

**Addresses at the dinner to the President of the
United States by the citizens of Washington under
the auspices of the Board of trade and Chamber of
commerce,**

ADDRESSES AT THE DINNER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE
CITIZENS OF WASHINGTON UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE BOARD OF TRADE
AND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SATURDAY EVENING, MAY EIGHTH NINETEEN
HUNDRED AND NINE

Washington, D. C. Board of trade

LC

PRESS OF W. F. ROBERTS COMPANY WASHINGTON

Copy 2

LC

CONTENTS.

Page.

Introductory Address of Mr. Edson 5

Address of Honorable Wendell Phillips Stafford 9

Address of the President 27

Reproduction of Contents of Souvenir 35

Library of Congress

By transfer The White House March 3rd, 1913

5

Introductory Address of Mr. John Joy Edson CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE AND THE WASHINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. President:

Your presence here to-night is keenly appreciated, and great pleasure and value are attached to the occasion.

It is the first time in the memory of any of our people that the President has accepted an invitation to dinner, to meet and confer with the citizens of Washington upon District matters. The interest you have shown at this early date in your administration is unprecedented, and quickly inspires the citizens of Washington with the belief that a clearer and a more correct understanding will be brought about as to the true relation of the Federal and local governments. While the nation, we are sure, feels a great pride and interest in the nation's Capital, the administration of purely municipal domestic affairs has often not been understood by the country, nor even by Congress.

Our present government has been, in the main, the most successful municipal government in this country. In the thirty years of its history not a single instance of scandal has occurred, nor a hint of corruption, nor of the existence of rings. Practically every dollar expended by the District authorities shows value received, a striking contrast, we believe, to the experience of other cities throughout the country.

Yet with this good record, the defect referred to exists, which is growing more complicated as our population and importance increase, and that is, in not fixing a demarcation between what is properly intended to be a Federal control and what should properly and wisely be accorded the people of Washington, in the administration of the government, in

Library of Congress

purely local affairs, such as hospitals, penal institutions, police and fire regulations, and especially schools and charities.

Whenever it is apparent that any improvement can be made in any branch or in any detail of the machinery of the government, it will be wise to make the change, unless it is plain that the effort to do so is, for the time being, likely to endanger the main structure.

Mr. President, this dinner was tendered to you by the Board of Trade and the Chamber of Commerce on behalf of and representing all the citizens of the District of Columbia. The Board of Trade was organized about twenty years ago, and the Chamber of Commerce has had several years of activity. It was soon found, after the establishment of the present government, that there was no way in which the people of Washington could collectively voice their sentiments on local public matters. Several ineffectual methods were adopted, and, finally, the Board of Trade was organized. It is not a trade body, as its name would imply. It has proved almost wholly to have been engaged in civic effort. It numbers over seven hundred public-spirited citizens, embracing practically all reputable professions and business occupations.

It has always been the purpose of the organization to consider carefully all questions arising in civic matters, and never to declare itself on any subject until certain that its position was right. The effect has been that the organization enjoys the confidence of the general and 7 local governments and the public. It has done splendid constructive work and secured many good results.

The Chamber of Commerce, with a larger number of members, was organized more particularly to correct a really neglected branch of public effort in the commercial, manufacturing, and business interests of the District, and it also engages in many civic activities. In the short time since its organization much has been accomplished by its efforts, and the city's material business interests and importance thereby have made

Library of Congress

substantial progress and improvement. It has made intelligent and comprehensive plans for the future, and these plans, we feel confident, will prove valuable and successful.

We feel sure, Mr. President, that we have in both these bodies and in the citizenship of Washington, a people who, in character, culture, public spirit, patriotism, and philanthropy, will compare favorably with the citizenship of any city in the nation.

So impressed are we with this innovation, and the fruitful results that are certain to follow, that I venture to suggest that this happy occasion may establish an annual function, where the people may meet The President and confer about what has been accomplished and what is the best way to accomplish the most in the coming of each year. It should be the yearly mile-stone in the progress and welfare of the District of Columbia.

I believe, if this suggestion is carried out, it will be looked forward to each year with the greatest possible pleasure, as the greatest event of the year to the citizens of Washington, and in the best interest of the Nation's Capital.

The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia has Federal and local jurisdiction. In this respect it differs from any other court in the United States, and therefore, it has become the custom to appoint jurists, part from the States and part from the District of Columbia.

Justice Wendell Phillip Stafford was appointed from Vermont by President Roosevelt May 1, 1904—just five years ago.

8

In this time he has become well acquainted with the people of Washington and with District affairs—more so, probably, than any of his predecessors or associates in the same length of time.

We have learned to respect and esteem him as an able, upright judge; a scholarly, cultured gentleman; a splendid citizen, and an ideal neighbor and friend—Justice Stafford.

**ADDRESS OF Hon. Wendell Phillips Stafford Associate Justice Supreme Court Of
The District Of Columbia**

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, and you, my Fellow-citizens:

I pledge you in a sentiment that is almost a prayer: "May this prove a fortunate day for the District of Columbia." Without doubt the people of the District look upon the occasion that has drawn us here as a most happy augury. The Chief Magistrate of the nation, not more respected than beloved, has signified his willingness to sit at their board, to break their bread and taste their salt. It is a proof of interest and kindness that has touched all hearts. We who are seated around these tables are only a handful out of many thousands who in thought and sympathy are with us at this feast. Presidents have come and gone, doing their duty by the District as they saw it, but in the press and throng of larger duties too often prevented from giving to local matters the attention they deserved. Never before has a President at the beginning of his term thus held out the hand of friendship to our people. Our President has seen much of Washington. But more than that, he has traveled far and wide, he has studied the capitals of other countries, their institutions and their laws. And thus he adds to the true promptings of a generous heart the wisdom of a ripe experience. Those are the qualities that are needed here and now. It is the hour for a statesman. The population of the 10 District has increased so rapidly, it is growing so in wealth and beauty, the greatness of its future is already so assured, that the time has come when the true relations between the District and the nation must be clearly conceived and accurately defined, and when an ideal must be formed for the District of Columbia—an ideal to be worked for through generations, true enough and grand enough to claim the attention and the devotion of all the land.

