

[1915?] ]

I.

Federal Suffrage,- The right of Women to vote for United States Representatives and Senators in Congress to be established by appropriate legislation in Congress.

Shortly after the adoption of what are called the War Amendments to the U.S. Constitution suffrage women looked with hope to them as offering protection through process of law to the women of the United States in the right of suffrage which they believe is consistently and inherently a part of democratic republican principles. In consequence, there have been two historic legal suits in which women have tried to establish their right to vote by the Federal Constitution and Amendments; both of which are more or less familiar to suffragists because they are recounted in full in the second volume of the History of Woman Suffrage. One case was that of Miss Susan B. Anthony, who voted for State and Federal officers in the state of New York; and the other was that of Mrs. Virginia L. Miner, who attempted to register and vote for state and Federal officers in Missouri. Both of these women based their claim upon the XIV Amendment, believing that it annulled the restrictions of state laws upon the right of women to vote. Both the cases reached the Federal Courts and were decided against the women. In each case, however, the counsel for the women claimed that state laws were nullified by the Amendment, and asked that women should vote in state elections as well as in Federal, on the same terms as men. It is noticeable that neither case brought before the Courts the separate question of the power of Congress, by appropriate legislation, to set aside the limitation of sex in the right of voting for Representatives in Congress which is imposed by state constitutions for voting for the most numerous branch of their legislatures. Therefore these adverse decisions do not affect the claim we are now advocating. I think it advisable to point this out because there is an impression among some that the Federal Courts have already decided the contention against us.

The suffragists have made continuous efforts for the Susan B. Anthony

Constitutional Amendment. Also, for many years they have made persistent efforts for a Federal Suffrage law. AS early as 1889 Gen. E. F. Mendenhall introduced in the U. S. Senate a Federal Suffrage Bill with practically the same features as the one now under discussion. For years the N. A. W. S. A. had a Federal Suffrage Committee for the purpose of working for the law, basing its claims upon the XIV Amendment. After awhile this Committee was discontinued; but the importance of the work was so deeply felt by some suffragists that another Association now called the Federal Suffrage Association, was formed in 1902 to take charge of this measure.

This Association shifted the claim from the XIV Amendment to the first Article of the Constitution. This Assn. has among its leading members such honored names as the Rev. Olympia Brown, ~~the late~~ Mrs. Belva Lockwood, the former editor of the Woman's Tribune, Mrs. Clara B. Colby, with others whose talents and devoted service to the suffrage cause are gratefully known to all of us. This Assn. has kept before Congress the Federal Suffrage Law, being successful in having it introduced several times, though not yet brought to a vote. But both the Amendment and the Federal Suffrage Law have suffered in the same way from the lack of political power in women and now that in twelve states women have a voice in electing 91 members of the Electoral College both of these lines of action have taken on a new aspect. At its last annual convention, held in Nashville, the N. A. W. S. A. again took up the support of the Federal Suffrage Law by a resolution; and also by a motion overwhelmingly carried instructed its Congressional Committee to "investigate and promote the right of women to vote for U. S. Representatives and Senators and Electors for President and Vice-president by Congressional action". The resolution and the motion both carried in them the claim to vote for Presidential Electors on account of the forceful argument founded upon the XIV Amendment and supported by the Association in former years, whereby, if adopted by Congress, Congress could give women the right to vote for these Federal Electors also. But I think

The Good Old Days.

[May 8, 1916]

I propose a toast to the Good Old Days <sup>of the time</sup> just ~~at the point~~ when the abounding life of the nineteenth century began to cry that women were excluded from many rights which make life ~~richer and happier~~ <sup>more useful and better worth living</sup>. Immediately cautious persons were alarmed lest in a contest privileges should be lost for which rights would be no compensation. Feminine lips set in a truly womanly and pleasing expression by pronouncing "prunes and prisms" murmured "We prefer privileges". Men, <sup>also</sup> ~~indeed~~, showed ~~more~~ spirit, and demanded with indignation if women would have the temerity to enter spheres properly limited to men. One of the rights, college education for women, was attacked on both sides. Women felt that it was opprobrious to call them strong-minded and men deprecated meeting in the companions of their firesides the sharp competition of mentality which they had to endure in the world of business. When they came home from their day's work they did not wish ~~to~~ immediately to be drawn into conversation by college-bred wives on the latest discoveries in science, or asked to amuse themselves by solving problems in higher mathematics. Was it not well known that when men desired that kind of mental exercise they ~~found~~ <sup>found</sup> it in men's clubs; but when they were in female society they desired repose for their intellects. Just recently we have seen <sup>the</sup> legislature in Virginia <sup>how</sup> men still prize this privilege of associating with restful feminine minds by the exhibition of exultation when a bill intended to establish college facilities for the daughters of the State was voted down. Shouts of victory and wild applause gave evidence of how much those Virginia solons still cling to that privilege of the good old days now passing away. Horace Greeley's pithy advice "Go West, young man, go West" <sup>was followed and accepted by many who desired</sup> ~~indicated that western air was more congenial to~~ <sup>air for</sup> active intelligence. I suppose because Kentucky is west of Virginia ~~the~~ State university was made co-educational long ago by the efforts of distinguished men; and in the west of Kentucky a business college welcomed this new spirit of education for women, and graduated young

May 8, 1916

women in its most approved business course. One of the <sup>typical</sup> instances of its success was the fact that a young woman, having taken the course, was immediately employed by a firm which had previously employed a young man; and it was triumphantly declared that she did the work just as well as he for a <sup>yearly</sup> salary of six hundred dollars whereas the young man had received eighteen hundred dollars. This evoked the comment that she paid exactly twelve hundred dollars a year, for the privilege of being a woman. Nobody denied that it was worth the price, - to ~~the~~ woman. ~~Maybe~~ the young man who lost his job went out West; <sup>where</sup> and his wits ~~being~~ sharpened by that invigorating air he began to reflect that young women trained in business colleges might increase in numbers faster than \$1800 dollar jobs; and if women's privileges involved their working for one <sup>of a man's</sup> third salary, who knew if he could maintain what he had always

thought his right to a fair wage for fair work? Now women do not mind <sup>admitting</sup> saying to men who do <sup>are not</sup> insist upon resting their brains when they talk to women that after all women are not sticklers for this special privilege of working for cut-rate wages; but that they are merely yielding to that principle of political economy which will not bend for woman or man, <sup>persons of</sup> that any class which is on a lower plane of rights than another

are thereby compelled to work for less wages and to become undesirable competitors of more favored classes. <sup>No doubt they compared notes on many similar instances of the reflex action of privileges upon rights; and on that</sup> ~~And then~~ in that new West they ~~carried to~~ the West "We will <sup>conclude</sup> ~~take~~ away the barriers to rights, and let privileges care for themselves".

