3024.5
S7P3

Peabody

Perfecting of the Promise

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N.Y.
Stockton, Calif.

LIBRARY COLLEGE

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS
1914 TRUSTEES' SERIES NO. 25

THE PERFECTING OF THE PROMISE

A SERMON BY

REV. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D. D.

March 1, 1914, Commemorating the Ninth Anniversary of the Death of Jane Lathrop Stanford

THE FOUNDERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

AN ADDRESS BY

HON. WILLIAM W. MORROW, LL. D.

Founders' Day, March 9, 1914

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
1914

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

TRUSTEES' SERIES

No.		Date.
1.	The Leland Stanford Junior University. A pamphlet of information	(No date)
2.	Address of Jane Lathrop Stanford to the Board of Trustees	February 11, 1897
3.	Address of Jane Lathrop Stanford to the Board of Trustees	June 1, 1897
4.	Address of Jane Lathrop Stanford to the Board of Trustees	May 31, 1899
5.	Address of Jane Lathrop Stanford to the Board of Trustees	October 3. 1902
6.	Address on "The Right of Free Speech," by Jane Lathrop Stanford to the Board of Trustees	April 25, 1903
7.	Petition filed in proceedings to establish and construe University Trusts	June 16, 1903
8.	Decree in proceeding to establish and construe University Trusts	July 3, 1903
9.	Inaugural address of Jane Lathrop Stanford as President of the Board of Trustees	July 6, 1903
10.	Organization of the Faculty of the University	March 31, 1904
11.	Report of the Organization Committee of the Trustees upon the Organization of the University Faculty	March 31, 1904
12.	First Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1905
13.	Second Annual Report of the President	April 30, 1906
14.	Third Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1906
15.	Fourth Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1907
16.	Trustees' Manual	November 1, 1908
17.	Fifth Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1908
18.	Sixth Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1909
19.	Seventh Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1910
20.	Eighth Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1911
21.	Ninth Annual Report of the President	December 31, 1912
22.	Addresses of Timothy Hopkins, Emmet Rixford and David Starr Jordan at the Dedication of the Lane Medical Library Building	January 1, 1913
23.	Tenth Annual Report of the President	July 31, 1913
24.	Addresses at the Installation of John Casper Branner, LL.D., as President of the University	October 1, 1913
25.	The Perfecting of the Promise, a sermon by Rev. Francis G. Peabody, D. D., March 1, 1914, commemorating the ninth anniversary of the death of Jane Lathrop Stanford; The Founders of the University, an address by Hon. William W. Morrow, LL. D., Founders' Day, March 9, 1914	July 31, 1914

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS
1914 TRUSTEES' SERIES NO. 25

THE PERFECTING OF THE PROMISE

A SERMON BY

REV. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D. D.

March 1, 1914, Commemorating the Ninth Anniversary of the Death of Jane Lathrop Stanford

---

THE FOUNDERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

AN ADDRESS BY

HON. WILLIAM W. MORROW, LL. D.

Founders' Day, March 9, 1914

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
1914

LD
3024.5
S7P3

THE PERFECTING OF THE PROMISE

The anniversary of the death of Jane Lathrop Stanford, on February 28, 1905, was observed on Sunday, March 1, 1914, by a service in the Memorial Church, at which the Rev. Dr. Francis G. Peabody, special preacher at the university, delivered the following sermon on "The Perfecting of the Promise":

"These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."—Hebrews XI. 39-40.

This splendid chapter on the heroes of Faith, after describing the great procession of witnesses from the days of Abel and Abraham to the days of David and the Prophets, ends with what may be called a Philosophy of History, a Law of Evolution, which links the Present with the Past. There is, according to this profound and original thinker, a relation of reciprocity between successive generations, a mutual dependence, which makes the Present a fulfillment of the Past, and the Past an anticipation of the Present. On the one hand, the present looks back to the past, and out of all its achievements and distinctions recalls as most creative and redemptive the ventures of its faith. By faith Abraham went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith Moses forsook Egypt as seeing Him who is invisible. By faith kingdoms were subdued, righteousness was wrought, weakness was made strong and armies were turned to flight. What seemed at the time a national migration, or a revolt from Pharaoh, or a war with the Philistines, disclosed itself to the philosophic historian as a victory of faith, a venture into the unknown, an invasion of political or economic life by spiritual power. That was what gave dignity and significance to the history of Israel. These all had obtained their good report through faith.

That is one side of the doctrine of reciprocity. But the other is set forth with equal clearness. "These all," the Chapter proceeds, "though they were thus witnesses of faith, received not the promise, God having provided better things for us that they without us should

661977

not be made perfect." The perfecting of their faith, in other words, was to be made in the fidelity of their descendants. The promise of the Past had to be kept by the service of the Present. Good as were the things which the Elders might do, God had provided better things for us, in the justifying and amplifying of their faith. Without us their sacrifices and conflicts were but intimations and prophecies of what might be. The past needs the present as much as the present needs the past. It is all one world, where each gallant deed of the past becomes by degrees detached from its immediate circumstances, and recognized as a venture of faith; and where again each honorable service of the present interprets and fulfills the imperfect efforts of the past. This is the spiritual heredity which gives to human victory its moral continuity. The evolution of society unfolds before the students' mind as an organic and interdependent life.

Now, nowhere is this reciprocity of the Past and Present more conspicuous or more effective than in a university. The associated life of teachers and students seems on its surface to be the most fluid and shifting of relationships. The classes come and go. The staff of teachers changes from year to year. The stream of academic life flows by one as he watches it and bears with it all that is familiar, so that when he returns to a university after a few years of absence, he walks as a stranger among buildings and methods of instruction, and youthful faces, which did not, in his day, exist. And yet, below this superficial changefulness there is a deeper continuity and unity which makes a university, to one who has lived in it and loved it, always the same. The eddies and ripples on its surface pass, but it is the same stream flowing in the same channel, and one may sit on its bank and dream the same dreams. The family-circle widens as new classes claim their heritage, but it is the same Alma Mater who is the parent of all. In fact, it is one of the most curious experiences in life to discover that the longer one lives the more he loves his university. Other bonds of intimacy grow weaker as time and distance put their strain on one's affections, but this tie of relationship has the almost unique quality of growing firmer and more compelling with the passing of the years. The older one grows the more romantic and poetic seem those vanished days of youth. The university, with all the external changes which make it seem another world, remains to its oldest graduates the same centre of loyal affection.

