The following letter addressed to each Republican candidate for Congress in Connecticut last year by the Connecticut Constitution League was organized by Niagara men, resulted in committing each member of the present Connecticut delegation in the House to the Reduction of Southern Representation:

DEAR SIR:—

NEW HAVEN, CONN., October 20, 1906.

The platform adopted at the last Republican National Convention contained a strong plank in which was condemned the unjust discrimination against the black voters of the south. The party also by the same plank pledged itself to the enforcement of the Constitutional Amendment which requires the reduction of the representation of a state in Congress in proportion to the restriction of the franchise.

At the last session of Congress, the Republicans refused to take any steps whatever looking toward the fulfillment of this pledge. Added to this is the fact that the most prominent member of the present Cabinet has but recently made a speech in which he all but condones those mischievous southern constitutions, and in which he practically announces the doctrine that the Negroes of the south ought to be content with the incidental advantages which flow from legislation aimed directly at their welfare.

Under these circumstances it is but natural that thoughtful colored men should begin to question the motives which led to the adoption of this plank, and to ask whether it was a firm, fixed declaration of principle which the party was willing to live up to, or simply the conventional clap-trap resorted to to secure the negro vote in the doubtful states. We prefer to think that the latter was not the case. At the same time, in adopting this charitable view we are still as a loss to understand why none of the many Reduction measures introduced at the last session of Congress ever left the Committee Rooms.

Every passing year confirms the fact that the result of the "doctored" southern constitution is the establishment in that part of this land of a condition of quasi-slavery. There has lately grown up in this country, concerning the black folk of the south, a theory to this effect: that all they need do is apply themselves assiduously to the betterment of their moral and material conditions, leaving the rest to take care of itself; that at some remote future time when their moral and material estates have been made eligibility better, some benign influence will come forward and restore to them their political and civil rights which they in the interim had let go by default. The short-sighted speculators who are responsible for this theory are beginning to see in every newly reported barbarity, its refutation. They are beginning to see that the worthy Negro, so far from being exempt from the barbarity of unreasoning southern prejudice, has become the special object of its attack. Southern white men who make and administer the laws will feel a responsibility only to those whose votes elect them to office. The black men of the south can have no adequate security in life, liberty or property until they are able to protect these things with their ballots.

We colored men of Connecticut, together with other colored men of the north, are going to make our votes as influential as possible in the matter of reinforcing the black men of the south, whose votes are unjustly withheld from them. We think a very potent influence in this direction lies in the reduction of southern representation in Congress, as provided for under the Constitution.
A diligent search of the Congressional Record for the last session shows that you did not take part, either for or against, in any of the discussions on this question, which leaves your position in doubt.

As you are a candidate for re-election on the ticket of the party to which belong most of your constituents, represented in the conference above referred to, we feel free to ask for a statement of your position on this question of Reduction. It would be appreciated by us if you answered the form of a reply to these two questions:

1st. In case of your re-election, would you actively support a measure for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the restriction of the elective franchise in the several states?

2nd. Upon a finding by such Commission that the elective franchise is materially restricted in any state, would you actively support a measure for reduction of the representation of that state as required by the Constitution, provided that state persists in such restriction?

An early reply is solicited.

Respectfully yours,

P. S. It is just to you to apprise you in advance of our intention to make public your reply, such being in our opinion, the requirements of the Corrupt Practice Act.

II.

Some Suggestive Figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Negroes of Voting Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Plurality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Pres. '94</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Secretary of State, '96</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Governor, '86</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>President, '94</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Governor, '96</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Secretary of State, '96</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Governor, '96</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Democratic Governor, '98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Pres. '94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Figures:

Delaware (Pres. '94) 3 4,334 8,374
Indiana (Secretary of State, '96) 15 39,953 18,156
Massachusetts (Governor, '86) 16 20,733 10,455
Minnesota (President, '94) 18 25,137 40,448
New Jersey 19 15,000 91,471
New York (Governor, '96) 39 57,997 31,455
Ohio (Secretary of State, '96) 23 58,399 31,333
Pennsylvania (Governor, '96) 34 48,435 51,666
Rhode Island (Democratic Governor, '98) 4 1,318 2,965
West Virginia (Pres. '94) 2 31,145 14,705

III.

