**GENERAL STATEMENT:**

**Senator Luke Poland (Republican from Vermont) comments on the difference he expects the amendment will make:**

“[The South] will be opened and expanded by the in influence of free labor and free institutions . . . All causes of discord between north and South being over, we shall become a homogenous nation of freemen, dwelling together in peace and unity.”

**GENERAL STATEMENT:**

**Senator Edgar Cowan (Democrat from Pennsylvania) comments on how the amendment will expand federal power:**

“What conceivable difference could it make to a citizen of Pennsylvania as to how Ohio distributes her political power? . . . To touch, to venture upon that ground is to revolutionize the whole frame and texture of the system of our government.”

**SECTION 1:**

**Rep. Thaddeus Stevens (Republican from Pennsylvania) comments on Section 1:**

“[Section 1] allows Congress to correct the unjust legislation of the states, so far that the law which operates upon one man shall operate equally upon all. Whatever law punishes a white man for a crime shall punish the black man precisely in the same way and to the same degree. Whatever law protects the white man shall afford ‘equal protection’ to the black man.”

**SECTION 1:**

**Scholar Garrett Epps describes Democratic opposition to Section 1:**

“Andrew Rogers of new Jersey gave the fullest explanation of the opposition when he [said]… ‘I hold if [Section 1] ever becomes a part of the fundamental law of the land it will prevent any state from refusing to allow anything to anybody embraced under this term of privileges and immunities,’ he said. ‘ at, sir, will be an introduction to the time when despotism and tyranny will march forth undisturbed and unbroken, in silence and in darkness, in this land which was once the land of freedom . . .’”

**SECTION 1:**

**Senator Edgar Cowan (Democrat from Pennsylvania) warns about the rami cations of the amendment’s definition of citizenship:**

“There is a race in contact with this country which, in all characteristic except that of simply making fierce war, is not only our equal but perhaps our superior. I mean the yellow race; the Mongol race. They outnumber us largely. Of their industry, their skill, and their pertinacity in all worldly affairs, nobody can doubt… They may pour in their millions upon our Pacific Coast in a very short time. Are the states to lose control over this immigration? Is the United States to determine that they are to be citizens?”

**SECTION 2:**

**Scholar Garrett Epps describes Thaddeus Stevens’s support for Section 2:**

“To Stevens . . . the second section was ‘the most important in the article,’ because it would ‘either compel the states to grant universal suffrage or so . . . shear them of their power as to keep them forever in a hopeless minority in the national Government.’”

**SECTION 2:**

**Rep. James Brooks (Democrat from New York) responds to the exclusion of women from Section 2:**

“I raise my voice here on behalf of 15 million of our countrywomen, the fairest, brightest portion of creation, and I ask why they are not permitted to be represented under this resolution . . . Why, in organizing a system of liberality and justice, not recognize in the case of free women as well as free negroes the right of representation?”

**SECTION 3:**

**Scholar Garrett Epps describes revisions made to Section 3 during the debate in the Senate, changing the penalties for former Confederates:**

“The Senate unanimously struck out Section 3, which would have disenfranchised former Confederates from voting until 1870 . . . [Senator] Howard brought forward a new disenfranchisement section, far more lenient than the [previous] House version; it did not limit ex-Confederates’ right to vote, but only excluded a small group from holding office: those who had ‘previously taken an oath’ to support the U.S. Constitution and then had afterward participated in the Confederate cause.”

**SECTION 5:**

**Senator Jacob Howard (Republican from Michigan) comments on Section 5:**

“[Section 5] casts upon Congress the responsibility of seeing to it, for the future, that all the sections of the amendment are carried out in good faith, and that no State infringes the rights of persons or property . . . It enables Congress, in case the States shall enact laws in conflict with the principles of the amendment, to correct that legislation by a formal congressional enactment.”