

WOMEN SERVE THE NATION

Valiant Recruits From Homes and Firesides Are Enlisted in Army of Democracy.

95 PER CENT VOLUNTEERS

Great Red Cross Organization Now Occupying Liberty Temple Efficient Through Efforts of Those Who Work for Flag.

They are not generals, colonels, majors. In fact, they never carry any title at all.

They are simply privates in the great National Army of Patriotism. They do the work.

Many of them have homes and babies, but just the same they will be found indispensably linked with each great patriotic campaign, no matter whether it be Liberty Loan, Y. M. C. A. or Red Cross. Sometimes they just work mornings; sometimes just evenings, sometimes only a few hours now and again, but most of them work morning, noon and night.

They are the valiant army of women who answer to the call for volunteers.

95 Per Cent Are Volunteers.

State Chairman This and State Chairman That; Manager Blank and Colonel John Doe and Richard Roe are mentioned daily in the public prints, but back of them are the stenographers, the office force, the telephone operators, 95 per cent of whom are volunteers.

Some of these volunteers come from homes, and they dash away just in time to get hubby's dinner, or dash away from home just after dinner.

Some come from offices, making arrangements with their fellow employees to work overtime, so that their work shall not fall behind.

But were it not for them, no matter what the campaign, the great heart and pocket of the public would not be touched, for it could not be reached.

In the great Red Cross organization, for example, there are to be found in Liberty Temple all day Miss Getta Wasserman, Mrs. Miss Glitzer, Mrs. R. W. Childs, Mrs. Julius Louissou, Mrs. A. L. Fish and many others, and through these women, their friends, their business affiliations, their husbands and their friends, a great working organization is created.

Organization Is Complete.

There are eight typewriters in Liberty Temple. Every typewriter operates continuously, even though sometimes three or four volunteer operators may be required.

Comes a sudden call for one or more stenographers at night. The call is filled. None knows just how or why the required number of stenographers appears. It is part of that wonderful organizing faculty a woman has.

It may chance that a man may be dictating to an employee to the stater of his employer.

Take the telephone switchboards, for example. It is there, no matter what service in the city of Portland. Six women, relieving each other, have made that service perfect. Even the moon here is taken care of by "the Florence Gatta relieves the other workers to the minute.

The telephone operators are Mrs. Guy Reynolds, Mrs. Chester Martin, Miss Mildred Joy, Miss Cates, Miss Deery, Mrs. G. A. Olsson, Mrs. Griffith.

Vacancies Call for Experts.

Now among the stenographic and clerical force a veritable "who's who" might be compiled. Some are business women, some society women, some have taken up stenography, but it is the consensus of opinion they are all wonderfully efficient. In fact, in the Liberty Loan campaign virtually every volunteer had a highly paid position tendered to her—and many accepted.

There are still vacancies, Miss Getta Wasserman, office manager points out, but only for experts in any special line.

Among the volunteer clerical workers will be found Mrs. Ralph Tomlinson, Mrs. J. Chipman, Miss Gray, Miss Maery, Mrs. F. W. Webb, Mrs. W. F. Gleibig, Mrs. Frank Camp, Mrs. C. C. Cole, Mrs. Frank McCallis, Mrs. William See, Mrs. Hathaway, Mrs. A. R. Innes, Miss Rosemary Baldwin, Mrs. Westfall, Miss Marion Citron, Mrs. D. C. Freeman, Mrs. F. W. Webb, Mrs. Ruth Plummer, Mrs. R. W. Webb, Miss Henrietta Lauer, Miss Shepherd, Miss Annie Shaylor, Mrs. R. C. Danford, Mrs. R. G. Hecker, Mrs. F. Baiden, Mrs. Clifford Lewis, Mrs. Dowling, Mrs. Burnett, Mrs. Philip Dater, Mrs. M. J. Clobesay, Miss Ina Arubacke, Miss Girsberger and Mrs. Brewster.

JAIL FOR EX-POLICE CHIEF

Prominent Cle-Elum Citizen Convicted of Moonshining.

YAKIMA, Wash., May 11.—Matt Kausalrich, City Councilman, former chief of police and influential citizen of Cle Elum, was sentenced today by Judge F. H. Beckler in Federal Court to six months' imprisonment in the Yakima County Jail and to pay a fine of \$1000. Kausalrich was convicted of being the leader of a ring of moonshiners who operated a still in the mountains near Cle Elum. He denied his guilt, even after conviction. Notice was given of appeal, and Kausalrich is expected to secure his freedom on bond pending final action of the courts. He is an Austrian.