<sup>Near the end</sup> ~~So~~ here's to the Good Old Days! May all that was beautiful in womanhood <sup>that they cherished</sup> live on and grow more beautiful, secure in the calm <sup>shelter</sup> majesty of rights, ~~that~~ and ~~unassailable~~ <sup>precarious favors</sup> ~~whether~~ ~~unmindful~~ of the ~~variable~~ <sup>delusive</sup> of privilege.   
 ~~not needful~~

May 31, 1916

# Synopsis of Miss Clay's Remarks.

## The United States' Elections

Bill provides that women shall be given the right to vote in the Federal elections for members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senators as well as United States citizens, by Congressional action.

When in 1789 the Constitution of the United States superseded the Articles of Confederation the government ceased to be merely a league among several States, and formed a "more perfect Union" proceeding from and established by the People of the U. S.

Unlike the Confederation, which was formed by and ~~which~~ acted only on sovereign States, the powers of the new Constitution emanate from the people, and are to be exercised directly

[Aug. 31, 1916]

2

on them and for their bene-  
<sup>the rights of the People are distinct from</sup>  
 fit. Thus, in addition to the  
 the States, appeared in a new and  
 State governments, another govern-  
<sup>pre-eminent form.</sup>  
 ment of enumerated powers was  
 established, so that now <sup>we have</sup>  
 in our political system, a gov-  
 ernment of the U. States and a  
 government of the several States.  
 Each one of these is distinct  
 from the others, and has citi-  
 zens of its own, who owe it  
 allegiance, and whose rights  
 within its jurisdiction it must  
 protect." (Cruikshank Decision) U. S.  
<sup>Supreme Court.</sup>  
 Each of these governments to have  
 offices created by <sup>their constitutions</sup> themselves, and  
 filled in the manner prescribed  
 by their Constitution or laws.  
 The offices of President and Vice-  
 president of the U. S. and Sena-  
 tors and Representatives in  
 Congress are all offices of  
 the U. S.; created by its

E Aug 31, 1916

3

Constitution, which also directs how they are to be filled. C

Each State must appoint in such manner as the Legislature there of may direct, the electors to elect the President and Vice-president.

In 1913, the Legislature of Illinois <sup>expressed this right</sup> departed <sup>and by giving women Presidential suffrage</sup> from the uniform practice of all the other States <sup>which</sup> prescribing that the <sup>fundamental</sup> electors shall be voted for <sup>only</sup> by citizens who voted for the State officers, <sup>they</sup> and granted <sup>the privilege</sup> to women, <sup>who</sup> they have not State constitutional right to vote <sup>for State officers</sup>.

Originally, Senators were to be chosen by the Legislatures of the States; but by the 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which went into effect in 1913, Senators are now to be chosen by the people, with qualifications

[Aug 31, 1916]

prescribed by the several States  
for the electors of the popular  
branch of this Legislature.

But from the ~~establishment~~ <sup>adoption</sup>  
of the Constitution the mem-  
bers of the House of Repre-  
sentatives were to be chosen  
by the People of the sever-  
al States, without any in-  
tervention of ~~any~~ their Legis-  
latures. ~~No distinction of persons~~ <sup>but comprises</sup> ~~the~~ People ~~and com-~~  
~~posed~~ ~~was~~ ~~obvious~~ by persons  
persons unfitted by age, resi-  
dence, etc, ~~from~~ <sup>for voting</sup> the Cou-  
stitution ~~and~~ <sup>instead of itself</sup> ~~indirectly~~ give  
the rights of prescribing qual-  
ifications <sup>it adapts for its own electors.</sup> ~~by~~ ~~providing~~ the  
the electors ~~shall~~ ~~possess~~  
the qualifications prescribed  
by the several States for the  
electors of ~~the~~ ~~more~~ ~~most~~  
numerous branch of the



Aug 31, 1916

5.

Legislature.

When the U. S. Constitution was adopted the States had courts - the question may be asked, then why do not women vote for these officers? Undoubtedly the precedent is against their election, but possibly Georgia) all the States have good grounds for disputing the right of voting from male citizens only.

Congress left the machinery of providing for taking the votes in Federal elections to the States, though undeniably it has the right to prescribe the regulations for Federal elections. Now, because the idea of woman suffrage was unfamiliar to the people, or because the control of the elections were left by Congress entirely under the direction of the States, or for whatever reason it may be, it is certainly

Aug 31, 1963

true that the <sup>6.</sup> distinction of the  
 right of the people to vote for  
 members of the House of Repre-  
 sentatives, and the right of  
 the States to prescribe qualifi-  
 cations have been confounded;  
 and it has been assumed as  
~~one and the same~~ <sup>custom has assumed that</sup> the right and  
 the qualifications <sup>for voting</sup> have been  
 assumed to be <sup>an</sup> one and the  
 same thing; and where States  
 have not given women suf-  
 frage in State elections, it has  
 been assumed that they have  
 had the Constitutional right  
 to exclude them from the  
 U. S. Election for the mem-  
 bers of the House of Represen-  
 tatives, because the State had  
 the right to limit voting in  
 the States to male citizens.

Aug 31, 1961

The question, therefore, for suffragists  
 to consider is: Does the language  
 in which the Constitution vests  
 this right of voting warrant the  
 custom of the States ~~of~~ <sup>in</sup> regarding  
 sex as one of the qualifications  
 they may ~~prescribe~~ <sup>require</sup> for votes at  
 this <sup>General</sup> election? <sup>if it is prescribed for</sup>  
~~State elections?~~  
 The advocates of this Bill hold  
 that it does not. It is perfectly  
 clear that no ~~nation can~~  
~~continue to exist without~~  
 community ~~can~~ <sup>in which</sup>  
 there ~~is~~ only one sex can prosper  
 by be called "~~the People~~" <sup>a nation</sup> in  
 the connection in which it is  
 used in the Constitution. Na-  
 tional existence is dependent  
 upon the functions of both  
 sexes; as is clearly implied  
 in the language of the  
 Preamble, in the words, "We,

Aug 31, 1967

the People of the United States,  
 in order ~~to~~ to secure the blessings  
 of liberty to ourselves and our  
 posterity <sup>thereby by necessary inference</sup>  
<sup>defining the People as consisting of two sexes,</sup>  
~~Now, the philosophical lang-~~  
 uage of the Constitution does  
 not permit the assumption  
 that men may call the  
 children of women their  
 posterity. As they are the  
 posterity of <sup>a people</sup> two sexes, the  
 rights vested in that People  
 are vested in <sup>two</sup> sexes. Women  
 are a constituent of the People  
 in ~~which the power is vested,~~  
 which cannot be eliminated  
 by the power of the States for  
 prescribing qualifications, for  
 with women eliminated the  
 society remaining would not  
 be a "People" within the  
 meaning of the Constitution.

