCreary
McKinley, Ill.
Macon
Malby
Martin, Colo.
Mays
Miller, Minn.
Millington
Moore, Texas
Morrison
Moss
Murphy

Oldfield
Olmsted
Parker
Payne
Pickett
Randell, Texas
Rauch
Roddenbery
Rucker, Mo.
Scott
Sheppard
Sherley
Simmons
Sisson
Smith, Cal.
Southwick
Stafford
Steenerson
Stevens, Minn.
Tawney
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, Ohio
Thomas, Ky.
Thomas, Ohio
Tou Velle
Volstead
Woods, Iowa

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13

Carter
Douglass
Gillespie
Goldfogle

Hardwick
Hayes
Kennedy, Ohio

Langley
Sabath
Smith, Iowa

Sparkman
Spight
Tirrell

NOT VOTING—136

Adair
Alexander, N. Y.
Allen
Anderson
Andrus
Ansberry
Ashbrook
Barclay
Barnard
Barnhart
Bartholdt
Gilmore
Glass
Godwin
Goulden
Gregg
Gronna
Hamill
Hanna
Harrison
Haugen
Henry, Conn.

Hinshaw
Hobson
Howell, N. J.
Huff
Hughes, W. Va.
Hull, Iowa
Humphreys, Miss.
Jamieson
Jones
Kahn
Kitchin
Knowland
Bartlett, Ga.
Bates
Bennett, Ky.
Boehne
Bowers
Broussard
Brownlow
Burke, Pa.
Butler
Byrd

Candler
Kopp
Kronmiller
Lafean
Langham
Latta
Lee
Legare
Lindbergh
Lindsay
Livingston
Longworth
Lowden
McCredie
McGuire, Okla.
McHenry
McKinlay, Cal.
McMorrin
Madden
Martin, S. Dak.
Miller, Kans.
Mondell

Moon, Pa.
Moore, Pa.
Cantrill
Capron
Clark, Fla.
Clayton
Cook
Cooper, Pa.
Cowles
Cox, Ohio
Cravens
Creager
Dent
Morse
Moxley
Mudd
Nye
Page
Palmer, H. W.
Parsons
Patterson
Pearre

Peters	Sherwood	Garner, Pa.	Thistlewood
Pray	Sims	Slayden	Townsend
Prince	Dickson, Miss.	Smith, Mich.	Underwood
Pujo	Diekema	Smith, Texas	Vreeland
Reeder	Draper	Snapp	Wallace
Reid	Edwards, Ky.	Sperry	Weisse
Rhinock	Elvins	Stanley	Wheeler
Richardson	Fairchild	Stephens, Texas	Wiley
Riordan	Ferris	Sulzer	Willett
Rothermel	Fitzgerald	Swasey	Woodyard
Rucker, Colo.	Foelker	Talbott	Young, Mich.
Shackleford	Fowler	Tener	The Speaker

So the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice: Mr. Bradley with Mr. Goulden.

On this vote: Mr. Clark of Florida, in favor, with Mr. Sims, against; Mr. Sulzer, in favor, with Mr. Boehne, against; Mr. Morse, in favor, with Mr. Slayden, against; Mr. Swasey, in favor, with Mr. Byrd, against; Mr. Diekema, in favor, with Mr. Vreeland, against; Mr. Kronmiller with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Spight—Mr. Speaker, I wish to know if the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Henry) is recorded on this vote.

The Speaker—He is not.

Mr. Spight—I voted "No" with the understanding that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Henry) would vote for this bill if he were present, and I thought he was going to vote for it. I want to withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

Mr. Tirrell—Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Kitchin) is recorded?

The Speaker—He is not.

Mr. Tirrell—I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. Lever, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE INDIVIDUAL RECORD BY STATES

Below are given the individual records of the representatives, arranged by states and districts. The figure preceding each name is the number of the congressional district of the member. The index numbers following each name have the following meanings:

¹Voted YES in the Sixtieth Congress.

²Voted No in the Sixtieth Congress.

³Did not vote in the Sixtieth Congress.

⁴New member; predecessor voted YES.

⁵New member; predecessor voted No.

⁶New member; predecessor did not vote.

Names in italics are those of Democrats.