What is the secret of this academic continuity which binds together the passing generations in undiminished attachment? It is to be found in that spiritual reciprocity of which the Apostle to the Hebrews writes. On the one hand is the discovery that the strength of a university depends, not on its buildings or its endowments, or even its instruction, but on the perpetuation of a tradition, on the inheritance of a sentiment, on a gradually accumulated and perpetuated ideal of life, which the new-comer may only dimly appreciate or accept, but which creates the atmosphere he breathes, sustains him even while he is unconscious of its presence, and finally, as it becomes recognized, strengthens and steadies his whole later life. "A university," one of the most honored university administrators, President Gilman of Johns Hopkins, once said, "is a home of idealism. If it were not that, it would be better that its walls should crumble in a night." I happen to be associated with a university which has large resources in its laboratories, libraries, endowments and equipments, and these material advantages naturally draw to it many students to whom such opportunities seem a sufficient persuasion. But they do not become Harvard men until they enter into quite another region of academic appreciation. They begin to hear of a Puritan youth, dying of consumption, far from his English home, and bequeathing a few hundred pounds of his modest estate, and three hundred books, to the little school which had been set up on the edge of the wilderness, between the Indians and the sea. Every pound of John Harvard's money was, so far as we know, soon spent, and every book save one—and that a valueless treatise on antique theology—was soon destroyed by fire. Nothing seemed left but a tradition. The pedigree, the physical appearance, even the signature of John Harvard, have been among the mysteries of antiquarian research. And yet, on that tradition of a modest, devout and dying youth, the University is founded; and as that tradition fastens on a young man's mind today it lifts him out of the rut of modern life and sets his feet on the high, firm ground of moral idealism and self-forgetting service. By faith, he says, John Harvard went out, not knowing whither he went, seeking a State which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God. So this youth begins to breathe the atmosphere which refreshes and exhilarates his life. And then there is superadded to that original tradition the long history of other lives which have given dignity and worth

to the growing college, and the new student gathers them all together into his Walhalla of Faith. "And what shall I more say," he repeats in the New Testament language, "for the time would fail me to tell of statesmen and orators, of philosophers and poets and preachers, of Adams and Sumner, of Emerson and Longfellow, of Channing and Brooks; who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness and turned to flight the armies of evil?" So the new-comer, friendless and lonesome though he may be, finds himself gradually admitted to this ennobling companionship and sustained in his steps by this momentum of an honorable past.

But that is but one-half of this academic continuity. If the past supports the present, so the present must justify the past. All these achievements and sacrifices which adorn academic history become fruitless unless they issue into a more substantial and serviceable life. The duty of each newly matriculated student carries into it the prophecy and destiny of the whole organic life. These all receive not the promise, God having provided better things for us that they without us should not be made perfect. A few years ago, when my University was celebrating the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, a procession of undergraduates marched through the streets bearing many flags, and finally came the freshman class, which had been admitted but a month ago, carrying a banner with what seemed a most audacious and amusing inscription: "The University," it read, "has been waiting two hundred and fifty years for us." And yet, in a profound and searching sense, that boyish boast was true. This was precisely what the long history of the University had produced. For these the privations of primitive colonists in the wilderness were endured, for these the faith and prayers of many generations had been offered. Without these happy, jesting, delightful boys the whole great evolution of the University had been in vain. The whole creation, as Paul said of the world, had waited for the manifestations of these last sons of God.

These general indications of the nature and charm of university life find a most impressive illustration on this Campus; and I recall them to you today as we meet for this memorial service. Yesterday was the ninth anniversary of the death of Mrs. Stanford, and our service of worship today, in this church, which was the centre of her affection and her generosity, would be ill-timed indeed if it did not express the permanent gratitude felt, not only by this University, but

by all who care for the higher education of America. I cannot as a stranger presume to speak in detail of this indomitable woman; but it is possible that the dramatic trials which she encountered and conquered may impress a stranger quite as freely and as keenly as they do those to whom the events are familiar. The career of Mrs. Stanford is the most distinguished instance in America of parental affection dedicated to a great cause; a perfect love which cast out fear; a charity which endured all things, hoped all things and never failed. I have spoken of the pathetic figure of young John Harvard dedicating his scanty means to the education of young men like himself. But an even more appealing and dramatic figure in the history of education in America is that of a boy of sixteen years, dying in Italy, and giving his name to a great University on the remote shores of the Pacific. The stranger may survey with admiration your surroundings, your landscape, your refinements of architecture, your multiplication of resources, but he is finally arrested and quite overwhelmed by the more central fact that all this stately organism has at its heart the life of a little boy, and the love of two stricken parents. Other institutions have cherished other ideals which have been wrought into their foundations, and have stamped themselves upon academic life. The most important university of Europe, for example, that of Berlin, is a monument of Germany's emancipation, just a century ago, from the sway of Napoleon, and the prevailing note of appeal to students from year to year is that of patriotism, the call of the scholar to serve his country, the application of learning to statesmanship. The University of Oxford, again, is the direct descendant of the monastic communities of the Middle Ages, detached from the world in the privilege and liberty of the higher learning, with no obligation of citizenship but to pray for the souls of their founders; and this monastic spirit, with its instincts of a spiritual aristocracy, still prevails among Oxford Dons who are the successors of the monks and who may still be receiving a stipend for their prayers, even though in their philosophy or teaching there be not a shred of religion left. One may watch the same survival of idealism in many American institutions. One New England college was primarily founded to teach the Indians, and the spirit of adventure and courage is still prevalent in the administration and even in the student life of Dartmouth. Another college cherishes as its central shrine the monument which marks the spot of a haystack,

near which three students met and consecrated themselves to the work of foreign missions, and in whose work the vast enterprise of the American Board modestly began, and ever since that day the missionary call to self-forgetting and happy sacrifice has met a glad response at Williams College. But here you strike an even deeper and more universal note; the hope of youth and the memories of age; the full chord which is sounded in the harmony of a boy's life and a parent's love. Under the family system of Japan it became the highest privilege of children to reverence the memory of their parents and to offer prayers at their shrine. It was a noble, but a backward-looking religion. Here you are initiated into the opposite type of reverence, the offering of parents to the memory of their child—the forward-looking, expectant, fulfillment of the tragically short career, the immortality, not of the parents' lives which were so soon to end, but of the son's life which had hardly begun to be.

And that parental love had its natural fruit in a persistent and indestructible faith. The time soon came when all that the University had to live on was this faith of Mrs. Stanford. The vicissitudes in which this University was soon involved, the loss of resources which seemed fatal, and the dependence for its very existence on the unremitting sacrifices of one lonely woman, make up a story of faith quite worthy to be enrolled in the list of Israelite heroes. By faith she went on, not knowing whither she went. By faith she looked for a University that had foundations. By faith she chose to suffer affliction with the people of her choice rather than to enjoy pleasures for a season. By faith she obtained promises of help, stopped the mouths of creditors, quenched the violence of enemies, escaped the edge of the courts, and finally turned to flight the armies of litigation. And then she died, in good time, with her faith unshattered by the disaster which might perhaps have broken her heart. It is not surprising that the first object which meets the visitor as he approaches these halls is a statue of Faith, bearing her own cross. There might have been written under it the great words of the Apostle: "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even your faith."