[ Sept., 1916 ]  
[ 1916 ]

While I am convinced that there is a field for appropriate National legislation in obtaining suffrage for women I am one of the many who do not believe that the pursuit of <sup>the so called S. B. Anthony</sup> ~~a Federal Constitution Amendment~~ <sup>to the</sup> ~~is a profitable expenditure of the energies of the National Suffrage Association.~~ <sup>is desirable.</sup> It is perfectly clear that <sup>the</sup> ~~such an~~ amendment is by no means necessary to the success of our cause. <sup>It is usually advocated chiefly as a means of lessening the labor of the suffragists;</sup> ~~and shortening~~ <sup>saving time and labor;</sup> in a word, as a "short cut" to woman suffrage. It is my purpose to show <sup>that the</sup> ~~by a brief review of the making and amending of the Constitution~~ <sup>on the</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>al history</sup> ~~the Anthony Amendment is a~~ <sup>that to obtain it</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>is difficult and prece-</sup> ~~rious~~ <sup>ious</sup> ~~As we know, the present United States Constitution was submitted~~ <sup>in 1789</sup> ~~to the people in 1787 to supersede~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~Articles of Confederation under which the country had been governed since 1778. The Articles of Confederation were un-~~ <sup>distinctly</sup> ~~distinctly~~ <sup>distinctly</sup> a league among independent and sovereign States, ~~in which each joined in its sovereign ca-~~ <sup>having proved</sup> ~~But this league of sovereign states was found not to be unequal~~ <sup>to the</sup> ~~to the requirements of the new nation; and so in 1787 Congress called~~ <sup>its statesmen</sup> ~~a convention to formulate a new constitution. By the~~ <sup>genius of</sup> ~~genius of~~ <sup>over</sup> ~~delegates, especially of Alexander Hamilton, the Convention finally formulated a Constitution deriving its power~~ <sup>from</sup> ~~and acting~~ <sup>directly upon</sup> ~~the People of the United States, instead of~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the several States in their sovereign capacity. But notwithstanding the~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~Revolutionary war had proved that a league among sovereign states had~~ <sup>failed to meet the requirements of national life, the attachment of</sup> ~~the people to State sovereignty was so strong that it appeared probable~~ <sup>that the Convention would find it impossible to come to an agreement</sup> ~~between the advocates of a centralized government and those of State~~ <sup>of the people</sup> ~~sovereignty if Dr. Johnson, a delegate~~ <sup>Dr. Johnson,</sup> ~~had not suggested a means of~~

[1916]

compromising the opposing claims by having the sovereignty and equality of the States ~~represented~~ <sup>represented</sup> by the provision that each State should ~~send an equal number of members~~ <sup>by an equal</sup> ~~in the Senate of the National Congress.~~ <sup>people</sup> ~~But even with this and other concessions to the rights of the States~~ <sup>while the population should be varying population of the States should be represented by varying numbers in the lower House.</sup> ~~it was difficult to persuade the Convention to make the sacrifices of their rights of the States which Hamilton and others of like views felt to be necessary for a more perfect union of the people.~~ <sup>trend towards surrendering</sup> ~~The state of New York so resented the disposition of the Convention to surrender these rights of the States, that all her delegates except Hamilton withdrew from the Convention.~~ <sup>them</sup> ~~Even after the factions had come to a reluctant agreement the refusal of the people that ~~to ratify the~~ <sup>it the</sup> ~~constitution which had surrendered so much of the sovereignty of the States seemed imminent, and was averted only by the strenuous efforts of such statesmen as John Jay, James Madison, and especially, Alex. Hamilton. It was ~~by the promise that ten amendments, usually called the Bill of Rights~~ <sup>rights amendments</sup> ~~which should immediately be submitted, that the necessary nine states were induced to ratify it. The ten amendments are usually called the Bill of Rights Amendments, and they limit the new powers of Congress and affirm those of the States. Virginia finally ratified with the declaration that she was at liberty to withdraw from the Union whenever its powers were used for oppression; and New York ratified after Hamilton had declared that no state could ever be coerced by an armed force.~~ <sup>may</sup> ~~The country from this period was divided into two parties, the Federalists, who were in favor of a strong centralized government, and the anti-federalists, who held to the sovereignty and rights of the States. AS we all know, this division has persisted ever since in parties of various names.~~ <sup>though</sup> ~~The 11th Amendment was passed to ~~secure~~ <sup>affirm</sup> a state right which had been ~~imposed~~ <sup>have had</sup> ~~overridden~~ <sup>of state sovereignty</sup> ~~by a Supreme Court decision; and the 12th~~ ~~merely altered the method of electing the President and Vice President.~~~~~~~~

Until after the *War* of the States no more amendments were passed. Then came the three called the War Amendments. The 13th Amendment forever forbidding slavery was submitted in 1865. It was rejected unconditionally by only two States of the 36 which then formed the Union. The secession States, *which had* ~~having~~ taken steps for readmission on the principles of the Amnesty Proclamation of President Lincoln, *by* ~~the~~ new legislatures rescinded the acts of secession and ratified the 13th Amendment. The legal right of secession for which they had fought had passed into history as The Lost Cause; The slaves had been emancipated as a war measure; and the Amendment was accepted as *a* logical outcome of the war and the conclusion of a controversy which had raged *from* the establishment of the government.

The history of the other two war amendments, which are those involving the doctrine of States Rights, are known. Congress proposed the 14th Amendment. Only 23 States out of the 37 would ratify it. Then Congress passed the ~~Reconstruction Acts~~ Reconstruction Acts. The States governments of ten of the secession States were not recognized; they were put under military government and re-admission to the Union refused until the 14th Amendment *should be* ~~was~~ ratified. Under this coercion those ten States ratified the amendment and carried it; though four non-secession States never ratified it.

By *that* provision of the *14th* ~~amendment~~ *by which* ~~the~~ States were to lose representation in Congress in proportion to the number of male citizens who might be excluded *from* suffrage for the first time there was incorporated in the Constitution a provision *for* protecting male citizens which did not extend to female citizens; and the women of the United States by one and the same act were discriminated against by the supreme law of the land and given nearly a million more of new political masters in the persons of the emancipated negro men.

The 15th Amendment was carried by the same tactics; though the number

1916

of non-seceding states which did not ratify increased to eight.