In pronouncing sentence Judge Rudkin rebuked Kausalrich in scathing terms, not only for his own participation in the moonshining operations, but for using his influence to get others into the same offense. Kausalrich took his sentence with a smile.

MYRTLE MASON IS HONORED

Willamette Freshman Awarded Albert Prize at Salem.

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY, Salem, Or., May 12.—The Albert Prize has been awarded to Miss Myrtle Mason, of Boise, Idaho. The prize is \$25, and is given by Mrs. Joseph H. Albert, of Salem, to the student in the university who in the last year, has made the greatest improvement in character, scholastic standing and leadership.

The faculty nominates three students whom they deem eligible and submit the names to the student body. A popular vote is taken, and the three nominated were Miss Mabel Garret, senior, of Salem; Miss Rose Martin, sophomore, of Myrtle Creek, and Miss Myrtle Mason, freshman.



The Man Who Fights for Oregon's Development.

Why National Prohibition?

"PASSING THE BUCK" TO THE STATES— THIS IS WHAT CONGRESS DID WITH PROHIBITION— MEMBERS WERE UNWILLING TO TRUST WILSON

Ready to Jeopardize the Structure of American Political Liberty, but Lacking Backbone to Defy the Prohibition Iconoclast and Fanatics.

NATION NOW TO BE TORN BY BITTER AND EXPENSIVE DISCUSSION

In voting to submit to the states for ratification the proposed Constitutional amendment providing for National prohibition Congress simply "PASSED THE BUCK" to the states. It was clearly within the power of Congress to clothe the Chief Executive with authority to declare National-wide prohibition for the period of the war; but this program was not agreeable to the personal liberty iconoclasts who propose to dictate to everybody the scope and character of their individual initiative. They insisted on introducing an element of discord in our country when all its energies should be directed towards the one object of "WINNING THE WAR." They were determined to exploit what J. Y. Brattan, correspondent of the Baltimore American, calls "one of the facts that are sapping the Nation's strength." In my judgment their action is not only distinctly unwise, but, in a sense, unpatriotic and unfair.

National prohibition BY EXECUTIVE ORDER for the period of the war would have met every argument of the "DRYS" in their philippic against booze as a hindering factor in war. Their insistence on the Constitutional settlement of the question at this time PROVES THAT THEY WERE ACTUATED MORE BY FANATICISM THAN BY PATRIOTISM.

The ratification of this proposed amendment MAY CHANGE THE WHOLE CHARACTER OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE AND ACTIVITY. In this statement, I include both our political and our commercial character. I will first speak of the political character of this proposed change.

The provision of Article X of Amendments to the Constitution is well known, and has hitherto been accepted as the basis of state action, namely: "THE POWERS NOT DELEGATED TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE CONSTITUTION, NOR PROHIBITED BY IT TO THE STATES, ARE RESERVED TO THE STATES RESPECTIVELY, OR TO THE PEOPLE." This provision forms one of the principal foundation stones of the doctrine of political "states' rights." "THE UNITED STATES SHALL GUARANTEE TO EVERY STATE IN THIS UNION A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND SHALL PROTECT EACH OF THEM AGAINST INVASION." This clearly gives to each state the power, through its Legislature or other factors of political procedure, the right to determine the individual privileges of its citizens, INCLUDING THE PRIVILEGE OF DRINKING STIMULANTS. This is further emphasized by Article IX of Amendments to the Constitution, which says: "THE ENUMERATION IN THE CONSTITUTION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR DISPARAGE OTHERS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE." But for these clear thoroughfares of political action prohibitionists would never have been able to secure prohibitory enactments in any of the states. Yet they propose now, by one incisive stroke, to absolutely nullify the right of any state to determine for itself its local political economy. This is clear as daylight, for in the event of three-fourths of the states of the Union ratifying the pending prohibition amendment, the remaining one-fourth (in all, twelve great states) would be forever disbarred so far as this question is concerned, from exercising the plain rights guaranteed them under the Constitution.