Such is the inheritance into which each student enters here, and which dignifies his daily work and will enrich his later memories, not with information and acquisition only, but with a sentiment and ideal worthy of an educated life. That is what rescues a great institution

from the persistent risk of becoming a mechanical and external organization and makes it a body at whose centre is a soul. Just as at the heart of these alluring quadrangles with their many doors opening into special sciences and arts, there stands this Memorial Church as the symbol of a spiritual centre, so at the heart of all these varied and sometimes divisive activities stands this act of love, which, like the heart in the body transmits its blood to every part and marks the beat of vitality and health. Science, however active and wise it may be, is not likely under these conditions to obliterate sentiment. The head and the hand of the University will not forget their dependence upon the heart. An efficient university may be recognized not alone by the growth of its plant but by the fulfillment of its ideal. Its greatest asset is a fine tradition. Its finest product is not its experts or technicians but its vitalizing faith in truth and goodness at the heart of the world.

Such is the significance of this commemoration as it turns toward the past. But, finally, there remains the other side of the Apostolic teaching of historic reciprocity. These, though they died in faith, received not the promise; for they without us could not be made perfect. The perfecting of the founders' promise can be attained only as each successive year justifies their hope and prayer. The broadening of the stream is the only convincing evidence of the fulness of the fountain. The life of a little boy who died in Florence is taken up and perpetuated in the life of each young man or woman who humbly accepts the privilege and opportunity here offered in his name. To the founders, the university was the reincarnation of their son; and as they had looked to him to perpetuate their name, so in his name they adopted the sons and daughters of California. And so this service of commemoration becomes a service of consecration. It is a day not merely for historical appreciation, but for a personal pledge. What the founders wanted here was not honor, but results. That was what the apostle realized as he recalled the heroism of Israel. "Seeing," he says, "that we are compassed about by this cloud of witnesses, let us run with a greater patience our own race." The same message is delivered to you today. The momentum of the faith in which your University began ought to carry you far on your own way. A community which is the product of a great faith must run with a greater patience its own race. The spirit of the past looks

down upon even the least important student of today and says: "The University, which was founded twenty-three years ago with such sacred hopes, and has endured such extreme vicissitudes, and has now entered upon such a career of national service, has been, all the while, and through all these dramatic transitions, waiting, with parental expectancy, for you."

THE FOUNDERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

At the Founders' Day exercises of 1914, held on Monday morning, March 9, in the Assembly Hall at the university, the following address, entitled "The Founders of the University," was delivered by the Honorable William W. Morrow, LL. D., for many years a friend and associate of Senator and Mrs. Stanford:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The invitation I had the pleasure of receiving from the Faculty Committee to deliver the Founders' Day address on this occasion came with the suggestion that I should speak from my personal knowledge of the life and public services of Senator Leland Stanford. The suggestion was most acceptable, since it required nothing more serious or exacting than the recalling of events in the general order of a narrative. This effort has been one of unusual personal interest for me, and has brought to my mind many interesting associations connected with public affairs of this state and nation, in which Senator Stanford was a prominent figure, and which I think illustrate in a marked degree his originality, courage and strength of character.

My acquaintance with Leland Stanford covered a period of more than thirty years, and during part of that time our relations were of such a nature that phases of his character were brought under my observation that made me know him as a most unique, independent and commanding personality.

He was born at Watervliet, New York, on March 9, 1824—ninety years ago today. Watervliet is about eight miles above Albany, on the Hudson River. His father was of English stock, with Irish blood in his veins. This was a combination from which we might expect an individual possessed of vigorous qualities of mind and body, coupled with courage and sound judgment, and balanced with a strain of quaint, happy humor. These qualities do in fact appear to have been inherited in full vigor by the son. The father was a farmer, and for a time at least a railroad contractor. These parental occupations and surroundings must

have given the son an early practical view of the affairs of life and a habit of constant self reliance that would be likely to grow into marked independence of judgment and will.

We start then with heredity, environment and an early experience favorable to the future efficiency and independence of the son, who had, moreover, the advantage of a good, practical education. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1848. In that year he yielded to the spirit of that day and moved west to Port Washington, Wisconsin, where he practiced law. He visited his New York home in 1850 and was there married to Miss Jane Lathrop, and returned with his wife to Port Washington. In 1852 a fire destroyed his law library and household effects. This misfortune caused him to consider the advantage of going still further west, and as a result he came to California. He left his wife with her father in Albany, New York, and reached California in July, 1852. He visited his brothers, who were engaged in a general merchandise business in Sacramento, and soon after he entered into the same business for himself at Cold Springs, in Eldorado county. In 1853 he opened a store at Michigan Bluffs, in Placer county, a very prosperous mining section, and he also engaged in mining and was highly successful. In 1855 he purchased the business of his brothers in Sacramento and the same year returned east and brought Mrs. Stanford to California and established his home at Sacramento.

He was an original Republican, and with a few others organized the Republican party in Sacramento in 1856. All Republicans were progressives in those days, and correspondingly fearless. Senator Cole, in his memoirs, speaking of the Republican party in Sacramento at that time, says: "The party at its inception was extremely limited in numbers"; that besides himself there were "Leland Stanford, C. P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, Edwin B. and Charles Crocker, and that besides these there were not for some time as many as could be counted on one's fingers." But this small party does not appear to have been ignored by others in the community because of its lack of numbers. Its members were denounced as agitators, disturbers of the peace and traitors to the country. Violence against them was resorted to occasionally, and efforts of intimidation often. Senator Cole gives a copy of a public notice, printed in large type and posted about the city of Sacramento on May 13, 1856. It was headed,—"*To Arms*" and called upon "all good citizens to attend a public meeting" at a place named "to devise means to protect

the public welfare by appointing a committee to *hang all the leaders* and as many of the attaches of said traitors as may be deemed necessary to restore the public quiet and put a stop to such treasonable practices." This notice was understood to be directed against Mr. Stanford, Mr. Cole and their associates. It was probably nothing more than a species of intimidation; but whatever its object it could not have been highly pleasant reading for those to whom it referred. The historian fails to give us any further information concerning the meeting. Nobody appears to have been hung; but we are left to infer that this little band of agitators followed Franklin's wise advice given to the signers of the Declaration of Independence. They hung together and thus escaped being hanged separately.

I do not mention these matters to recall ancient animosities, long since forgiven and forgotten. Mr. Stanford was himself among the first to forgive and forget, save the humor of some of the situations, to which he sometimes referred; but I mention these incidents to show you the man in action under circumstances and conditions calculated to test the strength of his physical and moral fiber, and his ability to meet the passions and turbulence of a new community fearlessly and with perfect composure.