The ~~so-called~~ Anthony Amendment is a repetition of the 15th, with the substitution of the word "sex" for "race, color or previous condition of servitude". Before it can become law it must be ratified by 36 State legislatures. It is hardly to be supposed that the ten coerced States now will subscribe voluntarily to a principle which they ~~thaxra~~ rejected <sup>formerly;</sup> and if even three of <sup>of these</sup> the eight which refused to ratify the 15th Amendment remain of the same mind, <sup>others</sup> it cannot be carried. Nothing but coercion made the 15th Amendment possible; and what reason have we to suppose that any thing less than coercion will pass the Anthony Amendment? In fact, I believe it is usually admitted by those most zealous to push that amendment at all costs that coercion will be necessary; and as military coercion is no longer among the possibilities they propose a political coercion by the votes of the women who have been enfranchised by the peaceable ~~method~~ <sup>method</sup> conformed <sup>ed</sup> to the well-defined limitations between State and Federal powers, ~~recognized by our govern~~

~~ment~~ Yet why should such revolutionary action be expected of enfranchised American women? The results of those two <sup>amendments</sup> are far from conclusive proof of their wisdom; <sup>Moreover</sup> the principle of limitation of centralized power is growing stronger all over the world in every govern-  
ment, which <sup>in</sup> ~~possesses~~ <sup>includes</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>is a feature,</sup> ~~method~~ of ~~Federat~~ <sup>in</sup> in any form. X The Reconstruction Period in our history can never be forgotten as an illustration of what may happen when one section of our country is ruled by an unsympathetic majority in other sections. X Whether it be called State sovereignty

as in our country, or Home Rule, as in the British Empire, or by whatever <sup>maybe</sup> ~~name~~ <sup>it means that is for securing</sup> ~~it is known,~~ ~~same~~ ~~idea~~ ~~safe~~ ~~and happy government.~~ <sup>other</sup> Even now while Europe is convulsed with war, the interest of at least the English speaking peoples is attracted to the advocates of ~~Home Rule~~ <sup>the heroic</sup> in Ireland, who ~~use~~ <sup>through calling it</sup> another name than that we use <sup>who</sup> are showing themselves willing martyrs for ~~the~~ <sup>principle</sup> ~~great~~ ~~cause~~ of non-centralized self-government. <sup>under its name of Home Rule</sup>

*we are attracting the interest and sympathy of each people*



The two Amendments recently adopted, the 16th and the 17th, are not in the same category as the the preceding two, as they bear only on matters of method which the States could not ~~admit~~ <sup>separately</sup> ~~for themselves.~~ <sup>separately</sup> Since the establishment of our <sup>Constitution</sup> ~~Government~~ only these 17 amendments have been passed, though it has been computed that more than 1700 have been introduced into Congress.

In view of these enormous difficulties ~~in the way~~ <sup>of an unnecessary one</sup> ~~with no necessity~~ <sup>had,</sup> ~~to which will be added the likelihood~~ <sup>for another amendment,</sup> and with ~~the~~ <sup>certainty</sup> that our association cannot ~~continue~~ <sup>of the Anthony Amendment</sup> its advocacy without involving itself in partisan politics I believe it is wise for our Asso. to work only for such Federal legislation as does not require from the States any portion of those ~~reserved~~ <sup>granted</sup> rights accorded to them by the Constitution, and which <sup>love of</sup> our whole history proves are strongly entrenched in the convictions of our people in all sections of the country, ~~and which are~~ <sup>cherished by our</sup> people ~~of all sections of the country.~~ <sup>without regard to</sup>

Even <sup>now</sup> while the war in Europe ~~is overshadowing~~ <sup>the world,</sup> so many lesser events, the heroic struggle for non-~~ces~~ <sup>in Ireland</sup> for non-centralized self-government, under its name of Home Rule, <sup>does not fail to</sup> ~~attract~~ <sup>attract</sup> the sympathy and interest of freedom-loving nations, so vital is the principle of non-self centralized self-government to free institutions, though so many events are overshadowed by the great war, cannot ~~not~~ <sup>cannot</sup> divert

*L. Clay in support of  
Federal suffrage - shortly after  
adoption of 17th Amendment -*

Abridged from *The Arena*, Dec. 1891,  
Francis Minor.

Citizenship and Suffrage; The Yarbrough Decision.

Nothing demonstrates more clearly the importance and necessity of the ballot for women than the apathy and indifference with which the movement in its favor is regarded by men in general.

The object and purpose of that movement is to secure for one half of the people or citizens a political right, which is at present monopolized and enjoyed solely by the other half.

A favorite method of objection with men of weak minds is that of saying women do not want to vote; if they did, they could have the ballot in twenty-four hours. Such statements are contemptible. They are untrue, to begin with, and they treat a grave political question in a frivolous manner.

It has been publicly stated by a senator of the United States upon the floor of the Senate that more petitions in favor of woman suffrage had been presented to Congress than upon all other subjects combined. But the matter does not rest upon the basis of the number of petitioners. Federal suffrage is a right or privilege of Federal citizenship, and as such should be enjoyed by all citizens who desire to exercise it.

It is the duty of the national government to protect this right, although not a single petition had been presented for that purpose. It would be an alarming state of things if fundamental rights depended upon the whims or fancies of individuals, and they do not thus depend.

For more than twenty years Congress has been petitioned to submit an amendment of the Constitution forbidding the denial of the right of citizens of the United States to vote, on account of sex. Judging the future by the past, it is doubtful if such an amendment will ever be proposed.

But the Supreme Court having decided that the right to vote for members of Congress is based upon the Constitution of the United States, it becomes a matter of vital importance to ascertain whether or not the provision of the Constitution to which the court refers is broad enough to include women as well as men. If it should be found to be so, then the work will be greatly lessened and simplified. It would then only be necessary to petition Congress to pass an act giving effect to the constitutional provision. This would be necessary, because the Constitution is not self-enforcing, but congressional legislation is required to make the right practically available.

To promote a clearer understanding of the matter, the reader should keep constantly in mind the difference between the Federal and State suffrage.

The duality of suffrage is often lost sight of, even by persons otherwise well informed; and this is due, in part, to the union of the two rights in the same individual and in part to the fact that at the polls the entire election is conducted by State officials and under State auspices, the Federal supervision of the election which is sometimes had serving the purpose merely of a report for the information of the House, or for the United States Circuit Court. Under these circumstances the vast majority of voters easily conclude that their right to vote for every office is derived from the State, when in truth the States have no jurisdiction whatever over the Federal right of suffrage. Their authority is confined to the control of Federal elections, and even this is subject to the superior power of Congress.

Section 4 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution provides;

"The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to places of choosing Senators".

To the general voter it is a matter of indifference whether the vote which he casts for a member of Congress is given under one authority or the other, so long as he is permitted to exercise the right. To the disfranchised citizen, however, the matter appears in a totally different light.