ALABAMA

Yes

1. *G. W. Taylor*³
4. *William B. Craig*¹
5. *James T. Heflin*¹
7. *John L. Burnett*¹

No

Not voting

2. *Stanley H. Dent, Jr.*⁴
3. *Henry D. Clayton*²
6. *R. P. Hobson*¹
8. *W. Richardson*¹
9. *Q. W. Underwood*²

ARKANSAS

6. *J. T. Robinson*¹

1. *Robert B. Macon*²
2. *W. A. Oldfield*⁴
3. *John C. Floyd*³

4. *Ben Cravens*³
5. *Charles C. Reid*³
7. *R. M. Wallace*²

CALIFORNIA

6. J. C. Needham²
7. James McLachlan¹

1. W. F. Englebright²
8. S. C. Smith²

2. D. E. McKinlay³
3. J. R. Knowland²
4. Julius Kahn²
5. E. A. Hayes^{2*}

*Present

COLORADO

- At large—*E. T. Taylor*⁵
2. *John A. Martin*⁶

1. *A. W. Rucker*⁵

CONNECTICUT

- At large—*John Q. Tilson*⁴
3. *Edwin W. Higgins*²
4. *Ebenezer J. Hill*¹

1. *E. S. Henry*^{1*}
2. *N. D. Sperry*¹

*Paired with a negative vote

DELAWARE

- At large—*W. H. Heald*⁴

FLORIDA

3. *D. H. Mays*⁶

1. *S. M. Sparkman*^{3*}
2. *Frank Clark*⁴

*Present

GEORGIA

9. *Thomas M. Bell*¹

1. *C. G. Edwards*²
2. *S. A. Roddenbery*⁵
3. *D. M. Hughes*⁶
4. *W. C. Adamson*³
8. *W. M. Howard*²
11. *W. G. Brantley*²

5. *L. F. Livingston*³
6. *C. F. Bartlett*²
7. *Gordon Lee*²
10. *T. W. Hardwick*²

IDAHO

- At large—*Thomas R. Hamer*⁵

ILLINOIS

2. *James R. Mann*¹
3. *William W. Wilson*²
4. *James T. McDermott*²
7. *Fred Lundin*⁵
8. *Thomas Gallagher*⁵
9. *H. S. Boutell*¹
10. *George E. Foss*²
14. *James McKinney*¹
16. *Joseph V. Graft*²
17. *John A. Sterling*²
20. *Henry T. Rainey*¹
21. *James M. Graham*⁶
22. *William A. Rodenberg*³

12. *Charles E. Fuller*¹
19. *William B. McKinley*²
23. *Martin D. Foster*²
24. *Pleasant T. Chapman*²

1. *M. B. Madden*²
5. *A. J. Sabath*^{2*}
6. *William J. Moxley*⁵
11. *H. M. Snapp*³
13. *F. O. Lowden*²
15. *George W. Prince*¹
18. *Joseph G. Cannon*²
25. *Napoleon B. Thistlewood*⁴

*Present.

INDIANA

2. *W. A. Cullop*⁵
3. *Willis E. Cox*²
4. *Lincoln Dixon*²
5. *Ralph W. Moss*⁵
7. *C. A. Korbly*³
9. *M. A. Morrison*⁴
10. *E. D. Crumpacker*²
11. *G. W. Rauch*²
12. *Cyrus Cline*⁴

1. *J. W. Boehne*⁴
6. *W. O. Barnard*²
8. *J. A. M. Adair*²
13. *H. A. Barnhart*²

IOWA

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. C. A. Kennedy ² | 4. G. N. Haugen ² |
| 2. A. F. Dawson ² | 7. J. A. T. Hull ¹ |
| 3. C. E. Pickett ⁶ | 8. <i>W. D. Jamieson</i> ⁴ |
| 5. James W. Good ⁵ | 9. W. I. Smith ^{2*} |
| 6. Nathan E. Kendall ⁵ | |
| 10. Frank P. Woods ³ | *Present |
| 11. E. H. Hubbard ² | |

KANSAS

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. D. R. Anthony, Jr. ² | 2. Charles F. Scott ² | 4. J. M. Miller ² |
| 7. E. H. Madison ¹ | 3. P. P. Campbell ² | 6. W. A. Reeder ¹ |
| 8. Victor Murdock ² | 5. W. A. Calderhead ² | |

KENTUCKY

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>Ollie M. James</i> ³ | 2. <i>A. O. Stanley</i> ¹ |
| 3. <i>R. Y. Thomas, Jr.</i> ⁶ | 6. <i>J. L. Rhimock</i> ³ |
| 4. <i>Ben Johnson</i> ² | 7. <i>James C. Cantrill</i> ¹ |
| 5. <i>S. Sherley</i> ² | 9. J. B. Bennett ¹ |
| 8. <i>Harvey Helm</i> ² | 10. J. W. Langley ^{1*} |
| | 11. D. C. Edwards ¹ |

*Present. Paired with Bartlett of Georgia

LOUISIANA

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>A. Estopinal</i> ¹ | 2. <i>S. L. Gilmore</i> ⁶ |
| 4. <i>J. T. Watkins</i> ¹ | 3. <i>R. F. Broussard</i> ² |
| 5. <i>J. E. Ransdell</i> ¹ | 7. <i>A. P. Pujot</i> ² |
| 6. <i>R. C. Wickliffe</i> ⁴ | |

MAINE

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 3. E. C. Burleigh ¹ | 1. A. L. Allen ¹ |
| 4. F. E. Guernsley ⁴ | 2. J. P. Swasey ^{4*} |