The men who made the Constitution were absolutely certain of one thing, and that was that this Federal government must have a home of its own. "Over such a district," the Constitution in so many words declares, the Congress shall "exercise exclusive legislation

Library of Congress

in all cases whatsoever." So far as general legislation is concerned, there is no power in Congress to delegate this authority. It must legislate itself. When it attempted once to bestow upon a Territorial legislature for the District the authority to make general laws, the court declared the attempt unconstitutional and vain. The utmost it can do in this direction is to authorize the enactment of local regulations. No attempt to legislate for Washington will be worth the making unless it is made in the same spirit in which the founders worked. It was said of an Eastern temple, "It was designed by Titans and finished by jewelers." The tribute is capable of a double meaning. A great work should be grandly conceived and then executed with minutest pains. We wish as much for Washington. But the jeweler must not meddle with the architect's design. If he does, men may say: "It was planned by Titans; it was finished by pygmies." Less than half a century had elapsed from the founding of the Capital before a congress was found pusillanimous enough to surrender and cede back thirty square miles of Federal soil, and the noble patrimony the nation had received from the Father of his Country was broken in two, and the Virginia portion cast away. Our task to-night is to put the Washington of our day to the test of the great principles that controlled the 11 founders of our government, to view the work they left us in the light of all that has developed since, and to plan for the future as men of their vision would have planned in our surroundings.

What do we mean when we say the District of Columbia? There are at least three meanings in which the expression may be accurately used. It may mean the mere territory, the seventy square miles of land and water. It may mean the municipal corporation which has been created by the act of Congress. It may mean the political community, which may be called, and by the Supreme Court has been repeatedly called, for certain purposes, a State. In this third sense it is not a mere municipal corporation, but is filled with the sovereignty of the United States of America. It is of the utmost importance to distinguish between these meanings, especially between the second and the third, if we would keep our thinking clear. Let us take a moment to trace this distinction in the transactions of a century.

Library of Congress

When the United States, in 1800, took possession of this territory it found local self-government here. For two generations it left it undisturbed. "Prior to 1871," said Mr. Justice Bradley, in a case before the court of last resort, "the government of the United States, except so far as the protection of its own public buildings and property was concerned, took no part in the local government. The officers of the departments, even the President himself, exercised no local authority in city affairs." In 1871 the Congress created here a new government expressly for "municipal purposes." It had its governor and its legislature—the latter, of course, elected by the people. It had also a board of public works, whose members, including the governor as its head, were appointed by the President and Senate. This board laid out the money raised in taxes, and assessed the owners benefited by improvements. The court held that its acts were binding on the District, and that, in spite of its appointment by the President, it was only a branch of the municipal government. 12 Thus matters remained until 1874, when Congress tore down all it had previously done, and started new. The governor and the board of public works were abolished, and the power which they had exercised was intrusted to a commission of three, to be appointed by the President and Senate. Four years later, in 1878, the new arrangement was made permanent.

Nevertheless, the contention was made before the Supreme Court of the United States that the effect of the new act was to destroy the District of Columbia as a municipal corporation, except in name, and to make it nothing more than a department of the national government. The contention was ruled down. The fact that its officers were appointed by the President, said the court, did not make the District of Columbia any less a municipal body corporate. Recognizing the general desirableness of local self-government, it held that the principle of representative government was legally satisfied when the appointment of local officers was made by other officers who themselves had been elected by the people, saying: "The people are the recognized source of all authority, and to this authority it must come at last, whether immediately or by a circuitous process."

Library of Congress

Whether a flaw is to be found in this reasoning as applied to the situation before the court, inasmuch as the people of the District of Columbia, the people to be governed, never did have a share in electing the President and Senate, who were the appointing officers, I will not stop here to inquire; for my present purpose is to point out the separation that has always been recognized between the District of Columbia, as a mere municipal corporation, and the District of Columbia as a quasi state.

There is only one sovereign in the District of Columbia: Indeed, in respect to sovereignty, the situation is precisely the same as if there were no other domain affected by the central government; as if all its functions were performed here. Why, then, it may be asked, should there be such a municipality as the District of Columbia at all? Why should not the general government take direct control and administer all the affairs of the District through its own bureaus? It would not be so easy to answer that question if two facts were other than they are: First—If there were no citizens of the United States except those who live in the District. Second—If the District elected the national officers. But there are 350,000 people here, and there are some 90,000,000 outside, and all are citizens of the United States; and the 350,000 who live here have some interests which they do not hold in common with the 90,000,000 who live outside. It is, in part at least, for the recognition and protection of these separate and peculiar interests that a municipal government exists and is required. All the more is it needed by reason of the fact that there is no suffrage. Let us picture what might be. The streets and public works might all be put under the War Department, the public health under the Surgeon General, the charities made a bureau in the Department of Commerce and Labor, or perhaps of the Interior, and the schools turned over to the Commissioner of Education. And so it might go on, until the local government was completely bureaucratic—until the rod of national administration, turned serpent, had swallowed up all the little rods of local administration and was left alone upon the floor.

In the meantime the city, growing by leaps and bounds, has doubled and trebled its present population, and we have here a million people, without a word to say, in theory or

Library of Congress

fact, directly or indirectly, about the streets they walk, the water they drink, the light they burn, or the education of their children—everything done for them, and done by officers in whose selection they had no voice and who have been selected with no particular reference to their opinions or their needs. To some of us that is not a pleasing spectacle.

Certainly we must not forget that this is a national city. There is little risk of that. But there are institutions, many and important, which are not national in their aim or character. They are exactly such institutions 14 as the same numerical population would require were this not the nation's Capital. That is true of the institutions of charity and punishment. We should need to have schools, recording offices, post-offices and courts; we should need streets and bridges, and a thousand things beside, by reason of the fact that we are a city. Institutions that answer the needs of the community merely as a community, without reference to the national government, should not these be treated as local institutions? Should they not be administered as a part of the municipal government and officered by men identified with the District?

Those courts of the District which deal not exclusively with local controversies, but in large measure with disputes to which the nation is a party, may perhaps be fairly made up, one-half of members drawn from the locality and one-half from the nation at large. This seems the more appropriate, inasmuch as those who hold these offices hold them during good behavior, and when they come here come hoping to behave well enough to remain through life!

But many offices relate exclusively to this community, at least as much so as the offices of any community can be said to relate to itself alone, and why should not these be filled by local citizens? Even if there should be no statute thus restricting the selection, ought not such a course be pursued as a permanent policy? Why should the people of the District have their deeds recorded by a man from California? Why should Washington be the only city in the land that cannot have a postmaster appointed from among its citizens? If we are to keep up the form of municipal government at all, does not a fair consistency demand

Library of Congress

that we should treat it as municipal, as existing, among other purposes, to care for all that is peculiar and local in the interests and needs of the community? Will it not be wisdom to treat it so? Let us not forget that there are thousands upon thousands here who have no other abiding place. Their roots have struck deep into the soil. They love the city with all the national pride we share with them, and with that tender sentiment which we call “the love of home” besides. Is it wise to treat them as aliens in the house of their fathers? Others have lived here till all ties with other places are dissolved and they expect their children will live here when they are gone. These people, so completely and irrevocably identified with the place, constitute an element not wisely to be overlooked when one is considering how local affairs may be most prudently and loyally administered.