Again, under the Federal as well as under the State constitutions, there is a difference between the right to vote and the qualifications for voting, although they are often confounded; and this confusion more than any other one thing is the cause of women being denied the right of Federal suffrage. It should also be borne in mind that the term "people" as used in the original Constitution, is identical with that of citizen, now more commonly employed. To many this may seem to be a piece of superfluous information; nevertheless, the Supreme Court of the United States laid great stress upon it, and called particular attention to it, in the case of *Scott v. Sandford*, 19 Howard. Under the Federal Constitution again there is no such thing as half-way citizenship. A person is either a citizen of the United States, or he is not, and Federal suffrage is conferred only upon the "people" or citizens, who are possessed of full citizenship, and consequently are members of the national body politic. In a closely contested congressional election this might become an important question. Yet these foreigners, who are not citizens, and may never become such, many of whom cannot read a line of English, are permitted to vote for our national law makers, while intelligent native-born citizens are denied that right. It is a shame that the men of this country permit such a thing!

But the cardinal difference, the difference of differences between the Constitution of the United States and those of the several states, in regard to the right of suffrage, lies in the fact that under the former the element of sex is wholly eliminated! The language of the Constitution which established the right of suffrage is as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature" (Art. I. Sec. 2.)

The right to vote for members of the House of Representatives is thus vested in "the people of the several States" without ~~limitation~~ condition, limitation, or restriction of any kind, and especially without reference to sex. As men and women unitedly constitute the people, unitedly they are entitled to the franchise. The right is bestowed upon both classes, and neither is authorized to deprive the other of its exercise. Let it be repeated that under and by virtue of this section alone, men have voted for members of Congress since the foundation of the government; not because they are males; not because of their sex; as is the case with State suffrage, but because they form a part of the people of the several States, in whom this Federal right is vested! And for precisely the same reason the other half of the people are also entitled to exercise this Federal right.

If it be asked, why, then, have men, during all these years deprived women of so plain a right, I reply, that it is not incumbent upon me to state why a wrong has been committed, but only to point out how it may be remedied. It may be stated, however, that this century of wrong-doing is the result of an erroneous construction of the second clause of the section, relating to the qualifications of the electors. The Constitution established the right of suffrage, but did not prescribe the qualifications of the voters. In place of doing this, it adopted the qualifications of the several States for their voters, and required the Federal ~~electors~~ electors to conform to them.

To ascertain these, the Federal electors in each State must examine the law of the State, and comply with its requirements on the subject of qualifications. None of the States, so far as I am aware, make sex

a qualification for voting. It is made an element or condition of the right to vote, and in this way the right to vote in the States has been confined to males, the qualifications of the voters being an entirely different thing. But even if some States were to rank sex in the list of qualifications, it would apply only to their own voters. The Supreme Court has well observed in the Yarbrough case, that the Constitution is not only a part of the law of every State, but is the paramount law. The right of Federal suffrage was established in order that it might be exercised, and cannot be defeated by a State law disguised as a qualification.

When the Federal Constitution was framed, and for many years thereafter, the qualifications required of State electors were three in number, to wit: age, residence and property. This last qualification has long since been dispensed with, leaving only age and residence. As a matter of course, women could comply with these as readily as men. But the trouble began, and is continued, by confounding right with qualification, and it is to this latter only that the Constitution refers. In addition to this, no special attention was given to the subject by men. Their right to vote being undisputed, they did not grieve over the wrongs of the other class and thus the matter has drifted along.

It will now be proper to consider the two decisions of the Supreme Court which bear directly upon the subject of Federal suffrage.

The first is the case of *Minor v. Happersett*, 21 Wallace, in which the court held that the right of Federal suffrage, claimed by the plaintiff, did not exist. The decision was not adverse to the plaintiff on account of her sex, as commonly supposed, but because the court at that time was of the opinion that the right of suffrage belonged entirely to the States; the court holding that the United States has no voters of its own creation, and that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone.

Entertaining these views the decision was necessarily adverse to the plaintiff. In reference to the matter of sex, the court said, that "sex has never been made an element of citizenship in the United States. In this respect men have never had an advantage over women. The same laws precisely apply to both". It further said, "if the right of suffrage is one of the necessary privileges of a citizen of the United States, then the constitution and laws of Missouri, confining it to men, are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, as amended, and consequently void".

This decision was rendered in 1875. Nine years later, in the Yarbrough case, 110 U.S., the court had changed its views, and declared that the right of Federal suffrage does exist, and is based upon the Constitution of the United States. The importance of this last decision, therefore, cannot be overestimated. Although the question of woman's right to the ballot was not in terms before the Court, it is necessarily involved in any adjudication of the question of Federal suffrage.

It is made so by the Constitution, which permits no distinction to be made between citizens of the United States as regards this right. The right of suffrage, as declared by the Court to exist, is vested in the "people of the several States".

The people consist of men and women. The right is, therefore, vested in men and women.

An extract from the Yarbrough decision is here given:-  
After a statement of the facts the Court said: "But it is not correct to say that the right to vote for a member of Congress does not depend on the Constitution of the United States. The office, if it be properly called an office, is created by the Constitution, and by that alone. It also declares how it shall be filled, namely, by election. Its language is: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every

second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature". Article I, Sec.2.

"The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislature, do not do this with reference to the election for members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for those, eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for members of Congress in that State". ( Note by Laura Clay; The court fails to notice that the Constitution does not say the "same persons", but that the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors in the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures. This peculiarity of language suggests that the framers of the Constitution had in mind that some persons might be Federal electors who were not State electors).

"It adopts the qualifications ~~must~~ thus furnished as the qualifications of its own electors for members of Congress. It is not true, therefore, that the electors for members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State law, in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State".

We are next to consider the practical use to be made of this decision, and a further quotation from the decision itself will show what ought to be done. The court said: "The principle, however, that the protection of the exercise of the right is within the power of Congress is as necessary to the right of other citizens to vote in general, as to the right to be protected against discrimination. The exercise of the right in both instances is guaranteed by the Constitution, and should be kept free and pure by Congressional enactments whenever necessary".

Acting upon the suggestion of the court, the form of an act for this purpose is submitted.....( I did not copy this form, as since the adoption of the 17th Amendment, Senators as well as Representatives should be included in the Act.)

The authority of Congress to pass such an act is not only upheld by the Supreme Court, but its passage is enjoined upon that body.

In the Virginia convention of 1788, which was convened to consider and ratify the Federal Constitution, Mr. Madison, one of the framers, was asked to explain the meaning of the fourth section, particularly as to why Congress had an ultimate control over the time, place, and manner of holding elections of Representatives, to which he replied that the power was reserved because "should the people of any State by any means be deprived of the right of suffrage, it was judged proper that it should be remedied by the general government" Elliott's Debates 3, 366.