*Paired with a negative vote

MARYLAND

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>J. H. Covington</i> ⁶ | 2. <i>J. F. C. Talbott</i> ¹ |
| 4. <i>John Gill, Jr.</i> ¹ | 3. J. Kronmiller ⁶ |
| | 5. S. E. Mudd ¹ |
| | 6. George A. Pearre ³ |

MASSACHUSETTS

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. G. P. Lawrence ¹ | 4. C. Q. Tirrell ^{1*} |
| 2. F. H. Gillett ¹ | 11. <i>A. J. Peters</i> ¹ |
| 3. C. G. Washburn ¹ | |
| 5. Butler Ames ³ | *Paired with a negative vote |
| 6. A. P. Gardner ¹ | |
| 7. E. W. Roberts ¹ | |
| 8. S. W. McCall ¹ | |
| 9. <i>J. A. Keliker</i> ¹ | |
| 10. <i>J. F. O'Connell</i> ¹ | |
| 12. John W. Weeks ¹ | |
| 13. W. S. Greene ² | |
| 14. <i>Eugene N. Foss</i> ⁴ | |

MICHIGAN

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Edwin Denby ¹ | 3. Washington Gardner ² | 2. C. E. Townsend ¹ |
| 4. Edward L. Hamilton ¹ | | 5. G. J. Diekema ^{1*} |
| 8. Joseph W. Fordney ² | | 6. Samuel W. Smith ³ |
| 9. James C. McLaughlin ¹ | | 7. H. McMorran ¹ |
| 10. George A. Loud ¹ | | 12. H. O. Young ² |
| 11. Francis H. Dodds ⁴ | | |

*Paired with a negative vote

MINNESOTA

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 3. Charles R. Davis ¹ | 1. James A. Tawney ² | 5. F. M. Nye ² |
| | 2. <i>W. S. Hammond</i> ² | 6. C. A. Lindbergh ² |
| | 4. F. C. Stevens ² | |
| | 7. A. J. Volstead ² | |
| | 8. Clarence B. Miller ⁴ | |
| | 9. Halvor Steenerson ² | |

MISSISSIPPI

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 4. <i>T. U. Sisson</i> ⁵ | 1. <i>E. S. Candler, Jr.</i> ¹ |
| 8. <i>J. W. Collier</i> ⁶ | 2. <i>Thomas Spight</i> ^{2*} |
| | 3. <i>B. G. Humphreys</i> ¹ |
| | 5. <i>Adam M. Byrd</i> ² |
| | 6. <i>Eaton J. Bowers</i> ² |
| | 7. <i>William A. Dickson</i> ⁶ |

*Paired with affirmative vote

MISSOURI

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5. <i>W. P. Borland</i> ⁶ | 1. <i>James T. Lloyd</i> ² | 8. <i>D. W. Shackleford</i> ² |
| 11. <i>Patrick F. Gill</i> ⁴ | 2. <i>William W. Rucker</i> ² | 10. Richard Bartholdt ¹ |
| 12. Harry M. Coudrey ¹ | 3. <i>James W. Alexander</i> ² | 13. Politte Elvins ⁶ |
| 15. Charles H. Morgan ⁵ | 4. <i>Charles F. Booher</i> ³ | |
| | 6. <i>C. A. Dickinson</i> ⁵ | |
| | 7. <i>Courtney W. Hamlin</i> ² | |
| | 9. <i>Champ Clark</i> ² | |
| | 14. Charles A. Crow ⁵ | |
| | 16. Arthur P. Murphy ⁶ | |

MONTANA

Charles N. Pray²

NEBRASKA

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>John A. Maguire</i> ⁴ | 3. <i>James P. Latta</i> ⁵ |
| 2. <i>Gilbert M. Hitchcock</i> ¹ | 4. E. H. Hinshaw ¹ |
| 5. George W. Norris ³ | |
| 6. Moses P. Kinkaid ¹ | |

NEVADA

At large—*G. A. Bartlett*²

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. C. A. Sulloway¹
2. Frank D. Currier¹

NEW JERSEY

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 1. H. C. Loudenslager ² | 7. R. W. Parker ² | 3. B. F. Howell ² |
| 2. J. J. Gardner ¹ | | 5. C. N. Fowler ² |
| 4. Ira W. Wood ¹ | | 8. William H. Wiley ⁶ |
| 6. <i>William Hughes</i> ¹ | | 10. <i>James A. Hamill</i> ⁷ |
| 9. <i>E. F. Kinkead</i> ⁵ | | |