Who knows? Perhaps we have come already to the parting of the ways. Little by little the local hold is lost. Here a hospital is drawn under the control of a department. There the jail slips out of the hands of the District into the hands of the Attorney General. Now it is proposed that the schools be placed under a bureau; and now, that the city shall be officered on the principle of efficiency alone, by any one who can be found who is most competent, though he never saw Washington before. It would be something to assume that among 350,000 such as we find gathered here, not a single man could be found capable of conducting the business of the city. But if it could be conjectured that in some far off place a commissioner might be found somewhat more efficient, would that difference in efficiency make up for the sacrifice of one more bond—sometimes it seems as if it were the last—between the government and the locality?

The problem of city government is not altogether, I venture to think, a matter of perfecting the machinery. Men are not altogether machines. They have sentiments; they have hearts. And if there had not been sentiment and heart, as well as brain, there would be to-day no Washington.

As far as the municipal government is concerned, the people of the District seem to have settled down to the arrangement that there should be no suffrage. They accept it—very

Library of Congress

much as Lord Dundreary's brother Sam accepted his embarrassment in being born and especially in being born bald-headed. "You see 16 Sam, he wasn't consulted; and there he was, and it was too late to do anything about it." But suffrage or no suffrage in municipal affairs has nothing to do with the principle of which I speak. I believe it should be the policy of the government, alongside of the national spirit that inspires all hearts, to foster and perpetuate a sturdy local patriotism, a local and peculiar civic pride; and, to this end, that all such institutions as are purely local in their character should be scrupulously retained under the District government, and that all offices of this kind should be filled by those who have become residents of Washington for good and all.

Sir, I am not inclined to discuss to-night the various proposed changes in the constitution of the city government. These concern a possible increase of efficiency in the municipal machine. In what I am yet to say I prefer to dwell upon a broader question. But no one ought to refer to the form of government that has given shape to our affairs since 1874 without doing justice to the splendid advances that have been made under its direction. In 1878 the plan was adopted of raising upon the ratable property here a tax of 1½ per cent. and of matching that with an equal amount from the national Treasury.

Up to that time the District had carried the burden year by year, almost or quite alone, and was sinking under a debt of many millions. Under the new arrangement Washington has sprung to her feet. Parks have been laid out, avenues extended, bridges built, public buildings erected, grade crossings abolished, railway terminals improved, a magnificent new station built, the sewerage and water systems practically made over, millions upon millions spent toward making the city in health and beauty what it ought to be. Meantime absolute fidelity in the discharge of duties, no stain or hint of corruption, scarcely a dishonest transaction even charged. Surely that is a record for any city to cherish and for those who have had a share in making it to look back upon with pride.

Library of Congress

Some forbidding obstacles have been encountered and are met with still. One is, this being compelled to pay for permanent improvements out of the current income. What other city is expected to pay for its great works, to last for generations, out of its ordinary receipts, meanwhile taking it out of its schools and scrimping its legitimate expenses? Any other city would raise the money on bonds and pay them a little at a time. Washington need not be bonded, since the national treasury can supply it with a loan and let it be paid back at a reasonable rate; but the principle is sound. It is enforced by the late Secretary of the Treasury in his able report for 1908, where he sets forth with great lucidity the need of a national budget to bring about an adjustment between disbursements and receipts, with a rigid separation between expenditures for the ordinary service of the government and those for permanent public works, the latter to be met by bond issues.

But there are obstacles of graver import, and they constitute defects radical and without remedy in the present relation between nation and District. They can be removed only by a change in that relation itself. We shall all agree that to legislate wisely requires two things—first, a lively interest in the object of legislation; second, a clear intelligence touching the subject in hand. There being no representative from the District itself in either branch of Congress, it becomes necessary to commit the interests of the District, and the interests of the nation in the District, to hands unfamiliar with the subject and without any lively interest therein.

The Congress as a whole cannot be expected to supply these requisites. No one pretends it does. It is engaged upon a thousand subjects, many of which appear to its members to be vastly more important than any that concerns the District. We cannot wonder at it; it is in the nature of things that it should be so. The step logically required by this condition is next taken.

A committee in the House and a committee in the Senate are specially charged with these affairs. Not that their word is accepted as final. If it were, some difficulties would be escaped. But in the end their report must run the gantlet of the whole House or Senate.

Library of Congress

Here ignorance of District affairs has often shown itself so egregious and glaring that it could excite nothing but laughter, if tears were not often a more fitting recognition of the folly. And when that occurs there is no representative of the District to meet the ignorant, unfounded claim. Three hundred and fifty thousand people are voiceless in that hall. The committees cannot meet the emergency. To expect it would be to expect more than mortal men can do. Who are the members of the committees? Are they Senators and Representatives set apart for this work and free to devote themselves entirely to such business? By no means. They have their own constituencies to serve, and they have, besides, their share of responsibility for the general legislation, like all their fellow-members. They are appointed; they do the best they can; and if they give sufficient time to our affairs to understand our problems, they run the risk of losing their seats entirely by being thought at home to have neglected their own States or districts. I am credibly informed that the risk has turned into a certainty in more instances than one. But, more than that, the membership of the House and Senate changes and the membership of the committees changes, too. Hardly has a member become reasonably acquainted with our subject than he is called away, another takes his place, and the whole process of education must be begun again. That is the radical and incurable defect of the present system. Keep your three Commissioners if you will, or substitute for them a single head, improve the machinery of municipal administration all you can, until it runs with the regularity of a Swiss watch—you have not touched the trouble. What is needed is, two men in the House and one man in the Senate; real live men with blood in their arteries and brains in their heads; men who have lived long in the District of Columbia and belong to her; men who know her needs and her capacity, men who know the history and condition of her institutions, her charities, her prisons, the views and aspirations of her people; men who are proud of their connection with her, and proud that to her soil has been committed the ark of civil and religious liberty. What we need is *members* of these bodies, with the prestige that belongs to members; not figureheads, not lobbyists, not delegates, but a member of the Senate and two members of the House, able, enlightened, informed, fit to represent the will and judgment of 350,000 citizens gathered within these bounds.

Library of Congress

But that requires an amendment of the Constitution! So it does. An amendment in strict accord with the principles of the Constitution, made necessary by the changed conditions of 120 years, made unavoidable and inevitable by the changes that will take place in the fifty or one hundred years to come. Do you imagine that when 1,000,000 or 1,500,000 shall be swarming in our borders they will be the only people in this broad domain to have no hand in the government of this magnificent republic, no word in the election of its President, no tongue in the national assembly?