No time could be more auspicious than the present, in view of the fact that more than thirty millions of the people are deprived of the right of Federal suffrage. One would suppose that a fact of this character would arouse general attention, and the wrong be corrected, but as we all know, such is not the case. The principle of the equality of all citizens under the law has never been reduced to actual practice. The right of suffrage represents, or is intended to represent, that equality. The woman suffrage movement is designed to bring about that result. Its motto is, One law for all citizens alike. Can anything be fairer or more just than this? There is no compulsion in the matter. Those who do not wish to vote need not do so, but the law should make it possible for all to vote. In consequence of the difficulties encountered, many suffragists are disposed to compromise the matter, and accept partial suffrage. I think this is a great mistake. It is a surrender of principle. It is an admission that the right may be given, or withheld, which is not true of Federal suffrage. That is a right established in the Federal Constitution for all the people, or

citizens, and should never be compromised or surrendered. It was in reference to the fact that Federal citizenship carries with it Federal suffrage that the Supreme Court, in what is known as the Slaughter House Cases, 16 Wallace, crystalized the whole matter in these memorable words:- "The negro, having by the fourteenth amendment been declared to be a citizen of the United States, is thus made a voter in every state of the Union."

An entire volume is compressed in these words.

Women are citizens of the United States, and are "thus made voters in every State of the Union", needing only Congressional recognition of the fact. A sixteenth amendment would add nothing to their right, except that it would include state suffrage. But why postpone the exercise of the Federal right on this account? Let women be recognized by Congress as Federal voters, and the States would, of their own accord, blot out the word "male" from their constitutions.

Francis Minor, in the Arena, December 1891/

Mr. Minor was the husband of Mrs. Virginia Minor, the plaintiff in the case of Minor v. Happersett, and was himself a practicing lawyer of ability.

In Febr. of 1916 Sen. Robert Owen, of Oklahoma, brought in a bill at the request of the Southern States Woman Suffrage Conference, to confer upon women the right to vote for United States Representatives and Senators. He expressed his opinion that such a bill is constitutional.

I. *(Beginning Over)*

Woman and Patriotism.

Is patriotism a desirable attribute of American women? Is it one in which the country has ~~a stake~~ *ought to cherish* worthy of care? I do not mean that love of the soil of our birth, that love of the surroundings to which we are accustomed, which ~~we~~ *is instinctive with all of us.* shares with the lower animals. Nor do I mean even that nobler feeling, peculiarly characteristic of women, which impels them to throw their hearts impersonally into those causes ~~which they~~ ~~love~~ loved by those near and dear to them.

<sup>all</sup>  
If these two sentiments were there is in patriotism it would not be worth while to inquire whether or not America needs the patriotism of its women, seeing that no course could ever ~~stare~~ *stare* out these sentiments in their hearts. But there is another group of feelings, not so self-centred as these, better deserving the name of patriotism. There is an understanding of the principles which underlie various forms of government, a discernment of the genius of a people and a comprehension of the ~~special~~ adaptation of some special form of government to the development and happiness of that people. When ~~all~~ *government combined requisites* these ~~are added~~ *are* to the admiration of the mind which contemplates them, and when the ~~whole~~ *heart* is warmed to a passion by the ~~feeling~~ *knowledge that* of the individual ~~is~~ *is* sharing to the full in all, ~~in~~ the beneficent ~~ness~~ *ness* flowing from the government, then real patriotism may be said to be alive in that heart, It is no longer an in-

Friends,

171  
I am going to see a great  
picture portraying the patriotism of American  
women. It will appeal to your hearts; it  
will appeal to your ~~souls~~; for it will  
be a visible exhibition of one of the noblest  
sentiments of human nature. We are  
living in heroic times, and great events are  
pressing upon us in quick succession, espe-  
cially in this great state of New York. Our  
nation is called to arms to make the world  
safe for democracy; and on Nov. 5th  
the voters of New York will be called  
upon to declare by their votes on the  
Woman Suffrage Constitutional amend-  
ment whether they are loyal to the principles  
of that democracy. This is not a cold and  
abstract question. In this theatre you are going  
to see a picture portraying the patriotism of  
American women. It will appeal to your  
hearts, for it will be a visible manifesta-  
tion of one of the noblest sentiments of hu-  
man nature. The decision of the voters of  
New York on the woman suffrage amendment  
will also be their answer to the  
questions:

(Over)



instinctive feeling following blindly where impulse or variable circumstance may lead; it is ~~instinctive~~ and intelligent <sup>sentiment</sup> ~~force~~ which understands what

it loves, strong to cherish what is already good, keen to apprehend dangers which may threaten and <sup>willing to make sacrifices</sup> devoted to its security and its expanding per-

fection. Does the American people need such a patriotism in its women,

or ~~will~~ it suffice that men alone shall feel it? If this country were

like those of Europe, surrounded by rival nations likely to become ag-

gressive foes, and where in the struggles for self-preservation the

alienation of the <sup>affections</sup> ~~heart~~ of any portion of the people might be fatal, there

would be no room to ask the question. We know those countries value the

patriotism of their women; for we see their forms of government take care

that women's pride of sex is respected. There is no aristocracy of men

alone; women share in its honors and privileges. Observers of the strug-

gle in England for votes for women tell us that for two hundred years

English women have been accustomed to taking an active part in politics,

seeing that birth carries privileges to the women of the ruling class and <sup>as well as to the men</sup>

they are not separated in interest from its men. There are class dis-

tinctions; but they are drawn on other lines than sex; and there is no

class where all the men are assigned to honor and all the women to neglect

Not so in America. Our government divides the people into two classes

only;- those who govern, and those who are subject. All men are in one class all women are in the other. If women receive any honor it comes not from governmental, but from social *sources*.

America fears no outward foe. Our greatest <sup>*George*</sup> statesmen from Washington on, teach us that the foes we need to dread are not foreign ones, but insidious foes within, working corruption and discontent which may eat out ~~the~~ respect and love for our form of government ~~and cause its final overthrow~~. If we obey their warnings and strive to guard against these foes, women must help; for the ideals of a nation are in the keeping of its women. But shall we trust the ideals of a self-governing people into the keeping of a class perpetually disfranchised, which has no <sup>*more responsible*</sup> experience of anything ~~less~~ in citizenship than passive obedience to laws made by others ~~than themselves~~? Lessons in all sentiments are learned at our mothers' knee. Let a woman recall how as a child her little heart swelled with loyal pride as she heard from revered lips that this government offers refuge for the oppressed of all nations; its opportunities are equal for all; and here all may look up to heaven and call no man master. Let her recall the first chill of doubt which touched her young enthusiasm when her questioning mind sought why she was excluded from any share in the government she loved so well; and then ask herself if she can ever

help to instill into coming generations the patriotism she once dreamed of if she ~~does not~~ <sup>does not</sup> hope that her country will yet deal with her honestly, according to its own declared principles. For no answer containing denial has ever been forthcoming ~~which~~ <sup>of her right to share in the government by voting</sup> which is likely to satisfy womanly intelligence and womanly self-respect, stimulated by contact with the world which modern conditions require; where every avenue to thought and endeavor is open to women and only the right of self-government is denied.