NEW YORK

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. William W. Cocks ¹ | 20. T. W. Bradley ³ | 2. <i>George H. Lindsay</i> ³ |
| 4. Charles B. Law ¹ | 23. G. N. Southwick ² | 3. Otto G. Foelker ¹ |
| 5. Richard Young ⁴ | 26. George R. Malby ² | 7. <i>J. J. Fitzgerald</i> ² |
| 6. William M. Calder ¹ | 27. C. S. Millington ⁵ | 8. <i>D. J. Riordan</i> ³ |
| 11. <i>Charles W. Furness</i> ¹ | 28. Charles L. Knapp ³ | 9. <i>H. M. Goldfogle</i> ^{1*} |
| 12. <i>Michael F. Conry</i> ⁴ | 29. M. E. Driscoll ² | 10. <i>William Sulzer</i> ^{1†} |
| 15. J. V. V. Olcott ² | 30. J. W. Dwight ² | 13. Herbert Parsons ¹ |

NEW YORK—Continued

17. W. S. Bennet¹
21. Hamilton Fish⁴
25. Cyrus Durey²
32. James S. Havens⁴
35. D. A. Driscoll⁴

31. Sereno E. Payne²
33. J. S. Fassett²
34. J. S. Simmons⁴

14. William Willett, Jr.¹
16. F. B. Harrison¹
18. Joseph A. Goulden²
19. John E. Andrus²
22. William H. Draper¹
24. G. W. Fairchild²
36. De A. S. Alexander³
37. E. B. Vreeland^{2†}

*Present

†Paired with a negative vote

‡Paired with an affirmative vote

NORTH CAROLINA

1. John H. Small¹
3. Charles R. Thomas³
4. Edward W. Pou²
5. John M. Morehead⁶
9. Edwin Y. Webb¹
10. John G. Grant⁴

2. Claude Kitchin^{2†}
6. H. L. Godwin¹
7. Robert N. Page¹
8. Charles H. Cowles⁴

‡Paired with an affirmative vote

NORTH DAKOTA

At large—A. L. Gronna²At large—L. B. Hanna⁶

OHIO

7. J. Warren Keifer²
8. Ralph D. Cole¹
14. William G. Sharp⁶

2. Herman P. Goebel²
4. William E. Tou Velle²
6. Matthew R. Denver¹
10. Adna R. Johnson⁶
12. Edward L. Taylor, Jr.¹
15. James Joyce³
16. David A. Hollingsworth⁶
19. William A. Thomas¹
20. Paul Howland²
21. James H. Cassidy⁶

1. Nicholas Longworth¹
3. James M. Cox⁴
5. T. T. Ansberry³
9. I. R. Sherwood²
11. Albert Douglas^{1*}
13. C. C. Anderson⁶
17. W. A. Ashbrook¹
18. James Kennedy^{1*}

*Present

OKLAHOMA

2. Dick T. Morgan⁶

1. Bird McGuire²
3. Charles E. Creager⁵
4. Charles D. Carter²
5. Scott Ferris²

OREGON

1. Willis C. Hawley²
2. William R. Ellis²

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Harry H. Bingham²
5. William W. Foulkrod¹
8. Irving P. Wanger²
9. William W. Griest⁴
10. Thomas D. Nicholls¹
14. Charles C. Pratt⁶
15. William B. Wilson²

6. George D. McCreary²
17. Benjamin K. Focht³
18. M. E. Olmsted²
29. William H. Graham²
30. John Dalzell²
32. A. J. Barchfeld²

2. Joel Cook¹
3. J. Hampton Moore²
4. Reuben O. Moon²
7. Thomas S. Butler²
11. Henry W. Palmer⁴
12. Alfred B. Garner⁶
13. John H. Rothermel²

PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

19. John M. Reynolds¹
26. A. M. Palmer⁴

16. John G. McHenry²
20. Daniel F. Lafean³
21. Charles F. Barclay²
22. George F. Huff²
23. Allen F. Cooper¹
24. John K. Tener⁴
25. Arthur L. Bates¹
27. John N. Langham⁴
28. Nelson P. Wheeler²
31. James F. Burke⁴

RHODE ISLAND

1. W. P. Sheffield⁴

2. A. B. Capron¹

SOUTH CAROLINA

4. J. T. Johnson¹
5. David E. Finley¹
6. James E. Ellerbe²
7. Asbury F. Lever¹

3. Wyatt Aiken²

1. George S. Legare²
2. J. O. Patterson²

SOUTH DAKOTA

At large—Charles H. Burke⁴

At large—Eben W. Martin¹

TENNESSEE

2. Richard W. Austin⁴
3. John A. Moon²
4. Cordell Hull²
6. Joseph W. Byrns⁴
7. Lemuel P. Padgett²

5. W. C. Houston²
9. F. J. Garrett²
10. G. W. Gordan²

1. W. P. Brownlow¹
8. Thetus W. Sims²

TEXAS

1. Morris Sheppard²
2. Martin Dies⁴
4. C. B. Randell⁶
5. Jack Beall²
6. Rufus Herdy²
8. John M. Moore²
9. George F. Burgess²
10. A. S. Burleson²
11. Robert L. Henry²
15. J. N. Garner²

7. A. W. Gregg²
12. O. W. Gillespie^{1*}
13. John H. Stephens¹
14. James L. Slayden²
16. W. R. Smith²

Gordon Russell², Third district, does not appear in the Record.