When 1,000,000 men are here, when they ask why they alone can have no part in a republican form of government, do you imagine they will call it a sufficient answer to be told "Because you live in Washington? If you lived in Pumpkin Hook or Bloody Gulch, you might, but not while you live here."

Bear in mind, I am not speaking of municipal suffrage. I am speaking of the right of a million of simple American citizens to have a share—less than a one hundredth part, it would be—in the legislation that concerns their country and its Capital. Suppose they have no more right than the same number of people who live anywhere else in the United States. Have they not as much? And that is all the right of which I speak.

But I hear it said, "The people of the District do not care for suffrage." Well, all I can say to that is this: If the people of the District of Columbia do not really care USERFILE. 20 to have a part in the government of this splendid country, they do not deserve to have it, and nobody need fear that it will be thrust upon them. But I cannot believe that statement.

"Say, seignors, are the old Niles dry?"

I cannot believe that the human heart has changed. I cannot believe that principles have lost their power. I cannot believe that the deep instincts that built up this wonderful fabric of free government have died out here in the very seat of its majesty, and that here alone the "bright consummate flower" of liberty has gone to seed. There is no doubt that they need

Library of Congress

quickenings. There is no doubt that they have sunk into the torpor of faculties disused. But hold before their eyes the hope of what I am describing, and you shall see whether self-respect and the desire for self-government are dead.

Sir, if I had it in my power to-night to dispose of this matter as I would, do you know what I would do? I would not change the constitution. I would not give the people of the District suffrage. What I would do is this: I would set to their dry hearts the flame of that old Promethean torch, the love of liberty. I would fill them with divine unrest at their condition. I would set beside that condition, a picture of the dignity and power they might enjoy as real citizens of their country. I would move them first to desire and then to demand their portion of our heritage. I would nerve them to toil for it and fight for it through years of bitter opposition—and then at last, when the agitation had created a new Washington, when 400,000 or 500,000 people were calling as with one mighty voice for the great prize of representative government—then, then, I would bestow it on them. And, sir, I believe that is exactly what the god of time will do.

A city of the dumb! Mr. Chairman, I have heard you speak of a little village on an island off the New England coast inhabited entirely by deaf mutes. They live unto themselves. They marry and intermarry and rear children who are dumb as they. They go about their tasks, but speak no word. The busy hum of life goes on 21 around them; the shuttles of the world's activities fly to and fro, but into the growing web they weave no strand. Sir, I will not extend the parallel. It is too obvious and too painful to be drawn.

But that is not the Washington that shall be. Only let the agitation begin. Let it start here to-night. Why not make the occasion historic? Let every true son of Washington, native, or adopted, go out from this feast strengthened and heartened for a long enlistment. Let him know for once in his life the glory of being possessed by a grand idea—the sublime enthusiasm of being lost in absolute devotion to a great cause. Let them meet and join hands and stir one another's hearts, quicken one another's minds, and sustain one another's courage. Let it go on. It will meet with opposition; it will meet with ridicule; it will

Library of Congress

meet with censure; it will take years; it may take many—but it can have but one possible outcome if the sons of Washington are worthy of the name they bear.

Again I say, I am not speaking now of municipal suffrage at all. Let the present arrangement, or some improved substitute for it, be continued if you please. What has that to do with the broad and fundamental fact that the hundreds of thousands here should have their due and proportionate representation in the National Assembly—should have the same right that other citizens enjoy of giving their votes in the election of the Chief Magistrate of the republic?

The republic! It is not alone for the District of Columbia that I bring the proposition forward. The interests of the nation would be served as well. They would be served first of all by the increased efficiency and propriety of the laws that would be enacted; in the next place, by the fact that the members from the District, being familiar with the local situation, and serving on the local committees, would relieve the members from other States of much of their present burden, leaving them freer to perform the duties for which they were specially selected. Further, it would serve the nation by adding to 22 Congress men of weight and influence in national concerns. We should have here a constituency peculiarly rich in material for representatives.

But, more perhaps than all the rest, the change would serve the interests of the whole nation by recognizing the grand principle of representative government here, in the most conspicuous position in the country, where hitherto it has been cast aside. Men could no longer point the finger of scorn at us, and say: "Washington gives the lie to your pretensions. Look! In the very seat of national greatness you acknowledge by your acts that your form of government is a failure." Until we are honest enough to live up to our principles, we shall deserve all our troubles; and, sir, from the bottom of my heart I do believe that the greatest troubles we have spring from this very fact, that we have turned our back upon those principles. We shall never find peace or safety until we return to them again.

Library of Congress

Shall we say we fear the suffrages of ignorance and vice—the ignorance and vice that we ourselves are to blame for—that could not last a generation if we did our duty by our fellow-men? Shame on the race or the community that holds in its hands the wealth of the continent and carries in its brains the accumulated culture of the centuries and yet refuses to lift that ignorance and vice to the level of enlightenment and virtue! Tear down your shacks and shanties. Let in the sun upon your noisome alleys. Build decent habitations for the poor to dwell in. Make your prisons moral hospitals instead of breeding cells for crime. Spread education broadcast in the streets. Let us do the work of Christians at our doors before we admit that our fathers were fools and that democratic government is all a dark mistake. Never until the men of wealth and education have spent their last surplus dollar and exhausted the ingenuity of their brains in the effort to make their fellow-men worthy to be sharers in the government, never until then will they have a right to hide behind an excuse like that.

I admit that an ignorant and degraded class armed with the ballot is a menace to the safety of the state; but I deny that it is a greater menace in the end than that same class, robbed of its rights, thrust down into the dark, and left as no longer necessary to be regarded or assisted because no longer having any part in the affairs of state. Strip men of the ballot and you take away from society the most powerful inducement that can prompt selfish human nature to educate and elevate its helpless and its poor.

We must find fault with the Creator if we wish to complain that wealth, virtue, and culture cannot be safe in the neighborhood of poverty, ignorance and vice. He means that it shall be so. He sees Blagden's alley as well as Dupont Circle, and He has made it certain by the laws of nature, by every wind that breathes across the city, by every tiny insect that takes its unregarded flight from home to home, that Dupont Circle shall not be safe while Blagden's alley is rotting with disease and filth. The laws of nature are democratic. It is just the same in government. A community that has the power to lift ignorance and vice to its own level and will not stretch out its hand to do it, deserves to be endangered by

Library of Congress

ignorance and vice; and eternal justice will see to it that it is so. We cannot escape our duties; let us face them, then, like men.