On the Improvement of Railroad Accommodations in the South.

The following excerpts from the Ruling of the Inter-State Commerce Commission in Edwards vs. The Railroad illustrates the value of another of the Department's recommendations in its general letter:
The train in question was defendant's No. 93, which leaves Chattanooga at 6:36 a.m. and arrives in Dalton at 7:38 a.m. The distance from Chattanooga to Dalton is 38 miles. This train left Nashville, 151 miles northwesterly of Chattanooga, and before it left Nashville all the cars in the train were thoroughly cleaned inside. They were again cleaned to some extent at Chattanooga. Two of these cars are of the same quality, having seats of the same size, upholstered in a like manner, and with exactly the same quality of goods. One of these is used by white passengers, and is provided with toilet and washbowls, while the other is without such conveniences. The latter is constructed as follows: A partition placed in the middle of the car divides it into two compartments and entrance from one to the other is through a swinging door which, after being opened, closes automatically. Negro passengers are required to occupy one of these compartments, while the other is occupied by other passengers who wish to smoke.

In one end of the other passenger coach there is a compartment for smokers which will seat seven persons, but defendant does not provide any separate smoking compartment for negroes. It is also true that while only one toilet is provided in the negro compartment, the car which is entirely used by other passengers has two, marked in such a way as to indicate that one is to be used by men and the other by women, but such restriction is only partially enforced. The principal reason for providing two toilets in one case and only one in the other is that the number of passengers carried in the negro compartment is very much less than the number contemporaneously transported in the other car. Defendant assigns to the use of negro passengers about one-sixth of the space in its passenger trains occupied by all passengers, while the number of negroes transported by defendant is only about one-twentieth of the total.

When there are no women in the colored compartment, smoking there is allowed, but not otherwise. It sometimes happens that a car provided by defendant for the use of white passengers has no wash basin and only one toilet and no smoking compartment, and smoking is allowed in such cars if there are no women present.

The broad question of the right under the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments of the Constitution to segregate white and colored passengers has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. Hall v. De Cuir, 95 U.S. 485; L. N. & T. Ry. v. Mississippi, 133 U.S. 587; Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537; C. & O. Ry. v. Kentucky, 179 U.S. 375.

Accepting these decisions as conclusive upon the constitutionality of such laws, we turn to the consideration of the reasonableness of such a rule when imposed by the carrier.

Upon the foregoing report it is ordered, That the defendant, the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Company, operating the Western & Atlantic Railroad, be, and it is hereby, notified and required, on or before the 1st day of October, 1907, to cease and desist, and during a period of at least two years thereafter abstain, from failing to furnish and provide on said railroad washbowls and toilets, and a separate smoking compartment for colored passengers, where the same accommodations are provided for white passengers paying the same fare; and to furnish and provide on or before said 1st day of October, 1907, and during a period of at least two years thereafter supply a washbowl and toilet and a separate smoking compartment on said Railroad for colored passengers paying first-class fare, where the same accommodations are provided for white passengers paying first-class fare.

IV. What of the Civil Rights Act in Your State?

The Massachusetts Civil Rights Act is one of the best in the country. Examine carefully with view to remedying defects in your own.

"Whoever makes any distinction, discrimination or restriction on account of color or race or, except for good cause, applicable alike to all persons of every color and race, relative to the admission of any person to, or his treatment in a theater or skating rink or other public place of amusement, licensed or unlicensed, or in a public conveyance or public meeting, or in an inn, barber shop or other place kept for hire, gain or reward, licensed or unlicensed, or whoever aids or incites such distinction discrimination or restriction, shall, for each offence be punished by a fine of not more than three hundred dollars or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment, and shall forfeit to any person aggrieved thereby not less than twenty-five nor more than three hundred dollars; but such person so aggrieved shall not recover against more than one person by reason of any one act of distinction, discrimination or restriction."-Termed Laws of Massachusetts, Chap. 212, Sec. 89.