*Answered "Present"

UTAH

At large—Joseph Howell²

VERMONT

1. David G. Foster¹
2. Frank Plumley⁴

VIRGINIA

2. H. L. Maynard¹
3. John Lamb²
4. Robert Turnbull⁶
5. E. W. Saunders²
9. Charles B. Stemp¹

7. James Hay²
8. C. C. Carlin²
10. Henry D. Flood²

1. William A. Jones¹
6. Carter Glass¹

WASHINGTON

3. Miles Poindexter⁶

1. W. E. Humphrey²

2. W. W. McCredie⁴

WEST VIRGINIA

1. W. P. Hubbard¹
2. George C. Sturgiss¹
3. Joseph H. Gaines³

4. H. C. Woodyard²
5. James A. Hughes³

WISCONSIN

1. Henry A. Cooper¹
2. John M. Nelson¹
4. William J. Cary³
7. John J. Esch¹
8. James H. Davidson¹
9. G. Küstermann²
11. Irvine L. Lenroot⁵

5. W. H. Stafford²

3. Arthur W. Kopp⁵
6. C. H. Weisse³
10. Elmer A. Morse¹

WYOMING

At large—F. W. Mondell²

SUMMARY BY STATES AND SECTIONS

	<i>Sixtieth Congress</i>			<i>Sixty-first Congress*</i>		
	<i>Yeas</i>	<i>Nays</i>	<i>Not voting</i>	<i>Yeas</i>	<i>Nays</i>	<i>Not voting</i>
NEW ENGLAND						
Maine	4	2	..	2
New Hampshire.....	2	2
Vermont	2	2
Massachusetts.....	13	..	1	12	..	2
Rhode Island.....	1	..	1	1	..	1
Connecticut	4	..	1	3	..	2
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	26	..	3	22	..	7
MIDDLE						
New York.....	17	11	9	12	10	15
New Jersey.....	3	4	3	5	1	4
Pennsylvania	10	12	10	9	6	17
Delaware.....	1	1
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	31	27	22	27	17	36
CENTRAL						
Michigan	8	3	1	6	1	5
Ohio	10	5	6	3	10	8
Indiana	3	9	1	..	9	4
Illinois	5	13	6	13	4	8
Wisconsin	5	4	2	7	1	3
Minnesota	2	7	..	1	6	2
Iowa	2	7	2	..	7	4
Missouri	3	9	4	4	9	3
North Dakota.....	..	1	4	4	9	2
South Dakota.....	2	1	1	1
Nebraska	4	1	1	4	..	2
Kansas	2	4	2	3	3	2
Oklahoma	4	1	1	..	4
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	46	67	27	43	50	48
ROCKY MOUNTAIN AND COAST						
Montana	1	1
Wyoming	1	1
Colorado	3	2	1
Nevada	1	..	1	..
Idaho	1	1	..
Utah	1	1	..
Washington	3	..	1	1	1
Oregon	2	2	..
California	1	6	1	2	2	4
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	17	3	3	10	8

SOUTHERN

Maryland.....	3	..	3	2	..	4
Virginia.....	7	1	2	5	3	2
West Virginia.....	2	..	3	3	..	2
Kentucky.....	5	3	3	..	5	6
Tennessee.....	6	4	..	5	3	2
North Carolina.....	7	2	1	6	..	4
South Carolina.....	4	1	2	4	1	2
Georgia.....	2	6	3	1	6	4
Florida.....	3	..	1	2
Alabama.....	6	2	1	4	..	5
Mississippi.....	2	3	3	..	2	6
Louisiana.....	4	1	1	4	..	3
Arkansas.....	2	2	3	1	3	3
Texas.....	3	11	2	..	10	5
	53	36	30	35	34	50

HOW THE HOUSE DIVIDED POLITICALLY

	<i>Yea</i>		<i>Nay</i>		<i>Not voting</i>	
	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.
Alabama.....	..	4	5
Arkansas.....	..	1	..	3	..	3
California.....	2	..	2	..	4	..
Colorado.....	2	..	1
Connecticut.....	3	2
Delaware.....	1
Florida.....	1	..	2
Georgia.....	..	1	..	6	..	4
Idaho.....	1
Illinois.....	9	4	3	1	7	1
Indiana.....	1	8	1	3
Iowa.....	7	..	3	1
Kansas.....	3	..	3	..	2	..
Kentucky.....	5	3	3
Louisiana.....	..	4	3
Maine.....	2	2	..
Maryland.....	..	2	3	1
Massachusetts.....	9	3	1	1
Michigan.....	6	..	1	..	5	..
Minnesota.....	1	..	5	1	2	..
Mississippi.....	2	..	6
Missouri.....	2	2	2	7	2	1
Montana.....	1	..
Nebraska.....	2	2	1	1
Nevada.....	1
New Hampshire.....	2
New Jersey.....	3	2	1	..	3	1
New York.....	9	3	10	..	7	8
North Carolina.....	2	4	1	3
North Dakota.....	2	..
Ohio.....	2	1	8	2	3	5
Oklahoma.....	1	2	2
Oregon.....	2
Pennsylvania.....	6	3	6	..	15	2
Rhode Island.....	1	2
South Carolina.....	..	4	..	1	..	2
South Dakota.....	1	1
Tennessee.....	1	4	..	3	1	1
Texas.....	10	..	5
Utah.....	1
Vermont.....	2
Virginia.....	1	4	..	3	..	2