If Franklin or Jefferson were here to-day and saw this mighty population with no voice in its affairs, he would lay his finger, like a wise physician, on the body politic and say: "Here—here is where you are ailing. Have faith in the principles that brought us through." Let us take up the stitch our fathers dropped. Let us apply to our situation the rules of government they applied to theirs. If you should say to Jefferson, "Why should we be disturbed? Will it give us more interest on our money?" Jefferson would answer you, "That I cannot tell, but this I know, that the man who loves freedom for anything but freedom's self was made to be a slave!"

Even if we should fail, men would write over our graves the profound saying of Guizot, "The struggle itself supplied in some measure the place of liberty." 24 But we cannot fail. Is this an hour to doubt or question the principles of free government? Now, when those principles, encouraged by their success upon this continent, are shaking every throne upon the globe? When, on the shores of the Bosphorus, Young Turkey is making good its claims to constitutional government? When Persia is starting from her reverie, and old China is turning from the slumber of 4,000 years? Now, when in the Islands of the South Pacific we ourselves are reaching out a hand to lead a strange race into the ordered paths of Anglo-Saxon freedom? Let the sons of Washington beware lest the little brown men of the Philippines enter the kingdom of representative government before them. If the people of Columbia prefer to take their ease, no rude reformer will disturb their rest. But when we have passed away, men will describe us as the dying patriarch in his prophetic vision pictured the most degenerate of his tribes: "Issachar is a strong ass, couching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute."

Sir, the danger to this country lies not, as we sometimes think, in the poor immigrant who flees to us from afar, still smarting from the lash of tyranny—ignorant and low-minded

Library of Congress

though he be. The prize of citizenship will appeal to him. He will clutch it and hold it fast as “the immediate jewel of his soul.” The danger lies in him who, “like the base Judean, throws a pearl away richer than all his tribe,” in the man who will share the blessings of liberty without bearing its burdens; in the man who is willing that impudence and theft shall sit in the seat of power, so long as he is left free to pile up his millions or scatter them like a lord on the playground of Europe.

The Capital of the United States—what is it? It is not marble palaces nor lofty domes nor splendid obelisks. If it is anything, it typifies a great idea. The deepest word that was ever uttered to interpret that idea was wrung from lips that trembled between hope and despair upon the field of Gettysburg—“of the people, for the people, by 25 the people.” Can Washington typify that idea while it stands as it does to-day? It cannot be. It must be changed. It will be changed. The time will surely come when he who stands in the shadow of these majestic structures, and of the prouder ones that shall arise, will have no cause to hang his head for shame at any violation of our principles, but will feel that here—here more truly than anywhere else on the face of the whole earth—he is standing in their august and visible presence.

And now, Mr. President, at the end as at the beginning, we turn to you, not to express the hope that you may discharge the new duties with clearer sight or firmer fidelity than you discharged the old—for that would be impossible—but that in your more exalted station you may find a wider field for your beneficent endeavors, cheered, as you will be, by the personal love of millions of your fellows and supported by the unwavering faith of all America.

27

Address of the President of the United States

Mr. Chairman, and the Solid Men of Washington:

Library of Congress

I wish to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the courtesy that you have extended to me this evening in this magnificent banquet, and in your coming here to take part in this occasion. I am proud of it, if it be the case, and I must believe it from the assurances given tonight, that this is the first time that a President of the United States has ever had the pleasure of meeting on such an occasion and under such circumstances, the business men of Washington. I hope for close intimacy; I hope that we may come together and we may discuss these things, because certainly we need it. I take the utmost personal pride in the city of Washington. It thrills my heart every day to look out of the back windows of the White House—for the short time I have been there—and whenever I get the opportunity, to see this beautiful city in which we are permitted to live—these avenues and streets, constructed on a magnificent plan, looking forward for centuries; these trees, planted with great foresight to make every part of Washington a park; these vistas into which always creeps unbidden that beautiful shaft that marks the memory of the founder of this city.

I have not been here very long in the city of Washington, as some men count it long. I was here two years, 28 between 1890 and 1892; four years, from 1904 to 1908—but that is a little bit longer than Justice Stafford. I have been a taxpayer; I have invested some money in land in Washington and have not seen a dollar come out of it; I have sent my children to the public schools; I have hung to straps in street cars, going both ways to the Capitol; I have bathed in the Potomac mud—in a bath tub; I have lunched at Harvey's on those steamed oysters, and I have been a fan with my friend "Sunny Jim" at the base-ball park, and have had a love, and cultivated it with him, for tail-enders. And therefore I claim that I have been through experiences that ought to give me some of the local atmosphere and some of the local feeling of Washington. And yet, with all that, gentlemen, as I look about here into these smiling faces, these somewhat rotund forms that give evidence of prosperity, it is a little difficult for me to realize that it was about those caitiffs and these slaves that Mr. Justice Stafford spoke.

Library of Congress

In spite of that experience, with respect to Washington I am a nationalist. This city is the home of the government of a nation and when men who were just as much imbued with the principles of civil liberty as any who have come after, Washington at the head, put into the constitution the provision with reference to the government of the District of Columbia, they knew what they were doing and spoke for a coming possible eighty millions of people who should insist that the home of the government of that eighty millions of people should be governed by the representatives of that eighty millions of people; and that if there were in that eighty millions of people men who desired to come and share in the grandeur of that capital and live in a city of magnificent beauty as this was, and enjoy all the privileges, then they come with their eyes open as to the character of the government that they were to have, and they must know that they must depend not upon the principles ordinarily governing in popular government, but that they must trust, in order to secure their liberty—to get their 29 guaranties—they must trust to the representatives of eighty millions of people selected under that Constitution.

Now I want to say, with deference to this discussion, that if this meeting, or subsequent meetings, are to be devoted to securing an amendment to the Constitution, by which you are going to disturb the principle of two Senators, from every State, and you are going to abolish the provision that was put in there *ex-industria* by George Washington, you will not get ahead in the matter of better government in Washington by such meetings. I do not want to seem to be abrupt, but I believe it is possible by such meetings as this to arouse the interest of Congress, and the Executive, to the necessity of consulting the people of Washington, to let them act as Americans, act when they don't have the right of suffrage—let them act by the right of petition, and are they not exercising that right all the time? Isn't it possible to determine on the part of the committees of the House and the Senate what the attitude of the Washington citizens is? Why, the government that we have today in Washington everybody admits is a good government. Has it not been brought about through the aid of those very committees in the House and Senate who you say know nothing about Washington, and who make their knowledge, or lack of knowledge,

Library of Congress

ridiculous by showing it? We are all imperfect. We cannot expect perfect government, but what we ought to do is to pursue practical methods, and not, I submit with deference to Judge Stafford, make it seem as if the people of Washington were suffering some great and tremendous load and sorrow, when as a matter of fact they are the envy of the citizens of other cities.

