

... does not require a prophet to foresee that a like course pursued in fixing the size of the House at the end of the next decade will round it out to approximately 500 Members.

With the constantly increasing tendency of our people to flock to the cities, there will of necessity be some States that will not keep up in the procession in its proportionate gain in population. Some Eldorado of the far West, rich in promise to the settler, will call him from the East; and the sunny clime of the South, with its fertile fields, will attract migration from the North, while the attractions and the opportunities of the great cities will continue to draw from the farms. With this ever-shifting population, to say nothing of the great increase of immigration which has already come to greatly congest our cities, is it wise to refuse to recognize such conditions, and insist that no particular State shall lose in numbers what it has already gained in its representation in Congress?

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, though I regret that I have to differ with a large majority of my own party, I am impelled to cast my vote against this bill.

---

### The Apportionment Bill.

## SPEECH

OF

# HON. PAUL HOWLAND,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

*Thursday, February 9, 1911,*

On the bill (H. R. 30566) for the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census.

Mr. HOWLAND said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The proposition embodied in the pending bill provides for a House of Representatives of 433 Members and one additional Representative for each of the new States of New Mexico and Arizona whenever these States are finally admitted. The proposition adopted and advocated by the Republican caucus provides for a House of 391 Members, its present size, to be increased by one Representative from Arizona and one from New Mexico when they become qualified to elect them. Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of the

sent time  
of its  
ood time,  
ig to our  
porarily,  
nt estab-  
ves prac-  
not un-  
nan from  
ideration  
and also  
been and  
develop-  
ll as in-  
t a mem-  
for that  
e of the  
our mem-  
rst, from  
re to the  
ge. The  
ir secre-  
s all the  
estimate  
s fair to  
estion of  
phase of  
Madison,  
nted out  
presenta-  
ere then.  
founders  
ey must  
ife, Gov-  
coming  
sions to  
all-wise

this sub-  
n. It is  
omposing  
ect their  
nably may  
to be the  
an never  
entatives  
e govern-  
; on the

391 proposition will lose my State one Member, I am so firmly convinced that the number of Representatives ought not to be increased that I shall give my vote to retain a House of the present size. I have noticed that the influence of Members on the floor does not in the least depend on the State from which they come or the size of the delegation from their State, but rather on their ability and standing among their fellow Members, and I am satisfied that the loss of a Member from my State by the new apportionment, which applies to all the other States as well as my own, would not in any respect detract from the influence which the delegation would exert in future Congresses. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if such a thing were possible, it would be the part of wisdom to reduce the House of Representatives even below the present number of 391. The criticism of the rules of procedure of the House of Representatives has largely grown out of the fact that the present House is too large, and the critic, losing sight of this fact, has called attention to the rules of procedure limiting debate and often cutting off the right to amend.

Everyone familiar with the proceedings of the House knows that such rules are absolutely necessary in order to transact business, and the necessity for these rules increases with the size of the parliamentary body. With a House of 391 Members, and each Member anxious to instruct the country upon vital and important questions, there are not enough days in the year, Sundays included, to give each Member one day's time in which to present his views. With a smaller House more freedom of debate would be possible and better results obtained in the matters of legislation. We are cited by the advocates of a large House to the House of Commons, which is composed of 670 members, as showing that a large number is not necessarily detrimental. In this connection, however, we should bear in mind that it only requires 40 members of the House of Commons to transact business, while in this country a majority of all Members must be in attendance in order to have a quorum necessary to transact business. It is impossible, however, to draw any satisfactory conclusion from a comparison of the size of the various parliamentary bodies of other countries with our own, or their ratio of members to population. The problem is one essentially our own, and to be solved by the consideration of circumstances and conditions peculiar to our people and to our form of government. The House of Representatives has grown from a membership of 65 in 1789 to its present membership of 391, and the ratio has grown from 30,000 to 194,182. There has been an increase in the number of Representatives every decade since the adoption of the Constitution with the exception of the Sixth Congress in 1819, and the

H C

On th

Mr  
Mr

Live  
1911.  
tion  
City,  
gress

Thi  
and f  
value  
which  
For n  
stock  
the c  
power  
only  
inesti  
the ra

As  
can R  
memb  
can b  
ous s  
tions  
kinds  
ent v

The  
ment  
busin  
reach  
signif  
entire  
Secre  
10 pe  
Indus

The  
excell  
miles  
count  
stock  
popul  
world  
duces  
The 1

draw any satisfactory conclusion from a comparison of the size of the various parliamentary bodies of other countries with our own, or their ratio of members to population. The problem is one essentially our own, and to be solved by the consideration of circumstances and conditions peculiar to our people and to our form of government. The House of Representatives has grown from a membership of 65 in 1789 to its present membership of 391, and the ratio has grown from 30,000 to 194,182. There has been an increase in the number of Representatives every decade since the adoption of the Constitution with the exception of the Sixth Census in 1843, and the ratio has been increased every decade with the exception of the Second Census in 1803. The sentiment in favor of a smaller House has always prevailed quite generally, but a practical question has, as a rule, intervened whenever the attempt has been made to decrease the size of the House or increase the ratio to such an extent as to prevent an increase of its size.

Whenever any action of this kind is contemplated it is always discovered that the numerical representation of some States will be decreased, whereupon the Representatives of those States feel called upon to fight any proposition the adoption of which would reduce the representation of their States. It has often happened that the decrease in the representation of a State would legislate out of future Congresses some of the strongest and most influential Members. It thus happens that the personal equation enters largely into legislation of this character and partisan considerations exert powerful influence. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when considerations of this character must give way to the general welfare. Our Democratic friends are lined up on this occasion in one solid column in favor of increasing the membership from 391 to 433. It is said that an increase of this character carries with it an increased expenditure of about \$1,000,000 per annum. It would seem that the cry of economy so recently shouted from all the hustings in the country is now hushed as they are about to take up the scepter of power and to assume responsibility. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, prefer that the responsibility for the enormous increase in the size of the House of Representatives shall be placed upon the Democratic Party, for it again demonstrates the ease and celerity with which that party can do the wrong thing. And to those Republicans, my colleagues, who would vote for a larger House, let me say that the loss of one Representative from their States or mine ought not to be considered when the efficiency and usefulness of the House of Representatives is involved. The welfare of the whole country should outweigh local considerations.

entire  
Secreta  
10 per  
Industr  
The  
exceller  
miles c  
country  
stocks  
populat  
world's  
duces n  
The Un  
and ha  
the rec  
gave ne  
In part  
of the  
Mexico,  
corporat  
ment of  
Your el  
authori  
campain  
growing  
The  
growing  
ciation  
results  
Texas  
West of  
support  
All p  
and ind  
prosper  
legislat  
to marl  
not be  
sults, t  
Denver,  
associa  
because  
the gre  
all hav  
makes  
What  
great A  
years a  
map, a  
ment o  
not cor  
verted  
of the  
ing the  
highest  
the py  
States  
than a  
of Eng  
ing the  
are mo  
control