Washington	1	..	I	..	I	..
West Virginia.....	3	2	..
Wisconsin	7	..	I	..	2	I
Wyoming	I
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	82	48	55	56	76	74

WHAT TWO VOTES SHOW

In the two votes taken on the Weeks bill, that in the Sixtieth Congress and that in the Sixty-first, all but fifty-two members of the present House have gone on record. Owing to the conditions under which the vote was taken in the present House, many of the members having left Washington, the vote was lighter than that in the Sixtieth Congress. A comparison of the individual records, as shown in the preceding statement, show that there were twelve changes from "No" to "Yes"—three in Illinois, two in Pennsylvania, and one each in California, Kansas, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin. There were five changes from "Yes" to "No"—three in Ohio, one in Illinois, and one in Virginia. This takes account only of personal votes, and does not include the votes of new members whose predecessors may have voted in the same or in a different way. Considering this individual record, it is interesting to tabulate the standing of the present House as shown by the two record votes. This is given in the following table. In making up these figures, members who voted differently in the two Congresses are placed according to their last vote. Those who did not vote this year, but who did vote in the Sixtieth Congress, are placed according to their vote at that time. This gives a fair estimate, and it is evident that very few changes would have occurred.

	<i>Yea</i>	<i>Nay</i>	<i>Non-committal</i>
Alabama.....	6	2	1
Arkansas.....	1	4	2
California.....	2	5	1
Colorado.....	2	2	1
Connecticut.....	5
Delaware.....	1
Florida.....	..	1	2
Georgia.....	2	8	1
Idaho.....	..	1	..
Illinois.....	14	9	2
Indiana.....	..	11	2
Iowa.....	1	8	2
Kansas.....	4	4	..
Kentucky.....	4	5	2
Louisiana.....	4	1	2
Maine.....	4
Maryland.....	4	..	2
Massachusetts.....	14
Michigan.....	9	2	1
Minnesota.....	1	8	..
Mississippi.....	2	4	2
Missouri.....	5	10	1
Montana.....	1
Nebraska.....	5	1	..
Nevada.....	..	1	..
New Hampshire.....	2
New Jersey.....	5	3	2
New York.....	19	14	4
North Carolina.....	8	1	..
North Dakota.....	..	1	1
Ohio.....	7	11	3
Oklahoma.....	1	3	1
Oregon.....	..	2	..
Pennsylvania.....	12	11	8
Rhode Island.....	2
South Carolina.....	4	1	2
South Dakota.....	2
Tennessee.....	6	4	..
Texas.....	2	14	..
Utah.....	..	1	..
Vermont.....	2
Virginia.....	7	3	..
Washington.....	1	1	1
West Virginia.....	3	..	2
Wisconsin.....	8	1	2
Wyoming.....	..	1	..
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	179	159	51

IN THE SENATE

While this successful fight was being waged in the House, the bill had come up in the Senate, and very different and very unexpected conditions developed there. On the 22d of June, Mr. Brandegee moved the consideration of the bill, which was popularly known in that

body as the Gallinger bill. On a roll call this was voted forty-eight to sixteen, with twenty-eight senators not voting. This made the bill the unfinished business of the Senate, and Senator Brandegee at that time contented himself with putting in the bill, together

with the report of the committee on forest reservations and the protection of game, and the report by the Secretary of Agriculture of 1907 on the examination of the Appalachian and White Mountain watersheds. This made these documents a part of the record and put them in printed form before the senators on the following day.

At two o'clock on Thursday, the 23d, the unfinished business was taken up and the bill read. Senator Burton of Ohio at once entered upon obstructive tactics. Senator Brandegee presented the bill with a speech in its favor, but was subjected to frequent interruptions by Senator Burton, assisted by Senator Newlands. It became evident very early in the discussion that a few senators were playing for time.

Following Senator Brandegee's speech, Senator Newlands secured the floor and proposed an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute a bill of his own providing for a conservation commission. In support of this, Mr. Newlands made a long argument, some parts of which were more or less pertinent to the question which he was supposed to discuss. The discussion of the bill was also interrupted by conference reports at intervals and some of these occupied considerable time. Senator Stone of Missouri offered an amendment providing for the survey of certain swamp lands in the states of Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana, and his argument on this amendment was made somewhat at length.