Moreover, such action on the part of the three-fourths would, in my judgment, constitute "INVASION," for, while this term in Section 4, Article IV, may primarily refer to MILITARY invasion, there is nothing in the phraseology of the article to indicate that it did not also include political invasion. Surely, a force measure adopted by three-fourths of the states which would nullify the Constitutional rights of one-fourth of the states to "EXERCISE POWERS NOT DELEGATED TO THE UNITED STATES," including the power of local self-government, would in effect be political invasion. AND POLITICAL INVASION, in its far-reaching effects, though peaceful in appearance, might prove as disastrous as MILITARY INVASION.

I contend that such a radical departure from the plain letter and spirit of the Constitution would INVITE POLITICAL ANARCHY IN THE UNITED STATES; for, if three-fourths of the states decide to use this method to settle the prohibition question, what is to hinder an equal number of states, at some future time, applying the SAME METHOD IN FORCING OTHER OBJECTIONABLE LEGISLATION? I will make this point clearer as I proceed. I have said that "EVERY STATE MAY WELL PAUSE AND REFLECT DEEPLY BEFORE GIVING THEIR SANCTION TO THIS AMENDMENT." I AM DEEPLY IN EARNEST IN UTTERING THIS WARNING, and wish I could give it greater emphasis.

I will now refer to the commercial aspect of the proposed amendment. In dealing with the commercial factor I am not thinking of the mere matter of dollars and cents (made, saved or spent) by reason of the alcoholic industry or any other industry or occupation, though that feature has importance; but I am thinking of the fetters that may possibly be placed upon the industries and the agriculture of this country (yes, upon great bodies of individual citizens themselves) should this latest prohibition method of procedure by constitutional tinkering become the fashion.

Let us predicate a case. Suppose, in the course of our participation in the present world war, it should be concluded that it is necessary, as a war measure, for the Government to take over all the industries and farms of the United States and establish prices (wage and selling) in connection therewith. This has already been done to some extent. At any time this power may include all industries, manufacturing and agricultural. The people, being loyal, would probably acquiesce and consent to the arrangement FOR THE PERIOD OF THE WAR. They might even comply uncomplainingly to a universal conscription of labor, as well as commodities, PROVIDING THE COMPENSATION AND PRICES WERE FAIR, and the conditions were lifted at the close of the war. (Congress has just gone through a discussion involving similar elements in the case of the conscripted railways.) But suppose, in the interest of the general welfare, A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT WAS PROPOSED TO MAKE THE CONSCRIPTION OF INDUSTRIES, MANUFACTORIES, AGRICULTURE AND LABOR PERMANENT—WHAT THEN?

"Oh," our prohibition orators would say, "it is unthinkable that three-fourths of the states would ratify a destructive measure like that." Yet these very unctuous and zealous prohibitionists are themselves arguing and working tooth and toenail for the success of the very principle, which, if successful, will make this predicated action possible. They are paving the way, so far as they are able, FOR THE AUTOCRACY OF CONSTITUTIONAL TINKERING, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF STATE AUTONOMY, AND, THEREFORE, OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY IN AMERICA. The prohibitionists and the spineless members of Congress who came under their domination will not "think so." There's the trouble. People of that bent of mind DO NOT THINK of the ultimate consequences of their act, but are bent on

the immediate gratification of their fanatical whims respecting the "moral aspects," if there are any, of their view of the liquor question. And they seem willing to JEOPARDIZE THE ENTIRE STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN POPULAR LIBERTY IN THEIR MADNESS. A leading apostle of this pernicious doctrine was told plainly in Canada recently by British "Tommy" in language not the choicest, but certainly forceful, where "he got off" and the apostle "got." I think it is time to use some of the "Tommy" language and style of argument in America.

There are members of Congress and State Legislatures who seem to be "scared" of the advocates of constitutional tinkering. It is time for them to come out of their trance, for there is more, much more, involved in this National prohibition amendment than the abolition of booze.

The debates and votes in Congress on this proposed amendment revealed some anomalous features. I have only space in this article to analyze the proceedings in the House. Fifty-three Representatives took part in the closing debate December 17. Of these 26 spoke for and 27 against the resolution. Of the 26 speaking for 14 were from "wet" or partially "wet" states; 12 were from "bone-dry" states. Twenty states were represented in the affirmative, five of which were Southern and 15 Eastern and Western. Of the 27 Congressmen speaking AGAINST the resolution 23 were from "wet" or partially "wet" states; four were from "bone-dry" states. Fifteen states were represented, 11 "wet" or partially "wet"; four "bone-dry." There were six Southern states and nine Eastern and Western states.