Is it desirable that American women shall be patriotic? If the answer is, It is desirable; then let every loyal American, whether man or woman, question himself whether ~~we~~ <sup>not</sup> are on the right path to instill patriotism in women by the present course of ~~leaving~~ <sup>levelling even</sup> them in the land of their birth ~~to~~ the political status of aliens.

(Over)

This war has proved that not only do women bear a full share of the sufferings and burdens of war, but that they bear a full share in the work necessary for carrying on the war itself. Justice demands that those who share in war shall have an equal voice in the government which decides for peace or war. Our country needs the votes of women as well as of men. The over-masculinization of governments in Europe has allowed unchecked attention to the masculine passions of commercialism, imperialism and militarism, and the feminine forces suited by nature to act as checks and balances to them have been excluded from government. In the co-ordination of the two, <sup>the masculine and the feminine</sup> in free and equal shares in government, there resides the best hope for the future peace of the world, ~~through~~ the settlement of international troubles by arbitration and international law, and instead of war, <sup>and to bring about the time when</sup> the sword shall be beaten into plowshares, and the spears into pruning hooks; and the nations shall not learn war any more."

The Mammoth Cave.

May - 1912

Madam Toast Mistress & Ladies,

The Federation of Women's Clubs has had a strenuous and glorious year in which its legislative efforts have resulted in glorious victories in the bills in which the Federation through which the Federation has proved its intelligent and patriotic interest in the welfare of our state. We have helped in the war against tuberculosis, against impure foods, <sup>to obtain</sup> vital statistics, for the protection of the laboring women and children by shortening their hours of labor and <sup>more</sup> efficient factory inspection, and have won in ~~the~~ the premier measure to reduce the illiteracy of the state by putting the school ballot in the hands of the mother sex. Now we turn to the future; and we think with joyful anticipation and a sense of pleasant relaxation to the measure we are pledged to support for the pleasure and instruction of the nation, - that which

looks to making <sup>2</sup> the Mammoth Cave <sup>c19123</sup>  
~~and~~ a National Reservation and Park.  
Though this greatest natural marvel of our state  
and one of the wonders of the world is  
more or less familiar to us all, its historic  
and scientific importance, as well as its scenic  
uniqueness, ~~furnishes~~ furnishes a continual  
fund of interest. It was probably discovered  
about the year 1809, and as early as 1821 had  
become numbered in literature among the  
Hundred Wonders of the World, and it has  
never lost that place among the impres-  
sive curiosities of nature. In the interval  
between its discovery and its world wide  
fame <sup>as a natural curiosity</sup> ~~the Mammoth Cave~~, the mineral  
riches of the Mammoth had played an  
~~important~~ part in the history of the  
nation so important that alone ~~its de-~~  
~~scribed~~ <sup>de-</sup> ~~scribed~~ <sup>scribed</sup> would make it worthy to ~~become~~  
a national monument. During the war  
of 1812, our government being excluded from  
foreign sources of supply of gun powder  
for ammunition, was forced to depend upon  
the resources of our country for its man-  
ufacture, an industry not greatly devel-

oped amongst us at that time. In this crisis, the supplies of salt-peter, obtainable from the nitrous earth of the Cave were of incalculable value to the nation in its time of deadly peril. The salt-peter was filtrated from the nitrous earth in great vats, whose remains are still seen in the Cave, and the crystals were transported hundreds of miles in ox-carts and on pack-mules through the forests and over the mountains to the sea-board, principally to Philadelphia. It is a pleasant piece of state and, we may say, of Federation history, to know that this vast industrial and patriotic enterprise of collecting and transporting the precious salt-peter was largely in the hands of the Graty Brothers of Philadelphia, and it was in pursuance of the management of this business that Benjamin Graty, ~~came the founder of a large and eminent family~~ came to this state, met here his Kentucky wife, became the founder of a large and prominent fam-

c 1912

ly of this section<sup>4</sup>; and that in his  
grand daughter, <sup>Mrs.</sup> Mary Grady Norton, the  
Ky. Fed. of Women's Clubs found its first  
president.

~~It has been said that the Woman's  
Club is a University for Women.~~  
The Woman's Club has been aptly described  
as the University for Women; it is there-  
fore a fitting task for the Federation to  
lend its efforts towards establishing  
a National Reservation which it is not  
a far fetched idea to call a National  
University because of the peculiar  
facilities it affords for the advance-  
ment of many of the natural sci-  
~~ences~~ <sup>scientific</sup> research and advancement in  
natural sciences. It is a vast underground  
world, an unmeasured object lesson  
of the effect tricking waters and atmos-  
pheric vicissitudes. The known length of  
its avenues amount to hundreds of miles;  
and ~~in~~ this <sup>subterranean</sup> area of ~~entire~~ <sup>great</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>of great development</sup> im-  
mense enough species of animal life.



peculiar to itself. Heimer has already <sup>2/19/27</sup> discovered 41 distinct forms of animal life peculiar to the Mammoth, whose existence under these abnormal conditions must prove of great use in ~~demons~~ <sup>elucidating</sup> scientific theories. The Cave also is rich in affording <sup>pre-historic</sup> the archeologist ~~revelations~~ of ancient human life and customs. Such a ~~great~~ storehouse of opportunities for scientific advancement ought to be under the strict care of the National Government, a perpetual possession for the whole people and for the scientific science of the world. While so much can be said for this University under the ground, equally ~~much~~ might be said of what the locality affords <sup>for study</sup> above ground; ~~it is situated as it is in the~~ Perhaps the most interesting possibility is that of establishing a School of Forestry there, because of the facts that it lies in the belt of the hard woods ~~for which~~ of Kentucky, and that thousands of acres in the vicinity are still covered with the native forests. It is a delightful theme for Kentuckians to speak of the pleasure which such

1912  
a park could give yearly to hundreds  
of thousands of tourists, for its salu-  
brious climate, pure water, and near-  
ness to the centre of population to the  
of the U. S. combine to make it attrac-  
tive to immense numbers, and the  
Cave itself is available to visitors  
throughout the year, because its  
temperature is practically the same  
summer and winter. But all the  
charms of scenery, of lawn, of ~~south~~  
of forest, of river and of Cave are too  
much for any one speaker; and yet  
the Federation desires that all shall  
be spoken of. So it has called its  
annual Convention of 1912 to meet  
at the Mammoth Cave from May 27<sup>th</sup>  
through the 31<sup>st</sup>. Let every Club member, there-  
fore, to whom it is possible, whether she be  
a delegate or not, plan to go to the An-  
nual meeting and prepare herself by her  
own observation, to speak with knowledge of the advan-  
tage to the State and Nation of making Kentucky's  
Greatest wonder a National Park.

 Read and hand to some intelligent friend, with request to read and pass it on.