Washington intended this to be a Federal city, and it is a Federal city, and it tingles down to the feet of every man, whether he comes from Washington State, or Los Angeles, or Texas, when he comes and walks these city streets and starts to feel that "this is my city; I own a part of this Capital, and I envy for the time being those who are able to spend their time here." I quite admit that there are defects in the system of government by 30 which Congress is bound to look after the government of the District of Columbia. It could not be otherwise under such a system, but I submit to the judgment of history that the results vindicate the foresight of the fathers.

Now, I am opposed to the franchise in the District; I am opposed, and not because I yield to anyone in my support and belief in the principles of self-government; but principles are applicable generally, and, then, unless you make exceptions to the application of these principles, you will find that they will carry you to very illogical and absurd results. This was taken out of the application of the principle of self-government in the very Constitution that was intended to put that in force in every other part of the country, and it was done because it was intended to have the representatives of all the people in the country control this one city, and to prevent its being controlled by the parochial spirit that would necessarily govern men who did not look beyond the city to the grandeur of the nation, and this as the representative of that nation.

I have got over being frightened by being told that I am forgetting the principles of the fathers. The principles of the fathers are maintained by those who maintain them with reason, and according to the fitness of the thing, and not by those who are constantly shaking them before the mass of the voters for the purpose of misleading them.

Library of Congress

Now, the question arises: What shall we do with the government of Washington? Shall we have the present board of three; shall we have one or shall we have some other form? I confess I do not know. My predecessor has recommended a change of the present form so as to give the responsibility to one, with the view of visiting that one with the responsibility. On the other hand, it is said that three have worked well; that it gives more opportunity, possibly, for counsel, and that it takes away the bureaucratic character of the government. As I have said, I have reached no conclusion as to what recommendation I shall make to Congress on the subject. I fully concur with Justice Stafford in thinking that it would be most 31 unwise to introduce into the District what I understand to be a bureaucratic form of government That is right. A bureaucratic form of government is one which, as he very well described it, would make the War Department look after the streets; Dr. Wiley, possibly, look after the health—the Agricultural Department through him—and the Treasury Department look after the finances. And so as to each branch of the government you should go to the head of that particular department in the general government. I think that would be a very burdensome, a very awkward, a very clumsy system of government. I am strongly in favor of retaining the municipal form, so that everything which shall effect the city of Washington shall be done under the chief executive of that city, and by that chief executive. In other words, I would give an entity to the city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, and take all of that entity out of the operation of the bureaus of the general government. That is what I understand to be the government today, and the only question that has been noted is really whether one man should be put at the head of that government as a mayor, or whether you should have three. I agree that probably three men are better, where you have real legislative functions to perform. I am inclined to think that, where the legislative functions are reduced to a minimum and consist in little more than mere executive regulation, that possibly the one-headed form is the better, for executive purposes and to fix the responsibility; but I am only thinking out loud, and only because we are here talking right out in meeting I am telling you the reasons as they have been brought to me.

Library of Congress

Now, I want to talk about the future. And the future of Washington! What an enormous development is before us! Why, I am not an imaginative man, but I would like to come back here a hundred years hence and see the beauties of which this city is capable, right here, under our noses for a time, under our very eyes, are those beautiful Potomac flats that are going to make as fine parks and parkways as there are in the world. 32 These parks ought to be connected with the Rock Creek Park by means of the mouth of Rock Creek, or otherwise; and then through them all there ought to be carried a park clear around, including the Soldiers' Home, and completing the circuit with Rock Creek at the other end. Then, too, there is the development in Anacostia and along the Eastern Branch. Then, the opportunities for playgrounds that there are in Washington! It just makes my mouth water for my poor city of Cincinnati when I look out and can see clear down to the Potomac and can see six and seven base ball matches going on with all the fervor of Young America, and nobody to say them nay! And to think—to think, that we had a genius a hundred years ago, almost, in his way, as matchless as Washington, to make the plan for a great Capital, like the Frenchman whose remains were buried here the other day, and whose plans were hardly changed in the new plan made by Burnham and his associates. I know there has been discussion as to that plan. There has been a feeling that perhaps it was slipped onto us at one time and slipped in at another; but we all know, even my dear friend, good old Uncle Joe, knows that we are going to build up to that plan some day. It is not coming at once, but we ought to thank God that we have got a plan like that to build to, so that when we go on with the improvement every dollar that we put in goes to make Washington beautiful a hundred years hence.

Then, Justice Stafford, in his very eloquent remarks, called attention to the fact that in 1846—I am sorry to say it ought to be characterized, at least as far as that is concerned, as a day of small things—when the Congress could have recited this: “Whereas, no more territory ought to be held under the exclusive legislation given to Congress over the District, which is the seat of the general government, than may be necessary and proper for the purposes of such a seat. Therefore, we give back all that we get from Virginia”. It

Library of Congress

is true the early statute said that no buildings should be put on anything but the Maryland side of the river, and perhaps they felt that as we were not going to use that side for buildings, they did not need it at all. I have never been able to satisfy myself that that retrocession was within the power of Congress to make. They did attempt to settle it once in the Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court has a facility in avoiding the main question, born of long practice. And when a gentleman who is paying taxes on this side asks that they be extended to the other side, on the ground that that retrocession did not carry Virginia, so that he might have his taxes reduced, the Supreme Court said that he could not do it in a collateral way; said that, as both parties to the transaction seemed to be satisfied up to this time they did not intend to investigate or seek any burdens that their salaries did not require them to meet. We have never had that question tested. I believe we ought to look forward to a great city of Washington, and while the Anglo-Saxon—and especially the Anglo-Saxon in Virginia—holds on to territory as long as he can, it might be possible by agitating the question in a legal way to induce another settlement by which we should get the only part of that that we really would like to have, the part that we own now in fee, the eleven hundred acres of the Arlington estate, and a great deal that is unoccupied, leaving Alexandria out, and Falls Church, and taking in only that that is inhabited, so that we may have in this District, under our fostering control, where we can build roads and make the District still more beautiful, that bank of the Potomac on the other side, as you go up towards Cabin John Bridge. We will need it; the city will continue to grow. It may be, as Justice Stafford has said, that there will be inaugurated a protest by the people living here that they have not political power; but, I think that the Justice will find, when he comes to looking into the hearts of the American people, that they will not be convinced when they come to Washington that the Washingtonians are suffering to that degree that requires a reversal of the policy adopted, with entire clearness of mind, by the framers of the Constitution. Washington, who doubtless inserted that particular provision in the 34 Constitution, through his influence, also had L'Enfant draw the plans of Washington—and the plans of Washington were not adapted to a village like Alexandria and the village that was in the District at the time we came here—that was adapted to a

Library of Congress

city of significant distances, and to a city of millions of inhabitants; and therefore the clause was adopted knowing that just such a city we would have here, and just such a city would have to get along, relying upon the training in self-government of the representatives of eighty millions of people to justice by it.