Under the debate agreement, Webb, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Volstead, Republican, of Minnesota, controlled the time for the prohibition side; Gard, Democrat, of Ohio, and Graham, Republican, of Pennsylvania, controlled the time for the opposition.

Mr. Webb occupied 15 minutes in preliminary remarks, mostly relating to the proposed amendments to the resolution. The main portion of his speech dwelt upon the right to submit the proposed amendment to the states for ratification, the "terrible evils" of drink, the "iniquity" of Government partnership, etc., closing with a letter from Anna A. Gordon, President National W. C. T. U., presenting a petition of 500,000 members of that organization.

Mr. Gard opened for the opposition in a ten-minute speech, striking at once at the heart of the matter by saying: "I am opposed to the passage of this article of amendment because I think it removes from the states the police power given to the states by the Constitution of the United States of America and never before sought to be taken from them. I believe that this question is a non-political, a non-partisan question, that it is essentially a social and moral question, and, therefore, that it is properly for the control of the several states and not at all to be engrafted on the Federal Constitution; it is not and never has been the policy of the law to engraft upon the Federal Constitution any policies of Government. These are left in two ways—the National provisions are for action of Congress; provisions applying to the states are left to the wisdom of the State Legislatures. That has always been recognized and should be recognized today."

Mr. Gard recalled that the acts of the states, under this arrangement, in enacting prohibition legislation, had been ratified by acts of Congress and sustained by decisions of the United States Supreme Court. He said further:

"We contend that the states should have the right to determine whether the states and the people of the states are best served by prohibition or by regulation. It is a constitutional right, and we ask that it be maintained."

Mr. Gard also referred to the necessity of concentration of every ounce of the National power toward the great task of winning the war.

Cooper, of Ohio, followed for prohibition. He recited the time-worn arguments of the "ill effects" of alcohol beverages on workmen and soldiers, and told about the victories (or near-victories) for prohibition in the recent election in Ohio. He admitted, however, that the state had gone "wet." He said not one word about the momentous political danger involved in the proposed amendment.

Dyer, of Missouri, scored some strong points for the opposition. He quoted from the late Senator Hastings, of Wisconsin, whom he characterized as "a great Democrat, one who tried in every way to uphold the hands of the President in this great war." This is the quotation from Senator Hastings:

"We are engaged in a war that requires a strong feeling of unity throughout the part of all 'excitable domestic questions ought to be relegated to the rear and only legislation calculated to promote our success in arms should be passed now. None else should be considered even. We want to get directly on to the promotion of our success in arms, and every Senator here knows that there is scarcely anything that so arouses bitterness and animosity as the question of whether America or Germany shall win in this great war. We have seen it in the papers that the Anti-Saloon League has stated that it will campaign for the adoption of the amendment. Could not the Anti-Saloon League do better with this money by putting it to the use of the war?"

Cantrill, of Kentucky, speaking against the resolution, referred to the power already placed in the hands of the President. He said:

"Under the Federal law today, the manufacture of spirituous liquors is absolutely prohibited. Only very light wines and beers can now be legally made in this country, and the President of the United States can now by the stroke of the pen prohibit the manufacture of wines and beers and place the Nation strictly on a prohibition basis. I am willing to trust this entire question to his wisdom and judgment. I will show my confidence in him by voting to defeat the pending amendment. The President, from his exalted position, knows better than any man, or any set of men, what is best for the welfare of the Nation, and he will not make a mistake in his hands, and the lawmakers of the land will not make a mistake when they permit him to handle the liquor question along with a multitude of other questions of equal or greater importance. This is no time for members of this house to consider their individual political fortunes in making up their minds how they will vote on the question which comes before them."

Walsh, of Massachusetts, made an effective argument in opposition to the amendment. He said:

"It is said that democracy is precious, and that we are engaged in a struggle for democracy, but to say that the states in one section of this country shall dictate to the states in another section of the country upon matters which heretofore have been within the sole control of the people of the several states, upon matters which by the plainest interpretation of the Constitution are reserved to the states, is not in the interest of democracy. So, for the reason that I am opposed to including in the fundamental law propositions of this sort, I am opposed to this resolution."