In 1857 Mr. Stanford was the Republican candidate for state treasurer; but the party was of such recent origin that its nominations were merely matters of form to maintain the party organization. In 1859 he was the nominee of his party for governor. The Democratic party was divided. One wing, being known as the Lecompton party, nominated a ticket with Mr. Latham as the candidate for governor, and the other wing, or Anti-Lecompton party, nominated a ticket with Judge John Curry for that office. There was a natural tendency for the latter party to unite with the Republican party, as it subsequently did; but at this time there were influences at work in favor of the Republican party withdrawing from the field. Horace Greeley, the editor of the *New York Tribune,* a man of distinction and the foremost Republican in the United States, arrived in California in the summer of 1859. He was everywhere received with the greatest enthusiasm and accorded every consideration. He made a number of speeches in the state, and regarding himself as entitled by his position to advise Republicans as to their duty, he proposed that they should withdraw their ticket and support the Anti-Lecompton party.

The proposition was submitted to Mr. Stanford. His reply was characteristic of the man. He declined to withdraw, maintaining with firm-

ness that it was the duty of the Republican party to stand by its principles, whatever the result. He preferred to go down to defeat rather than to surrender to an opposing party the standard placed in his hands by his political friends and supporters. He was not a mere office seeker. He was charged with the duty of preserving the integrity of a party organization and he would perform that duty. Like Mr. Lincoln, he would not be the last to desert. He would not desert at all. He was defeated at the polls, but he demonstrated to the people of the state that he was not a weak nor uncertain leader.

He was again nominated for governor in 1861, and it was in this campaign that I first became acquainted with him. I was then located at Santa Rosa. I was anxious to hear him, although I was not then a voter. I had come to California two years before from the state of Illinois, where political questions occupied the public mind to the exclusion of almost every other subject. I had heard such public speakers as Lincoln, Douglas, Trumbull, Browning and many others of their type. These were all rugged men of distinguished ability, combined with great force of character. Coming here from such a field of political discussion, my first impression of California speakers was a disappointment. They seemed to me to be lacking in force and in an understanding of national questions. I inquired for the joint debates between candidates, with which I had been familiar, and the keen discussion of such national questions as the Missouri Compromise, the Dred Scott decision, and the Lecompton Constitution. In Illinois the discussion of political questions was about the only diversion the people had, and they were accustomed to hear public speakers gifted with the force of persuasive eloquence. It seemed to me that the California speakers did not measure up to the standard we had in Illinois; but I was told to be patient until I heard such speakers as Colonel E. D. Baker, Frederick P. Tracy, Thomas Starr King, Thomas Fitch, Henry Edgerton and other orators of repute. I soon heard these speakers, and while they had culture of a high order, they lacked the plain, homely, frontier character of the middle west. But I soon became convinced that there were political orators in California as well as in Illinois. Incidentally it may be said that Colonel Baker, the greatest orator of modern times, was from Illinois and had been an associate of Mr. Lincoln. He had been trained in the Illinois school of political discussion, and was a master of the art. He was a brave soldier, a brilliant orator and a great statesman, and it was with these men that Mr. Stanford came into prominence in California.

While I was in this state of curiosity about the public speakers of the State, Mr. Stanford was advertised to speak in Santa Rosa on the issues of the day. He was a leader of the new party, based upon a new and an untried platform of principles. The political sentiment of that place at that time was decidedly unfriendly to the new party and its candidates. Mr. Stanford was received respectfully, but not enthusiastically. His personal appearance was impressive. He was then thirty-seven years of age, large in frame, with a swarthy complexion and something of the plain, rugged features of the frontiersman. He was dignified in manner, with a peculiarly attractive composure. His voice was melodious and pleasant; his language clear and expressive. He was listened to by a large audience with respectful interest. He wasted no time on immaterial questions, but went directly into the issues of the campaign. The platform of the party had declared in favor of the common school system, and insisted that it should be sustained in all of its essential features, and its benefits and efficiency extended. The platform also declared in favor of distributing the public lands of the United States to homestead settlers, and pledged the party to aid the immediate construction of a transcontinental railroad. The platform declared further that the Republicans of California pledged themselves, *and all they had,* to sustain the national administration at Washington. Mr. Lincoln had been elected the previous November, and on the fourth of March had been inaugurated president. Mr. Stanford had been a delegate from California to the national Republican convention that had placed Mr. Lincoln in nomination, and had advocated his election. He was the president's friend and adviser, and the two men had much that was in common.

In Mr. Stanford's speech on the occasion to which I refer, he discussed the platform of the party and declared his adherence to its principles. He spoke with the eloquence of an honest conviction. He believed that the public school system was at the very foundation of our form of government; that the public domain should be given freely to actual settlers for the building of homes; that the Pacific railroad should be built at the earliest possible moment that the people of the Pacific Coast might have quick and ample communication with the east. He declared that he was doing and would continue to do what he could to further the project; and in concluding he paid a splendid and feeling tribute to the high character and patriotism of Mr. Lincoln, and his administration, and its purpose to maintain the perpetuity of the union.

It is difficult now to understand how any of these questions could have ever been a subject of serious discussion; but they were, and the discussions were vigorous, sometimes violent. Mr. Stanford presented them in an able and fearless manner in all of the principal localities of the state. He gained the confidence of the people by his plain, straightforward speech and manner, and was elected by a large plurality. His term of office was for two years. Having become president of the Central Pacific Railroad, then in course of construction, he declined a renomination. During his term of office as governor he gave the state a wise and an efficient administration, and was counted one of the "war governors" of the nation, taking a place in support of the national cause alongside of such governors as Andrews of Massachusetts, Washburn of Maine, Morgan of New York, Curtin of Pennsylvania, Morton of Indiana, Yates of Illinois and Kirkwood of Iowa.

In June, 1861, and ten days after Mr. Stanford had been nominated for governor, he and a few other citizens of Sacramento organized and incorporated the Central Pacific Railroad Company, under the laws of the state of California, with Mr. Stanford as the president of the corporation. Congress had not then passed the act to aid in the construction of the railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean. That act was not passed until July 1, 1862. It organized the Union Pacific Railroad Company with an imposing array of stockholders, to build a railroad west from the Missouri River to a connection with the Central Pacific Railroad of California. Mr. Stanford's associates were not so conspicuous, but they were men of energy, ability and character. Among them were Theodore D. Judah, a distinguished engineer, C. P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins and Charles Crocker, merchants of Sacramento. There were a few others, but these were the men who afterwards became known in the construction of the road, and in the affairs of the state and nation in connection with this enterprise.