Now my dear friends, I want to say to you that I have got into a constitutional discussion here that I did not anticipate, but I hope it has not clouded my meaning, which I intended to make as clear as possible, that I am deeply interested in the welfare of the District, I am deeply interested in securing good government to every man, woman and child in this District, and to secure so far as is possible, with the original plan under the Constitution, such voice as the people of the District may require in their local matters. But, when it comes to defining how that is to be given, I can not be any more explicit than to say it must rest ultimately on the right of representation and petition. I do not see how you can do anything else. I am sure that if you will constantly agitate, and if you will have as eloquent an orator as Justice Stafford talk to the committees of the House and Senate every year, he will rouse them to such a desire to save you from the "slavery" that he has pictured that you will get the attention you deserve.

THE SOUVENIR CONTAINED THE FOLLOWING

DINNER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE CITIZENS OF
WASHINGTON UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE BOARD OF TRADE AND CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE

SATURDAY EVENING, MAY EIGHTH

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND NINE

GUESTS

The Vice-president of the United States

Library of Congress

The Speaker of the House of Representatives

Hon. Philander Chase Knox

Hon. Franklin McVeagh

Hon. Frank Harris Hitchcock

Hon. Charles Nagel

Hon. Henry B. F. MacFarland

Hon. Henry L. West

Maj. Wm. V. Judson

Hon. Wm. O. Bradley

Hon. Morgan G. Bulkeley

Hon. Elmer J. Burkett

Hon. Thomas H. Carter

Hon. Stephen B. Elkins

Hon. Duncan U. Fletcher

Hon. Thomas H. Paynter

Hon. Nathan B. Scott

Hon. Benjamin R. Tillman

Library of Congress

Hon. Eaton J. Bowers

Hon. Albert S. Burleson

Hon. Philip P. Campbell

Hon. Wm. J. Cary

Hon. Julius Kahn

Hon. J. Van Vechten Olcott

Hon. George A. Pearre

Hon. Thetus W. Sims

Hon. Samuel W. Smith

Hon. Edward Livingston Taylor, Jr.

Hon. Edward B. Vreeland

Colonel Spencer Cosby

Captain Archibald Butt

PROGRAM

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS

Mr. John Joy Edson Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Washington Board of Trade and the Washington Chamber of Commerce

ADDRESS

Library of Congress

Hon. Wendell Phillips Stafford Associate Justice Supreme Court of the District of Columbia

ADDRESS

The President of the United States

PINEAPPLE. NEW WILLARD

CELERY

OLIVES

RADISHES

SALTED NUTS

CLEAR GREEN TURTLE

BROOK TROUT. SAUTE MEUNIERE

HOT HOUSE TOMATO

RACK OF LAMB EN CASSEROLE. BOURGEOISE

FRESH WHITE ASPARAGUS, HOLLANDAISE

TERRAPIN, MARYLAND

SORBET FANTAISIE

SQUAB CHICKEN, ROASTED

SALAD DE SAISON

Library of Congress

SNOWBALLS SAUCE CHANTILLY

ASSORTED CAKES

COFFEE

The New Willard Washington

MUSIC

United States Marine Band Orchestra

Lieut. W. H. Santelmann, Leader

1. March Norma Bellin
2. Overture Merry Wives Of Windsor Nicolai
3. Excerpts From Rigoletto Verdi
4. Waltz The Bachelors Santelmann
5. Sextette Lucia Donizetti
6. Southern Sketch Way Down Upon The Suwanee River Myddleton
7. First Waltz Durand
8. Scenes From The Merry Widow Lehar
9. March The Fairest Of The Fair Sousa

PARTICIPANTS

Library of Congress

Mr. Byron S. Adams

Mr. Milton E. Ailes

Mr. Allen O. Albert, Jr.

Mr. Dwight Anderson

Mr. R. P. Andrews

Mr. Wm. H. Baldwin

Mr. B. F. Barnes

Mr. Lester A. Barr

Mr. John Barrett

Mr. Charles J. Bell

Mr. Claude N. Bennett

Mr. Ira E. Bennett

Mr. John O. Bennett

Mr. W. Berens, Jr.

Mr. H. C. Bergheimer

Mr. Emile Berliner

Mr. Frank H. Bethell

Library of Congress

Mr. Gist Blair

Mr. Henry P. Blair

Mr. W. J. Boardman

Mr. Scott C. Bone

Hon. George M. Bowers

Mr. Morgan Bradford, Jr.

Mr. Alexander Britton

Mr. Chapin Brown

Mr. Percival M. Brown

Mr. T. Janney Brown

Mr. Aldis B. Browne

Mr. Charles S. Bundy

Mr. Achille E. Burklin

Mr. P. G. Burton

Mr. L. White Busbey

Mr. D. J. Callahan

Mr. David S. Carl

Library of Congress

Mr. Fred. W. Carpenter

Mr. Albert Carry

Mr. Tileston F. Chambers

Mr. W. W. Chiswell

Mr. W. A. H. Church

Mr. Appleton P. Clark, Jr.

Mr. Murray A. Cobb

Dr. Horace B. Coblentz

Mr. Myer Cohen

Mr. F. G. Coldren

Mr. Robert Cook

Mr. James C. Courts

Mr. William V. Cox

Mr. A. P. Crenshaw

Mr. H. H. Darneille

Mr. Henry E. Davis

Mr. Wm. H. Delacey

Library of Congress

Mr. Thomas J. Donovan

Mr. J. Maury Dove

Mr. P. A. Drury

Mr. G. E. Dunkum

Mr. George J. Easterday

Mr. John Joy Edson

Mr. John Joy Edson, Jr.