Finally, after a long-drawn-out session, a quorum failing, the Senate adjourned at a little after seven o'clock. On the following day, when the hour for unfinished business arrived, the consideration of the bill was resumed and a desultory discussion followed in the intervals of other business. On Saturday, when it became evident that the filibustering senators would hold their ground, negotiations were entered into for an agreement to secure a vote at the next session. The House bill, having passed that body and been sent to the Senate, was substituted for the Senate

bill as unfinished business. Having secured this result, Senator Brandegee made the following statement:

This being the unfinished business, I, a few minutes ago, made a request that the Senate should vote upon it before adjournment. There was objection. The senator from Ohio stated that there were other senators who desired to be heard, and he had no idea that it could be finally acted upon at the present session. It has been perfectly evident to everybody from what has been going on here ever since we have had this bill under discussion that it could not be passed at this session. I am satisfied, and I think every senator on this floor is satisfied, that it is hopeless, in view of the present situation, to press the measure further upon the attention of the Senate at this time.

In view of that fact, and not desiring to block other business on this, the last day of the session, I ask unanimous consent that upon February 15, 1911, the Senate shall vote upon all amendments pending or to be offered to the bill (H. R. 11798) entitled "A bill to enable any state to cooperate with any other state or states, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," and upon the bill itself, before adjournment on that day.

During the discussion on the agreement asked for by Senator Brandegee, Senator Newlands frankly stated that he desired to have matters so arranged that every man who was a friend of the Appalachian proposition would be compelled to vote for the general waterways scheme, which he is interested in having embodied in legislation. Senators Brandegee and Gallinger both stated that they were in favor of enlarging the commission provided for by the bill and extending its functions to include at least some of the things desired by Senator Newlands. Finally, after a long discussion, the request of Senator Brandegee was agreed to and the matter was disposed of for this session by the Senate with that understanding—that the bill with all amendments that may be proposed in the meantime, shall be voted on before adjournment on the 15th of February next. This introduces an uncertain element in the form of possible amend-

ments in regard to which the friends of the bill must be on their guard.

Therefore, the only vote taken in the Senate was that by which the bill was made unfinished business. The division on this was practically what it would have been if the vote had been upon the bill itself. The roll call on this was as follows:

YEAS—48

Bacon	Gallinger
Beveridge	Gamble
Bradley	Guggenheim
Brandegee	Hale
Briggs	Keane
Bulkeley	LaFollette
Burkett	Lodge
Burnham	McEnery
Burrows	Nelson
Carter	Oliver
Chamberlain	Overman
Clapp	Page
Clark, Wyo.	Perkins
Crane	Piles
Cullom	Purcell
Cummins	Scott
Curtis	Simmons
Depew	Smith, S. C.
Dixon	Smoot
du Pont	Stephenson
Elkins	Sutherland
Fletcher	Taylor
Flint	Warner
Frazier	Wetmore

NAYS—16

Bailey	Gore
Bankhead	Heyburn
Bourne	Hughes
Bristow	Jones
Brown	Newlands
Burton	Paynter
Crawford	Percy
Dick	Shively

NOT VOTING—28

Aldrich	Martin
Borah	Money
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon
Clay	Owen
Culberson	Penrose
Daniel	Rayner
Davis	Richardson
Dillingham	Root
Dolliver	Smith, Md.
Foster	Smith, Mich.
Frye	Stone
Johnston	Taliaferro
Lorimer	Tillman
McCumber	Warren

An examination of the detailed vote by states, given below, shows that thirty-nine Republicans voted yes, eight voted no, and thirteen were not recorded. Of the Democrats, nine voted yes, eight voted no, and fifteen were not recorded. An analysis of the vote by sections and states is also given. From this, however, in the case of the Senate, little can be inferred. The question seems to have been largely one of personal judgment, or of personal relations with other senators.

THE SENATE VOTE IN DETAIL

ALABAMA

John H. Bankhead, no.
J. F. Johnston, did not vote.

ARKANSAS

James P. Clarke, did not vote.
Jeff Davis, did not vote.

CALIFORNIA

George C. Perkins, yes.
Frank P. Flint, yes.

COLORADO

Simon Guggenheim, yes.
Charles J. Hughes, Jr., no.

CONNECTICUT

Morgan G. Bulkeley, yes.
Frank B. Brandegee, yes.

DELAWARE

Henry A. du Pont, yes.
Harry A. Richardson, did not vote.

FLORIDA

J. P. Taliaferro, did not vote.
Duncan U. Fletcher, yes.

GEORGIA

Augustus O. Bacon, yes.
Alexander S. Clay, did not vote.

IDAHO

W. B. Heyburn, no.
William E. Borah, did not vote.

ILLINOIS

Shelby M. Cullom, yes.
William Lorimer, did not vote.

INDIANA

Albert J. Beveridge, yes.
Benjamin F. Shively, no.