The object of the corporation which these men formed was to construct a railroad from Sacramento eastward on the line of the proposed transcontinental railroad, and on January 8, 1863, Governor Stanford turned the first spadeful of earth in Sacramento for its construction. At that time the only railroads in the state were a short line from Sacramento to Folsom, a distance of about twenty miles, and a partly constructed railroad of about twenty miles from San Francisco to San Jose. The construction of these two short lines had been very expensive, and were in fact a warn-

ing against the prosecution of another such enterprise at that time. Railroad iron, locomotives and other rolling stock had to be brought from the east around the Horn in sailing vessels; and the cost of all kinds of materials was very high, and labor dear and scarce.

The prospect that the men who had organized the Central Pacific Company would complete any considerable part of the transcontinental road, under the then prevailing conditions, was not very assuring. It was not, in fact, generally expected. They were not men of wealth, nor did they have any of the resources that usually give men the command of wealth. It was stated, and I have no doubt truthfully, that they could not with all of their own means have built twenty miles of the road; but this fact does not appear to have discouraged them in the least; nor did the manifest lack of confidence on the part of the public seem to deter them in the prosecution of this great enterprise.

The engineer, Judah, who had been engaged in exploring a route over the Sierras for a railroad, recommended three routes as practicable,—one through Eldorado county, by way of Georgetown, one through Placer county by way of Auburn and Dutch Flat, and one through Nevada county by way of Nevada City. The middle route, by way of Auburn and Dutch Flat, was adopted. This action aroused the fierce opposition of those who were interested in the other routes, and was the cause of much ill-feeling and adverse public criticism. Dutch Flat at that time was a prosperous mining camp and was on the line of a wagon road over the mountains into the state of Nevada, called the Dutch Flat wagon road, and this name was afterwards applied, with derision, to the railroad as it was being constructed up the rough mountain slope, and the railroad itself was called the "Dutch Flat Swindle." It was said that the road, although it was being constructed under the terms of the act of Congress providing for a transcontinental road, and was being aided by a land grant, and by the loan of the credit of the nation in government bonds, would never be completed above Colfax; that beyond that point the road was impracticable for a railroad because of the deep snows of the summit and the falling of the dreadful avalanches sweeping everything before them; that the railroad could not be operated at all during the winter time, and the roadbed and track would inevitably be swept away by the fearful storms. Snowsheds had not then been devised, and the engineers' skill in driving tunnels and in constructing the line under treacherous projecting cliffs had not been fully realized.

It was therefore said that the difficulties in carrying the line of road over the summit were insurmountable and that it would not be accomplished; that the road as a pretended part of a transcontinental line was a palpable swindle; that the purpose of the railroad company was to connect with the Dutch Flat wagon road over the summit, and together they were to become a part of a scheme for the transportation of freight and passengers from California to the Nevada mines during the favorable season, but no further. Governor Stanford and his associates ignored all this adverse criticism of the project, and proceeded with the work on the line adopted, with every possible energy. They encountered all the difficulties predicted by the opponents of the road, and even more; but with immense labor, great expense, and the engineers' skill, the difficulties were all overcome. Judah was dead, but he had been succeeded by able and daring engineers under Montague and Hood.

While this work was going on I had occasion to go to the front on several occasions. Its novel and stupendous character made it attractive, and those who have been watching the construction of the Panama Canal with continuing interest may understand the intense interest of the people of California in the construction of this railroad as it climbed the steep slopes of the Sierras, and when it had passed the summit at an altitude of more than 7000 feet there was then, as there has been recently with respect to the Panama Canal, a decided feeling of relief that after all the great difficulties in the way had been overcome, and a transcontinental railroad was assured. The descent of the road down the steep eastern slope of the Sierras also required an immense amount of labor and a high degree of engineering skill, but in time that too was accomplished and the construction of the road through Nevada was carried forward with great rapidity.

On May 10, 1869, a connection was made at Promontory Point, in Utah, with the Union Pacific Railroad that was being built west from the Missouri River under the act of Congress, and thereupon the last spike was driven by Governor Stanford and the completion of the first transcontinental railroad became a part of the history of the nation.

But Governor Stanford and his associates did not stop with the building of the Central Pacific Railroad. When that road had reached Colfax in 1865, and the difficulties in the way of constructing the road over the summit were beginning to loom up before them, with wonderful boldness and foresight they incorporated the Southern Pacific

Railroad Company to build a railroad over a somewhat indefinite line from the Bay of San Francisco to Los Angeles and San Diego; and thence eastward to the eastern boundary of the state, there to connect with a contemplated railroad running to the Mississippi River. Los Angeles was at that time a modest, unpretentious village of less than 5000 inhabitants. San Diego, with a population of about 1500, was a little more important by reason of its harbor, but it had no other advantage over Los Angeles.

Why any person at that time should want to build a railroad from San Francisco to that part of the state, in competition with vessels by sea, was to the average person a mystery; but to Governor Stanford and his associates there was no mystery about it. They foresaw the immense possibilities of the San Joaquin Valley and the southern part of the state and they proposed to have a part in developing their wonderful resources. And this is what they did in the face of active and aggressive opposition:

In 1866 Congress granted lands to aid in the construction of a railroad from Springfield in the state of Missouri, (about 195 miles southwest of St. Louis), through the Indian Territory to Albuquerque in New Mexico, thence through Arizona, along and near the thirty-fifth parallel of latitude, to the Colorado River, and thence to the Pacific Ocean. This road was incorporated and constructed as the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad. It had for its incorporators some of the most noted bankers and railroad men in the country, and had every prospect of becoming one of the great transcontinental railroads. This road is now a part of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. In the granting act to the Atlantic and Pacific, the Southern Pacific, which had only been incorporated a few months before, was authorized to connect with the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad at such point near the boundary line of the state as might be most suitable for a railroad line to San Francisco. This point was subsequently fixed at the Needles, on the Colorado River.

In 1871 Congress also passed an act incorporating the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, with an imposing list of incorporators. The act granted lands to aid in the construction of the railroad from Marshall, near the eastern boundary of the state of Texas, along and near the thirty-second parallel of latitude, to El Paso, Texas, thence through New Mexico and Arizona to a point on the Colorado River near the southeastern boundary of the state of California, and thence to San Diego. For the purpose of connecting this road with San Francisco, the Southern Pacific

Railroad Company was authorized by the act to construct a road by way of the Tehachapi Pass and Los Angeles to the Colorado River. This point on the Colorado River was subsequently fixed at Yuma.

