

## Hitchcock Refuses to Vote for Suffrage

Both branches of the Nebraska legislature unanimously adopted a joint resolution memorializing the United States senate to submit national equal suffrage to the states for approval and particularly requesting Senator G. M. Hitchcock to vote for such submission to the states. The resolution follows:

Section 1. That the Nebraska senate and the house of representatives of the state of Nebraska hereby memorialize the senate of the United States without delay to pass and submit to the states for approval or rejection the pending women suffrage federal amendment.

Section 2. That the senate and house of representatives of the state of Nebraska hereby request Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska to vote in favor of the submission to the states of said women suffrage federal amendment.

Section 3. That copies of this resolution shall be sent by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of the senate of the United States and to Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska.

### TEXT OF REPLY

Senator Hitchcock replied to the resolution in the following letter:

"I acknowledge receipt of the resolution adopted by the Nebraska legislature requesting me to vote for the resolution submitting to the states for their ratification the woman suffrage constitutional amendment. The request, coming from a legislature so recently elected, was entitled to careful and respectful consideration although it called upon me to change my vote, if not my judgment on this important question.

"I need hardly say if I had been able to change my judgment I certainly should have changed my vote. Not being able to change my judgment it seems proper that I should state to the legislature my reasons for the conviction I hold.

### DIFFERENT PROBLEM

"Let me say in the first place that I make no argument against woman suffrage. While in the past I have opposed woman suffrage, the course of political, social and economical developments of recent years has modified by judgment on that issue and when the question is again submitted to the voters in Nebraska I shall certainly not be found in opposition to the change and may be among its active advocates. An entirely different issue is presented, however, when an amendment is proposed to the constitution of the United States to compel states against their will to grant the elective franchise to women. Should such a resolution be passed by congress it would mean that 36 states approving it would be in a position to compel 12 other states to recognize women suffrage even if opposed to it. It is perfectly competent for Nebraska to decide that in the election of her legislature, her city governments, her governor and her supreme court judges, she she wants women to vote, but I can not approve the idea that any other state in the union, or any other number of states in the union should compel Nebraska to adopt this method against the will of her people.

"If the federal amendment only contemplated the election of senators, congressmen and president, as dictated in the federal constitution, it would be much less objectionable, but when we contemplate that it includes the election of all state, county and city officers of 48 states in a manner dictated by 36 states, it is contrary to my ideas of government and I cannot vote to place 36 states in a position to make such dictation."

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE AGAIN BEATEN IN THE SENATE

A Washington dispatch, dated Feb. 10, says: Woman suffrage by constitutional amendment was beaten again today in the senate.

The house resolution for submission of the amendment failed of adoption with 55 votes in favor of it and 29 against, one less than the necessary two-thirds.

Thus ended what leading suffrage champions had said in advance would be the final test of this session of congress. The suffrage advocates went into the test knowing they lacked one vote, but hoping to the last that it would be won over.

Those voting in favor of the resolution were: Democrats — Ashurst, Culberson, Gerry, Gore, Henderson, Johnson of North Dakota, Jones of

New Mexico, Kendrick, Kirby, Lewis, McKellar, Myers, Nugent, Pittman, Pollock, Ransdell, Robinson, Shafroth, Sheppard, Smith of Arizona, Thomas, Thompson, Vardaman and Walsh — 24. Republicans — Calder, Colt, Cummins, Curtis, Fernald, France, Frelinghuysen, Gronna, Harding, Johnson of California, Jones of Washington, Kellogg, Kenyon, LaFollette, Lenroot, McCumber, McNary, Nelson, New, Norris, Page, Poindexter, Sherman, Smith of Michigan, Smoot, Spencer, Sterling, Sutherland, Townsend, Warren and Watson — 31.

Total voting for, 55.

Voting against the resolution were:

Democrats — Bankhead, Beckman, Fletcher, Gay, Hardwick, Hitchcock, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Pomerene, Saulsbury, Simmons, Smith of Georgia, Smith, of South Carolina, Swanson, Trammell, Underwood, Williams and Wolcott — 18.

Republicans — Baird, Borah, Brandegee, Dillingham, Hale, Logan, McLean, Moses, Penrose, Wadsworth and Weeks — 11. Total 29.

The following were paired:

Chamberlain of Oregon and Martin of Kentucky with Reed of Missouri; Goff of West Virginia, and Owen of Oklahoma, with Shields of Tennessee, Hollis of New Hampshire, and King of Utah, with Knox of Pennsylvania, and Phelan of California and Fall of New Mexico, with Smith of Maryland.

### RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION IS EVIDENCE OF HIGHER MORALITY OF NEW ERA

By the ratification of the prohibition amendment to the federal constitution one hundred per cent in efficiency has been added at one stroke to the people of America. And by the same stroke half of the misery and half of the poverty of the people of America have been abolished. Three hundred thousand saloons have been eliminated, three hundred thousand man-traps have been closed into which a considerable portion of the youth of the country fell every year — fell to degradation and to vice and to crime.