IOWA

J. P. Dolliver, did not vote.
Albert B. Cummins, yes.

KANSAS

Charles Curtis, yes.
Joseph L. Bristow, no.

KENTUCKY

Thomas H. Paynter, no.
William O. Bradley, yes.

LOUISIANA

Samuel D. McEnery, yes.
Murphy J. Foster, did not vote.

MAINE

Eugene Hale, yes.
William P. Frye, did not vote.

MARYLAND

Isidor Rayner, did not vote.
John W. Smith, did not vote.

MASSACHUSETTS

Henry Cabot Lodge, yes.
W. Murray Crane, yes.

MICHIGAN

Julius C. Burrows, yes.
William A. Smith, did not vote.

MINNESOTA

Knute Nelson, yes.
Moses E. Clapp, yes.

MISSISSIPPI

H. de S. Money, did not vote.
Le Roy Percy, no.

MISSOURI

William J. Stone, did not vote.
William Warner, yes.

MONTANA

Thomas H. Carter, yes.
Joseph M. Dixon, yes.

NEBRASKA

Elmer J. Burkett, yes.
Norris Brown, no.

NEVADA

Francis G. Newlands, no.
George S. Nixon, did not vote.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Jacob H. Gallinger, yes.
Henry E. Burnham, yes.

NEW JERSEY

John Kean, yes.
Frank O. Briggs, yes.

NEW YORK

Chauncey M. Depew, yes.
Elihu Root, did not vote.

NORTH CAROLINA

F. M. Simmons, yes.
Lee S. Overman, yes.

NORTH DAKOTA

P. J. McCumber, did not vote.
W. E. Purcell, yes.

OHIO

Charles Dick, no.
Theodore E. Burton, no.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas P. Gore, no.
Robert L. Owen, did not vote.

OREGON

Jonathan Bourne, Jr., no.
George E. Chamberlain, yes.

PENNSYLVANIA

Boies Penrose, did not vote.
George T. Oliver, yes.

RHODE ISLAND

Nelson W. Aldrich, did not vote.
George P. Wetmore, yes.

SOUTH CAROLINA

B. R. Tillman, did not vote.
E. D. Smith, yes.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert J. Gamble, yes.
C. I. Crawford, no.

TENNESSEE

James B. Frazier, yes.
Robert L. Taylor, yes.

TEXAS

C. A. Culberson, did not vote.
J. W. Bailey, no.

UTAH

Reed Smoot, yes.
George Sutherland, yes.

VERMONT

W. P. Dillingham, did not vote.
Carroll S. Page, yes.

VIRGINIA
John W. Daniel did not vote.
Thomas S. Martin, did not vote.

WASHINGTON
 Samuel H. Piles, yes.
 Wesley L. Jones, no.

WEST VIRGINIA
 Stephen B. Elkins, yes.
 Nathan B. Scott, yes.

WISCONSIN
 R. M. LaFollette, yes.
 Isaac Stephenson, yes.

WYOMING
 Francis E. Warren, did not vote.
 C. D. Clark, yes.

THE VOTE BY STATES AND SECTIONS

	<i>Yea</i>	<i>Nay</i>	<i>Not voting</i>
NEW ENGLAND			
Maine.....	1	..	1
New Hampshire..	2
Vermont.....	1	..	1
Massachusetts....	2
Rhode Island.....	1	..	1
Connecticut.....	2
	9	..	3
MIDDLE			
New York.....	1	..	1
New Jersey.....	2
Pennsylvania.....	1	..	1
Delaware.....	1	..	1
	5	..	3
CENTRAL			
Michigan.....	1	..	1
Ohio.....	..	2	..
Indiana.....	1	1	..

CENTRAL—Continued	<i>Yea</i>	<i>Nay</i>	<i>voting</i>
Illinois.....	1	..	1
Wisconsin.....	2
Minnesota.....	2
Iowa.....	1	..	1
Missouri.....	1	..	1
North Dakota.....	1	..	1
South Dakota.....	1	1	..
Nebraska.....	1	1	..
Kansas.....	1	1	..
Oklahoma.....	..	1	1
	13	7	6
ROCKY MOUNTAIN AND COAST			
Montana.....	2
Wyoming.....	1	..	1
Colorado.....	1	1	..
Nevada.....	..	1	1
Idaho.....	..	1	1
Utah.....	2
Washington.....	1	1	..
Oregon.....	1	1	..
California.....	2
	10	5	3
SOUTHERN			
Maryland.....	2
Virginia.....	2
West Virginia.....	2
Kentucky.....	1	1	..
Tennessee.....	2
North Carolina....	2
South Carolina....	1	..	1
Georgia.....	1	..	1
Florida.....	1	..	1
Alabama.....	..	1	1
Mississippi.....	..	1	1
Louisiana.....	1	..	1
Arkansas.....	2
Texas.....	..	1	1
	11	4	13