To meet these two roads at the points indicated on the eastern boundary of the state of California, Governor Stanford and his associates constructed the Central Pacific Railroad from Lathrop down the San Joaquin Valley to Goshen, and the Southern Pacific Railroad from that point over and across the Tehachapi range of mountains to Los Angeles. From Mohave, on the Mohave Desert, they built a railroad across the desert eastward to the Needles on the Colorado River, to connect with the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad, and from Los Angeles they built a railroad eastward down into the Colorado Desert 260 feet below the level of the sea, thence rising to and crossing the Colorado River at Yuma to meet the Texas Pacific.

In this way Governor Stanford and his associates authorized by law met and blocked these two roads coming from the east at the boundary line of the state, the one temporarily and the other permanently. The Atlantic and Pacific subsequently purchased the Southern Pacific line from Mohave to the Needles, and the Santa Fe, its successor, finally reached the Bay of San Francisco by an independent terminal at Point Richmond. The Texas Pacific Railroad never reached the Colorado River, but the Southern Pacific, building eastward from Yuma, pushed on across Arizona and New Mexico and met the Texas Pacific at the Rio Grande, near El Paso, in the state of Texas.

Under another act of Congress, passed in 1866, the Central Pacific Railroad, under the name of the California and Oregon Railroad, was authorized to build northward toward the Oregon line to connect with another railroad coming south from Portland, Oregon. This line was built and a road opened to Portland.

Governor Stanford and his associates also acquired control of short lines by which they reached the Bay of San Francisco from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. They also built a line down the coast; and with all these lines, connections and terminals they secured substantial control of the transportation facilities of the state, and in 1885 they merged all of these railroads under the control of the Southern Pacific Company.

I mention these matters to show with what determination, force and ability these men pushed forward against formidable opposition, and in the face of difficulties obtained the substantial control of the transporta-

tion facilities of the state. It has been said that others could have done the same thing with the same assistance in national bonds, land grants and other contributions. The fact remains that others, with like opportunities, did not make the effort, and that others failed, with the same opportunities to carry to successful completion corresponding enterprises. Every transcontinental railroad coming westward toward the coast, and with which the Central Pacific Railroad or the Southern Pacific Railroad was authorized to connect, failed at one time or another to meet its financial obligations, and was placed by the courts in the hands of receivers. Further comparisons are tempting, but will not be pursued on this occasion.

It is a fair question, however, to ask: What have been the financial operations of the corporations involved in the Southern Pacific System? Have any of these failed to meet their obligations? Have any of them been in the hands of receivers? We find no such records. They appear to have paid their debts at maturity, including the bonded debt and interest due to the United States by the Central Pacific. Perhaps some credit may be due to Governor Stanford and his associates for so having managed these properties that all the corporations under their control have maintained their financial integrity from the first spadeful of earth turned on the 8th day of January, 1863, down to the present time.

During all this time of construction Governor Stanford continued at the head of the corporations incorporated into this one controlling system. The people and press of the state protested against the system, and charged that a grasping monopoly had been formed to appropriate the transportation facilities of the state. It was insisted that competitive transcontinental lines should be admitted into the state and competition in freight and passenger rates secured.

Governor Stanford and his associates proceeded upon the theory that whatever monopoly there was in the Southern Pacific system was for the best interests of the state; that what the state needed was the development of its extensive and valuable resources, and that to do this it was imperative that railroad transportation be extended to all points of the state where business would justify it, either presently or prospectively; that one corporation or one system, with its connecting lines and terminals, could do this better and cheaper than several; that additional transcontinental lines would not be competitive, and would not confer the benefits that were expected by the public.

During the time that Governor Stanford and his associates continued in control of the Southern Pacific System they never swerved in their adherence to this policy. Neither did the press nor the public, until very recently, abandon their opposition to that policy. The Santa Fe came into the state as a competing road for business, but not with respect to rates for freight and fares, which now became matters for the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State Railroad Commission.

This question of railroad competition now comes up in a legal aspect. The federal government has submitted to the courts the question whether the merging of the Central Pacific and its terminals into the Southern Pacific system is a monopoly in restraint of trade and commerce in violation of the Sherman anti-trust law. This action on the part of the government is now being vigorously resisted by substantially the entire business interests of the state, upon the ground that the merging of these connecting lines and terminal facilities twenty-nine years ago was for the best interests of the people of this state, and is so now. The farseeing policy that constructed this system is now approved by the public, and the policy of Governor Stanford and his associates in extending and developing the Southern Pacific System from 1865 to 1885 is now the declared policy of the people of the state of California in dealing with this transcontinental transportation question. Upon this legal question, for obvious reasons, I express no opinion, but upon the question of policy I have the opinion of a citizen that the present situation should not be disturbed.

I now come to a period of a very different character, when my relations with Governor Stanford became official, personal and in some respects quite intimate. In January, 1885, Governor Stanford was elected by the legislature of the state to the United States senate for the term of six years commencing on March 4, 1885. I had been elected in November, 1884, to the House of Representatives from the San Francisco district, for the term of two years commencing also on March 4, 1885. By re-election I served six years in the House of Representatives, from 1885 to 1891.

Senator Stanford's colleagues in the Senate from California during his term of service were in succession, General John F. Miller, George Hearst, A. P. Williams, Charles N. Felton and Stephen M. White. In the House of Representatives during that time there were from California, among others, Charles N. Felton, afterwards United States Senator, and Joseph McKenna, afterwards United States Circuit Judge, Attorney General of

the United States, and now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the transaction of public business relating to California it was customary for Senator Stanford to have frequent conferences at his house with the California members of the House of Representatives who were his party associates concerning California matters. These conferences were nearly always interesting, and sometimes amusing,—interesting because they either related to some matter of legislation before Congress, or something pending before one or more of the departments in which important interests of the state were concerned,—amusing because of the extraordinary demands made upon the senators and members of Congress by their constituents,—from turnip seed, popcorn and offices to patents for nutmeg graters and flying machines. We speak of public officials as public servants, but we never use that term with so much accuracy and feeling as when we apply it to senators or representatives in Congress. They are public servants, practically as well as theoretically, with only one substantial privilege at their service,—and that is to make speeches in the Congressional Record and send them free through the mail to their constituents. Senator Stanford, however, never availed himself of this privilege. His speeches were all actually delivered. He was an efficient, conscientious public servant, performing all his duties faithfully and cheerfully. He never complained of the burden of small and often trifling demands.

One of the first subjects of national importance to engage his attention was that of education, in which he was deeply interested. A bill had been introduced in Congress by Senator Blair of New Hampshire to aid in the establishment and temporary support of the common schools. The bill provided for the distribution of seventy-seven millions of dollars among the several states and territories in proportion to the illiteracy in each state or territory. The distribution was to be in installments covering a period of eight years. The bill was fully discussed by the leading senators and representatives. In the course of the debate in the Senate, on February 25, 1890, Senator Stanford delivered a speech in support of the bill in which he said some pertinent things about education.