Three hundred thousand ambushes have been destroyed from which the forces of evil have been wont to issue in secrecy to overcome the happiness of homes and to attack the religion, the education, the morality and the prosperity of the community. Strong drink has killed more every year than the great war has killed. Strong drink has destroyed more every year than the great war has destroyed. And the continuance of strong drink would be as if the great war has been perpetuated forever to kill and to maim physically and mentally, forever to destroy the works of man and the potential fortress for achievement in man, forever to interfere with progress and prosperity and enlightenment and development — not wholly to prevent advancement but always to hinder and hamper it; to strike down many of these best fitted to create it; to dwarf the greatest possibility of civilized development and to make it fall of its greatest growth and fullest fruition. A heavy and overbearing burden has been lifted from the back of humanity and mankind is able to stretch its limbs with a new freedom, fill its lungs with a purer air, feel its heart throb with a new energy and its brain thrill with a clearer thought and higher purpose.

Did the great war destroy the drink evil? If so, the great war conferred the greatest benefaction of all ages.

But the drink evil was not destroyed by the great war, but by the growing, rising, expanding conscience of mankind, by the trend toward moral legislation as well as political and economic legislation, by the disposition of the ethical and intellectual forces of the country to take a closer care of the welfare of their less favorable fellows.

The great war merely brought to a culmination this finer sentiment, this higher development. Good is not born of evil, happiness is not bred of sorrow, but suffering often refines our thoughts and elevates our ideals. The griefs and deprivations of the war, the devotion and consecration to a noble cause lifted the character and conscience of our people and made the evil of drink more vividly seen, more deeply detested. The suppression of the drink traffic is an evidence and expression of the higher morality of the new era upon which we are entering, and it is the clearest indication as well as the strongest guaranty of the better conditions which this new era will afford to mankind. — William Randolph Hearst, in N. Y. American.

### HUGHES JOINS BRYAN IN THE PLEA FOR ARMENIA

[From New York Tribune, February 9.] Charles Evans Hughes and William Jennings Bryan pleaded for a free Armenia last night at the dinner of the Armenian Committee for the Independence of Armenia at the Hotel Plaza. Five hundred Armenians and friends of that oppressed people attended, many coming from distant parts of the United States.

A resolution was passed asking the peace conference to help Armenia to establish an independent state.

Messages from Foreign Minister Balfour, of England, and Foreign Minister Pichon, of France, promising the support of those nations to the cause of Armenian independence, were received with applause. The Armenian national delegation at Paris sent an expression of thanks for America's interest in Armenian freedom.

The dinner guests were stirred by a pageant depicting 3,000 years of Armenian history. This pageant showed some of the trials that Armenia in the past has endured in the cause of civilization and Christianity.

James W. Gerard, chairman of the committee who presided last night, asserted that the claims of Armenia could not be ignored by the peace conference. He told of the hundreds of thousands of Armenians slaughtered by the Turks because the Armenian people refused to support Turkey in Turkey's support of Kultur. He paid a tribute to the heroism of the Armenian contingent that fought with the Allies in Palestine. Armenia has earned freedom, he said.

### BRYAN URGES FREE REPUBLIC FOR ARMENIA

[From New York American, February 9.] William Jennings Bryan, urging self-determination and self-government for Armenia declared last night America has taught the world how to progress without revolution or bloodshed. The former Secretary of State was principal speaker at a banquet and pageant given in the Hotel Plaza by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia.

After the speeches a resolution was adopted unanimously, calling for the independence of Armenia and requesting President Wilson to take steps at the peace conference to aid in the setting up of a republic in that ancient country.

### THE BRYAN REVIVAL

What with prohibition written into the federal constitution, government ownership of railroads a near-policy of the administration, and the principle of his arbitration treaties given a prominent place in the tentative plans of the League of Nations, Mr Bryan's cup of happiness must be reasonably filled in his retirement from the stress and strain of official life. And now comes the titular representative of the administration in matters of fiscal policy and advocates the establishment of the guarantee of national bank deposits. The only thing seemingly lacking to make his joy complete would be the acceptance of his theory of silver coinage, and, to tell the truth, there are more or less accepted schemes of inflation either conditionally admitted or knocking at the door of the currency system today which are quite as dangerous to the sound money principle as any threatened recognition of silver. — Philadelphia Bulletin.

### GET SOMEBODY ELSE

The Lord had a job for me,  
But I had so much to do  
That I said you get somebody else  
Or wait 'til I get through.  
I don't know how the Lord made out  
But he seemed to get along  
But I felt kind a sneaking like  
I knowed I done God wrong.  
One day I needed the Lord  
I needed him right away,  
But he never answered me at all,  
And I could hear him say,  
Down in my accusin' heart:  
"Nigger, I've got too much to do;  
You get somebody else,  
Or wait 'til I get through."  
Now, when the Lord He have a job for me,  
I never tries to shirk;  
I drops what I have on hand,  
And does the good Lord's work.  
And my affairs can run along,  
Or wait 'til I get through;  
Nobody else can do the work  
That God marked out for you.

— Paul Lawrence Dunbar.