Mr. Joseph R. Edson

Mr. F. B. Eichelberger

Mr. George W. Engel

Mr. William J. Eynon

Mr. Henry H. Flather

Mr. Wm. J. Flather

Mr. G. W. Forsberg

Mr. W. H. Franklin

Mr. Daniel Fraser

Mr. George H. Gall

Library of Congress

Mr. W. T. Galliher

Mr. Isaac Gans

Mr. Julius Garfinkle

Mr. S. Gassenheimer

Mr. E. Gerstenberg

Mr. Henry H. Glassie

Mr. C. C. Glover

Mr. M. Goldenberg

Mr. R. H. Goldsborough

Mr. Philip F. Gormley

Mr. E. C. Graham

Mr. Thomas Grant

Mr. Benjamin S. Graves

Mr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor

Mr. A. Gude

Mr. William F. Gude

Mr. Benjamin W. Guy

Library of Congress

Mr. George E. Hamilton

Dr. W. S. Harban

Mr. Robert N. Harper

Mr. Carl A. Droop

Mr. Edward H. Droop

Mr. William A. Easterday

Gen. George H. Harries

Mr. A. K. T. Harvey

Mr. Giles F. Heilprin

Mr. James B. Henderson

Mr. R. W. Henderson

Mr. Wm. G. Henderson

Mr. James S. Henry

Mr. J. William Henry

Mr. Alexander T. Hensey

Mr. J. Whit Herron

Mr. Christian Heurich

Library of Congress

Mr. W. B. Hibbs

Adml. Philip F. Hichborn

Mr. Wm. A. Hill

Mr. Joel Hillman

Mr. Walter E. Hilton

Mr. W. B. Holtzclaw

Mr. James C. Hooe

Mr. Wm. D. Hoover

Mr. Lewis Hopfenmaier

Mr. Thomas S. Hopkins

Mr. George Howard

Hon. George F. Huff

Mr. J. E. Hurley

Mr. Hennen Jennings

Mr. C. A. Joerissen

Gen. John A. Johnston

Mr. O. H. Perry Johnson

Library of Congress

Mr. Sigmund Kann

Mr. Simon Kann

Mr. Rudolph Kauffmann

Mr. D. J. Kaufman

Maj. L. M. Kelley

Mr. George A. King

Mr. Harry King

Dr. Richard Kingsman

Mr. L. H. Kinnard

Mr. D. E. Kleps

Mr. Wilton J. Lambert

Mr. Charles C. Lancaster

Mr. James Lansburgh

Mr. John B. Larner

Mr. Ralph W. Lee

Mr. Charles Linking

Mr. A. Lisner

Library of Congress

Mr. Alvin M. Lothrop

Mr. Otto Luebker

Mr. John G. Luke

Mr. A. B. Lyon

Mr. William W. McClench

Mr. John McElroy

Mr. Frederic D. McKenney

Mr. Edward McLean

Mr. John H. Magruder

Mr. Arthur D. Marks

Mr. S. J. Masters

Mr. L. H. Mattingly

Mr. Wm. F. Mattingly

Mr. Wm. A. Mearns

Mr. Samuel W. Meek

Mr. Robert L. Middleton

Mr. Frank P. Milburn

Library of Congress

Mr. Fred W. Miller

Mr. John H. Miller

Mr. Lewis M. Miller

Mr. Wendell W. Mischler

Mr. Lester D. Moore, Jr.

Mr. Samuel H. Moore

Mr. Arthur C. Moses

Mr. Wm. H. Moses

Mr. Edward S. Munford

Maj. Edwin H. Neumeyer

Mr. H. T. Newcomb

Mr. W. W. Norman

Mr. Clarence F. Normen

Mr. Harry Norment

Mr. Theodore W. Noyes

Mr. Thomas C. Noyes

Mr. Howard S. Nyman

Library of Congress

Capt. James F. Oyster

Mr. E. Southard Parker

Mr. Myron M. Parker

Mr. James L. Parsons

Maj. D. C. Phillips

Mr. Robert A. Phillips

Mr. Arthur G. Plant

Mr. D. S. Porter

Mr. A. D. Prince

Mr. Frederick B. Pyle

Mr. Arthur T. Ramsay

Mr. A. E. Randle

Mr. George C. Rankin

Mr. E. E. Rapley

Mr. W. H. Rapley

Mr. Charles Rauscher

Mr. Albert M. Read

Library of Congress

Mr. Frank M. Reed

Mr. Frank P. Reeside

Mr. Benjamin W. Reiss

Mr. Clarence B. Rheem

Mr. Max M. Rich

Dr. Chas. W. Richardson

Dr. J. J. Richardson

Mr. W. F. Roberts

Mr. Wm. L. Robbins

Mr. Cuno H. Rudolph

Mr. Joseph I. Saks

Mr. F. R. Sale

Mr. F. T. Sanner

Mr. B. F. Saul

Mr. Ewald Schneider

Mr. George F. Schutt

Mr. Charles W. Semmes

Library of Congress

Mr. J. Albert Shaffer

Mr. Wm. E. Shannon

Mr. Edgar D. Shaw

Mr. N. H. Shea

Mr. Wm. Morgan Shuster

Mr. Henry K. Simpson

Mr. John C. Simpson

Mr. A. Leftwich Sinclair

Mr. John B. Sleman, Jr.

Mr. J. H. Small

Mr. B. F. Smith

Mr. Emmons S. Smith

Mr. E. Quincy Smith

Mr. George Linville Smith

Mr. Odell S. Smith

Mr. Thomas W. Smith

Mr. T. Towson Smith

Library of Congress

Gen. Ellis Spear

Mr. E. B. Spence

Mr. O. G. Staples

Mr. E. J. Stellwagen

Mr. Joseph Strausburger

Mr. G. W. F. Swartzell

Mr. J. Selwyn Tait

Mr. Alfred P. Thom

Mr. S. Percy Thompson

Mr. W. B. Thompson

Mr. John M. Thurston

Mr. Charles E. Tribbey

Mr. George Truesdell

Mr. Perry B. Turpin

Mr. Wm. P. Van Wickle

Mr. F. H. Walker

Mr. John H. Walker

Library of Congress

Mr. W. H. Walker

Mr. E. J. Walsh

Mr. Thomas F. Walsh

Mr. Harry Wardman

Mr. B. H. Warner

Mr. John L. Weaver

Mr. Joseph I. Weller

Mr. M. I. Weller

Mr. Hylas T. Wheeler

Mr. Geo. W. White

Mr. H. K. Willard

Mr. Louis C. Wilson

Mr. Simon Wolf

Mr. Levi Woodbury

Mr. S. W. Woodward

Dr. Wm. C. Woodward

Mr. Geo. Y. Worthington

Library of Congress

Mr. O. B. Zantinger

Dr. A. K. P. Harvey

Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Jr.

Percy S. Foster

Mr. J. E. Defebaugh

Mr. Snowden Ashford

Mr. Thomas P. Bones

Mr. E. B. Grandin

Mr. J. Harry Cunningham

Committee on Dinner

Mr. John Joy Edson, Chairman

Mr. Charles J. Bell, Treasurer

Mr. D. J. Callahan, Secretary

Mr. Allen D. Albert, Jr.

Mr. Scott C. Bone

Mr. Wm. F. Gude

Gen. George H. Harries

Library of Congress

Mr. Edward McLean

Mr. Arthur C. Moses

Mr. Theodore W. Noyes

Capt. James F. Oyster

Mr. J. H. Small. Jr.