"In my opinion," said he, "our government can have no higher object than to secure to the people a high degree of intelligence, thereby assisting them to the attainment of the possibilities of humanity. These possibilities and the beneficence of the Creator to man on earth are one and

the same, for it is obvious that there could be no beneficence in the unattainable. Had we been given reasonable wants without the means of gratifying them, the Creator's beneficence would be a failure.

"But when we look around at the sources of supply for our wants, whether spiritual or intellectual, we find them inexhaustibly supplied in the soil, waters, forests, mines and quarries. The raw material is everywhere within our reach, requiring only the intelligent application of labor and the control of the forces of nature. How this labor is to be supplied, and this control obtained, is what education will teach."

He believed in education of the masses, and he particularly favored the bill then under consideration, because it provided for the education of both sexes alike for their respective callings. He believed in the early education of the child for the moral influence it would have in forming his character and in laying the foundation for his future efficiency. He believed in educating all classes for the active duties of life, and for the deeper insight it gave into nature, and the greater knowledge of her wonderful forces, which, being understood, developed and brought under control, would enable humanity to realize the glorious destiny marked out for it by the Creator.

The bill which he was then supporting was defeated, mainly, as I recall, on constitutional grounds. But he supported other educational bills which became laws, notably bills in aid of state agricultural colleges, providing for experimental stations, and a more thorough training in agricultural pursuits. He was himself an agriculturist on a large scale, and with his extensive land holdings he naturally took a practical interest in the industry. But his interest was much more than personal. He viewed the production of the soil from the standpoint of the nation's welfare, and believed that the nation might increase its wealth enormously by the introduction of intelligent, economical methods.

He accordingly proposed a scheme of government loans on real estate, which should have the double purpose of furnishing the country with an elastic currency of sufficient volume to meet its requirements, and at the same time supply the farmer with money at a low rate of interest to meet the necessities of his calling and make agriculture profitable and attractive. The scheme was a bold one, but it was one in which Senator Stanford had the utmost confidence, and he was astonished that it did not receive general approval. I think the greatest disappointment he suffered during his senatorial career was his failure to secure any general support for this

bill. The scheme was discussed very generally in this country and in Europe, but, I think, adversely.

In view of recent legislation, it would seem that his failure was due mainly to the fact that he was at least twenty years in advance of the times.

Senator Stanford was essentially a progressive, and he was generally a pioneer in whatever he undertook, whether it was the formation of a political party, building a railroad, developing some new industry, or founding a university. He could see well into the future, and he usually saw his efforts successful; but in this instance he did not see his scheme adopted. Now, I am not going to discuss this financial question in any great detail. Mr. Gladstone is reported to have said in a debate in the British House of Commons concerning some financial measure before it, that there were two roads distinctly marked leading directly to the madhouse,—one was the study of a railroad timetable, and the other was the study of the principles of banking and currency. For your sakes as well as for my own, I shall touch but lightly upon this financial question.

But a few words of explanation are necessary to understand the full scope and purpose of Senator Stanford's scheme.

The United States loans its credit to national banks in national bank notes issued upon the security of United States bonds deposited with the treasurer of the United States. Senator Stanford proposed that the United States should also loan its credit to farmers in treasury notes on the security of real estate. The United States loans its credit to national banks in national bank notes in amounts equal to the par value of the bonds deposited. Senator Stanford proposed that the United States should loan its credit to farmers in treasury notes on the security of real estate to an extent not to exceed fifty per cent of its assessed valuation. The United States loans its credit to national banks in national bank notes without interest. Senator Stanford proposed that the United States should loan its credit to farmers in treasury notes at two per cent per annum. So far the farmer would seem to have the better claim to the loan of treasury notes; but financiers tell us that we now encounter difficulties. The amount of United States bonds available as security for national bank notes is limited, and could not become the basis of an inflated currency, whereas the amount of mortgages that would be tendered the United States for loans of treasury notes at two per cent per annum would be

practically unlimited and would become the foundation for an enormously inflated currency.

We know from experience that a currency in excess of the actual necessities of the people causes a rise in prices and frequently wild speculation, followed by disaster and ruin. We also know on the other hand that a currency that is not sufficient to enable the people to carry on their business operations freely and without stringency depreciates values, causes panics and likewise results in disaster and ruin. Both of these extremes should, therefore, be avoided, so that the business of the country may be conducted freely and as near as may be upon a continuous uniform unit of value.

In 1890 the situation was one of violent controversy. There was evidence that the volume of currency was not keeping pace with the growth of the country, and by reason of that fact, and general distrust of financial conditions, contraction of the currency was then in actual progress. Gold was the unit of value, but to prevent further contraction and provide a more elastic medium of exchange there were a large number of people who advocated the free coinage of silver as the solution of the problem. This of itself was deemed by the business interests to be an overshadowing menace to the sound financial condition of the country, and by reason of legislation tending rapidly in that direction, the danger appeared to be imminent and financial storm signals were then being set forecasting the panic of 1893, which swept over the country with such terrific fury.

While this financial storm was brewing Senator Stanford in perfect good faith to meet the situation brought forward his land loan scheme. He first introduced a resolution in the senate on March 10, 1890, instructing the finance committee of that body to report what relief might be provided by the United States government for the stringency in the money market, and particularly whether loans might be made by the government upon mortgages. This resolution failed to receive any consideration. On May 20, 1890, he introduced a bill entitled, "A bill to provide the government with sufficient means to supply the national government with a sound circulating medium." This bill provided that the treasurer of the United States should cause to be printed notes of the United States to the amount of one hundred millions of dollars, and such additional amounts from time to time as should be necessary to meet the requirements of the act. These notes were to be a legal tender

for all private and certain public debts, and were to be loaned on unincumbered agricultural land upon interest at the rate of two per cent per annum. A loan was not to exceed one-half of the assessed value of the land and for a term of not to exceed twenty years. No loan was to be for a sum less than $250. The bill provided for a bureau in the treasury department to administer the provisions of the act.

A few days after the introduction of this bill Senator Stanford made a speech in its support in which he explained its provisions, and contended that the plan of loaning money upon land at two per cent, with the privilege to the borrower of returning it when he had no use for it, would create a money system that would meet financial expansions and contractions as they might occur. He did not claim, however, that his bill had been perfected in detail. What he did claim was that the principle of loaning the credit of the nation upon sufficient security, to those who needed it, should be extended to the farmers on the security of real estate as had already been done to the national banks on the security of United States bonds, and that the financial condition of the country urgently required immediate legislation to that end. The bill was referred to the senate committee on finance. That committee, composed, it must be said, of able and experienced statesmen, reported on the bill adversely, classifying the proposed scheme with a number of others in this country and elsewhere that had operated disastrously. The committee held the bill to be bad in substance and unconstitutional. Upon this report the bill was indefinitely postponed.