Mr. Walsh also referred to the necessity of concentration of efforts to win the war, and said:

"I submit that we ought not at this time by our action here to open up the states a contest which will result in discussion and occupation of time, the expenditure of effort and money in each of the 48 states of the Union, which same time, effort and money might well be used toward the winning of this war."

Small, of North Carolina, a "bone-dry" state, made the following telling points, among many others:

"If the time ever comes when the states are shorn of the right to govern themselves in all local matters and are deprived of the right to exercise their untrammelled police powers in the enforce-

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND WOODROW WILSON IN FULL ACCORD.

(With acknowledgment to Washington Times. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, said: "Whisky kills one-third of our citizens and ruins our families." Woodrow Wilson said: "No more whisky shall be manufactured when the present supply is exhausted." Thomas Jefferson also encouraged the making of light wine and beer. He said: "It is to be desired that this beverage (beer) become common, instead of whisky, which kills one-third of our citizens and ruins their families." Woodrow Wilson, under the power granted him by Congress, stopped the manufacture of whisky, but allowed workmen beer, 96 per cent water, and light wine.

THIS DID NOT SATISFY PROHIBITION FANATICS.

ment of the same, we will see the beginning of the end of this republic. When all government is centralized at Washington there will come local and state insurrection, loyalty to the central Government will be impaired and ultimately revolution will stalk abroad throughout the land. It may be said that this invasion of the right the states constitute only one instance, and that other invasions will not necessarily follow. In a matter of such supreme import even one invasion of local self-government is not to be tolerated, but unfortunately this is only one of a number which are now being pressed by zealous reformers. The first error will make easier subsequent efforts. When we have seen the first error, the fine balance of powers between the states and the Federal Government we will have endangered the structure of the entire structure.

Again, "This amendment is not necessary to enable any state to control or prohibit the manufacture, sale, consumption or importation of intoxicating liquors. Each state has the power to use a familiar expression, to make itself 'bone-dry.' Not only may each state pass laws prohibiting within its borders the manufacture, sale or consumption of intoxicating liquors in any form, but, under the Webb law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States, it may prevent the importation of any intoxicating liquor into such state, through its administrative officers and by its own courts each state may literally enforce such laws. The statement may be emphasized that the states now have the exclusive power over intoxicating liquors."

Mr. Small's speech was one of the most powerful made in opposition. Every American citizen should get a copy and read it.

McArthur, of Oregon, a "bone-dry" state, injected a new note. He said:

"To those that contend that this is a war measure let me say that it will be at least two years before the requisite three-fourths of the states will hold sessions of their Legislatures; in the meantime the sake of argument, let the amendment be adopted as soon as the Legislatures have an opportunity to vote on it—which is extremely doubtful—there is a proviso that the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states. This means it will be at least three years before National prohibition can be enforced. Let us fervently hope that the time will elapse before three years have elapsed. I cannot agree that a vote in Congress for National prohibition is merely a 'referendum' and that the responsibility rests with the voters of the states. There is no such thing as a referendum, for this implies a popular vote rather than a vote by the Legislature, and the functions of Congress in this matter is not ministerial, but is an essential element in the process of amendment."

I highly think it would be profitable in this article to extend this digest of the speeches of Congressmen, especially since the essential lines of the debate have been indicated in the quotations already given. Perhaps, however, I should not close without citing the strong point made by Mr. Gordon, of Ohio. Mr. Gordon said:

"This proposed joint resolution is a bald, naked and palpable repudiation of the letter and spirit of the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, the adoption of which was necessary by its ratification, to insure the maintenance of the rights of the states. I have already quoted this amendment in the first part of this article. This joint resolution proposed to outlaw by prohibition the use of many hundreds of millions in value of property now utilized in the production, manufacture and sale of liquors. The functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and New Jersey to conform to the laws of the rural and sparsely settled states like the 11 states named, the functions of the executive operative until after its final adoption by the last of the necessary 35 states—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Vermont, Utah and Wyoming—presented on the floor of the House by 16 members and in the Senate of the United States by 22 Senators—had, by the census of 1910, an aggregate population of 14,400,000, while the same census of the state of New York had a population of 9,113,614. Neither of these 11 states had as many people as the city of Cleveland, Ohio, at that time. The population of the combined 11 states of New York and New Jersey was 17,000,000. The population of the city of New York here we have the impelling force behind this proposition, because the people of states like