In January, 1891, Senator Stanford was re-elected to the senate for a second term of six years and he again introduced his land loan bill with another bill placing the scheme squarely upon a gold basis. In January, 1892, he made another and more elaborate speech in its support, at the same time replying to the adverse report of the finance committee made in the previous Congress. He was now thoroughly aroused and defended his scheme with great force. A Kansas senator came to his support, and it looked as though the bill was about to be considered on its merits, and amended so as to provide against the possibility of an inflated currency. The bill was pending in the senate at the time of Senator Stanford's death on June 21, 1893.

At the memorial exercises in the United States Senate on September 16, 1893, and in the House of Representatives on February 12, 1894, the members of both houses paid feeling tributes to the life and character of

Senator Stanford. The address of Senator Daniel of Virginia, in particular, was very impressive by reason of the eloquent and feeling personality of his remarks. He referred to the land loan bill in terms that corresponded so nearly with my own experience that I venture to repeat them here:

"He" (Senator Stanford) "had some ideas which he was never able to impress upon his associates as being practicable, among them his idea of lending vast amounts of money upon land. I have talked with him for hours and hours upon repeated occasions on that theme, and he often urged me to adopt his views and advocate them. I could never see that they were practicable, and with all my respect for him and desire to meet his wishes I could not, of course, comply with his request. Yet let me say that beneath the difficulties which present themselves to such an idea as he had formed, there are in it germs of truth and wisdom such as are found in the first evolutions of invention, which, in a later and riper day of the world's history, may be developed into much that is attainable and good. * * * * As the world's population shall increase, and as financial refinements and facilities shall be developed, there will be found in this idea much to build upon, and in the end probably some ripe consummation."

How gracious and candid this was on the part of that distinguished Senator. That was twenty years ago. We have experienced some squally financial times since then. The period commenced with the panic of 1893 and included the panic of 1907; but the country has made substantial progress in its financial system during this time, and what is most interesting for us here today, in the direction of Senator Stanford's scheme. This progress will be found in the recent act of December 23, 1913, providing for reserve banks and an elastic currency, with gold as the standard of values. Mr. Horace White, the well known editor and financial expert, writing of this act in the North American Review, says:

"Twenty years was required to prepare public opinion, including that of bankers and congressmen, for the adoption of asset currency in the place of bond currency."

"Asset currency," as here used, means a currency based upon the security of the constantly maturing obligations of the banks' customers, as distinguished from a currency based upon the security of United States bonds.

This act has had the effect of opening avenues of credit in national

banks to classes of borrowers who have never had access to it before, and one such class is that of the farmer. When Senator Stanford was urging his bill before Congress, national banks were prohibited from loaning money on real estate. The farmer might have a very valuable tract of improved land, but he could not pledge it to the national banks as security for any sum of money or for any length of time. If he had personal credit with the bank he might obtain what is called a commercial loan for sixty or ninety days, but not for a longer period, or upon any other security than that of personal credit. Under the recent act of Congress national banks are authorized to make loans on farm lands for a period not to exceed five years, to the extent of fifty per cent of the valuation of such lands. The act also provides that national banks may discount notes, drafts and bills of exchange secured by agricultural products, with the maturity of the paper extended to six months.

This legislation is all new, and is based substantially upon the basic principle of Senator Stanford's land loan bill, but differing in detail. For example, under the act the loan reaches the borrower through a national bank; under Senator Stanford's plan the loan would reach the borrower directly from the government. The act also provides the security of reserves against an inflated currency. This was lacking in Senator Stanford's plan. But this is not all. There are pending before Congress a number of bills providing for a national system of banking based upon rural credits exclusively; that is to say, loans to farmers on mortgages for long terms at a low rate of interest. There is every prospect that some measure of that character will become a law during the present Congress. If it does, the fundamental idea of Senator Stanford's land loan bill will have been fully realized, and Senator Daniel's prediction of a ripe consummation will prove to be something more than a mere figure of speech.

We come now to the last and most impressive and important act of Senator Stanford's remarkable career,—the founding of this great university, when he said, "The children of California shall be my children." In this act we associate the name of that true and faithful companion and devoted wife, Jane Lathrop Stanford. The founding of this university was the blending of the pride and glory of both of their lives, in a vision of higher needs and deeper realities. For thirty-five years they had been co-workers in all of the affairs of life, reaching out to noble works and generous deeds. But now, in memory of their idolized son, they lov-

ingly united in founding this institution as a perpetual memorial to his youthful ambition to better the world by education.

In January, 1885, Senator Stanford submitted to the legislature of this state an act to advance learning, the arts and sciences, by providing for the foundation and endowment within the state of universities and other institutions of learning. This act passed both houses of the legislature and was approved by the governor on March 9, 1885,—twenty-nine years ago today. This act was general in its terms and in accordance with the constitutional requirement, but was intended to be and was in fact the foundation of this university. It is a happy coincidence that we commemorate the birth of the founder, Leland Stanford, and the foundation act, on the same day.

The selection of the first president for this university was a matter of very serious concern with Senator and Mrs. Stanford. Their ideal of a president was as exceptional and as exalted as their ideal of the institution they were founding; and accordingly the whole field of eligible persons was thoroughly canvassed, and the qualifications of each carefully weighed with respect to the immediate work of organization, as well as ability to project the lines of future development. It was from such a process of weighing and sifting that the selection fell upon that distinguished scientist and able executive, David Starr Jordan.

Senator and Mrs. Stanford were very earnest and very laborious in the effort to frame the outline of an institution whose teachings would be of the highest character. They believed in the value of present knowledge, but they also believed in the value of work expended in the discovery of new truths. They believed in teaching the student how to thread his way through the known regions of knowledge, but they also believed in extending the boundaries of knowledge into the unexplored that humanity might know and possess its inheritance. An institution to correspond to such a plan must necessarily be a growth, the result of the slow process of evolution.

"Every true man," says Emerson, "is a cause, a country and an age; requires infinite spaces and numbers and time fully to accomplish his design."

We look upon this university in that light, and behold it in the process of development reflecting the spirit and purpose of its founders. We see now the university taking its place as a force in the march of progress, advancing the standards of skill and efficiency, and equipping explorers

for new fields of knowledge in the search for truth. We see it working out its destiny in promoting "the public welfare by exercising an influence in behalf of humanity and civilization, teaching the blessings of liberty regulated by law, inculcating love and reverence for the great principles of government as derived from the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

We assemble here today to recall these works, revive the prophetic vision of the founders, and pay our tribute of respect to the genius of the builders who, building as they knew, built for all time.

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

UCLA-Young Research Library
LD3024.5.S7 P3
yr
L 009 578 765 1

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 001 324 564 2