# EQUAL SUFFRAGE

ADDRESS OF

CHIEF JUSTICE WALTER CLARK  
OF THE NORTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

BEFORE THE

## EQUAL SUFFRAGE LEAGUE

GREENSBORO, N. C., 22 FEBRUARY, 1915

*Ladies and Fellow Citizens:*

It will not be long before it shall be sufficient in North Carolina, as well as elsewhere, to say simply, "fellow citizens." It is a pleasure, always, to come to Greensboro. Your people are progressive and open-minded. You are willing to hear both sides of any proposition and then give your voice to the side that seems to be the better cause. You stand for the betterment of conditions, and form your opinions only after hearing what can be said for and against any measure. In short, this town is not fossilized. Its people belong to the Twentieth Century. One of the leaders down at Raleigh in the fight to confer equal and just rights upon women is a distinguished son of your town—Senator Hobgood. He had the courage to stand for the right, and will be heard from, in the years to come, as a leader.

We have heard much of the "submerged tenth." I am here to say a word for justice to the "*disfranchised half*." When our Constitution was formed at Halifax in 1776 and at Philadelphia in 1787 representative government was new. For thousands of years, down to that time, the people had not governed themselves, but they had been governed by whatever power held the sword. Only a partial experiment had been made in a few cities like Athens and Rome, where corruption and military violence had dominated, and for three or four centuries the landed interests in Great Britain had some voice in the Government—checked, however, by corruption and intrigue.

They are poor students of history who think that in 1776 we reached a democratic form of government, as we now understand popular government. Our State Constitution at Halifax allowed the manhood of the State to vote only for the lower house of the Legislature. The Senate was chosen only by voters who owned 50 acres of land or more. The judges were elected by the Legislature for life, and the Governor and the other State officers were also elected by the General Assembly, which body chose the magistrates, who in turn chose the sheriff and other county officers except the clerk of the court, who was appointed by the judges for life. Property was evidently afraid of manhood suffrage, and checked it on all sides so as to make it merely a delusion. It was 60 years before the people were allowed to vote for Governor; nearly 80 years passed before they were allowed to vote for State Senators, and 92 years before they were allowed to vote for judges.

In the Federal Constitution formed at Philadelphia there was the same discrimination. The people were entrusted with the election of only one-sixth of

the Government, *i. e.*, with one-half of the legislative department—the lower house of Congress—while the Senate was made elective at second hand through State legislatures, and it took us 115 years to acquire for the people the right to elect United States Senators. Last year was the first time the people of North Carolina ever had that privilege. The President was made elective at third hand by electors to be chosen by the State legislatures. But after the lapse of 40 or 50 years the people, without any constitutional amendment, forced the choice of electors to be made at the ballot box, with the result that they became mere figureheads, and we thus achieved practically the election of the President by the people—contrary to the evident intention of the Constitution. The third department of the Government—the judges—were made appointive at fourth hand by the President, who was intended to be chosen at third hand by the electors selected by the legislatures and subject to confirmation by a Senate chosen at second hand, and they were given life tenures, to be beyond any consideration of the popular will. This last matter still remains in that archaic state. The United States judges are not yet made elective by the people, and still hold for life, though Mr. Jefferson one hundred years ago contended that they should be made elective and serve for a term of years.

I have thus instanced the growth of manhood suffrage, first to point out to you that this movement for suffrage to the women is the logical outgrowth of this great democratic movement to place the Government in the hands of the people, and, secondly, to point out that while men have been slow in achieving their own emancipation, and that manhood suffrage is still denied as to one-third of the Federal Government—the choice of the judiciary—this movement for the enfranchisement of the women has progressed far more rapidly. Beginning some 40 years ago and practically becoming active only in the last 15 years, it has already become a part of the Constitution in twelve great States of this country and one Territory, and covers 49 per cent of the area of the continental United States. Already one-fourth of the United States Senators, one-sixth of the House of Representatives, and one-fifth of the presidential electors are chosen by States in which women have equal suffrage with the men.

#### MOVEMENT ACQUIRES SPEED.

In the last thirty days the movement has acquired accelerated speed. A constitutional amendment to confer equal suffrage has passed the New York Legislature by a unanimous vote in both houses. One man spoke against it, but there his obstinacy failed and he voted for the measure. The equal suffrage amendment has passed also by overwhelming majorities in the legislatures of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Iowa, South Dakota, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Arkansas. It passed one house in Maine, but lacked one vote of the necessary two-thirds in the other house, and in Texas. It is pending in several other States. All this has happened in the last thirty days. North Carolina's is the only Legislature this year that so far has refused to allow the people to vote upon the question.

Besides the above progress, there are some twenty other States in the Union, in addition to the twelve that have full suffrage, in which the women have municipal suffrage or vote for school officers and on local tax assessments.

The movement, too, is world-wide. The women have equal suffrage with the men in Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and Finland in the north of Europe, and in the Union of Australia and in all its states and in New Zealand. In addition, the women have municipal suffrage in all the provinces of Canada (a country territorially as large as the United States) and in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Indeed, in the British Isles the women vote for everything,

and are eligible for every office, except member of Parliament, and they are sure to get that at the first parliament held after the war closes. This is practically agreed upon.

#### NO MERE FAD.

A movement that is thus world-wide in its scope and which is moving onward with accelerated speed is no mere fad, but has its foundation in the justice of the demand and in the need for the suffrage based on economic causes. It has been proven beneficial in the countries and States which have adopted it.

Though formerly suffrage was based upon property and other considerations, the present Constitution of North Carolina recognizes that all adults, native born or naturalized, are entitled to it except those who are mentally or morally deficient. Let us examine the clause in our Constitution on suffrage. It admits to the ballot all adults who are native born or naturalized, except four classes. What are these classes that are disqualified? They are: (1) Idiots and lunatics—because they are mentally defective. (2) Convicts—because they are moral defectives. (3) Illiterates—unless their grandfathers could vote—because, as a class, negroes are deemed mentally and morally unfit; and (4) Women.

Are the mothers, the wives, sisters, and daughters of the white men of North Carolina disfranchised because they are morally defective or because they are mentally defective? Unless they are, they have as much right to vote as the men, and are as competent to exercise the right of suffrage. They cannot be deemed morally defective, for the records of our courts, our jails, and State prisons show that there are some twenty to thirty times as many men tried and convicted of crime as women. Are they mentally defective? That is the only remaining ground which can be urged. Judging by the evasive and often filigonal objections urged against equal suffrage by speakers who bestow exaggerated compliments while denying the women their rights, this must be the belief of many of the opponents. I have never heard but one man who stated the objection squarely. I was passing through Caswell County in an automobile and stopped at a country store one Saturday afternoon, where there were several men, some of whom knew me, and the subject of equal suffrage was mentioned. A rather dilapidated specimen of a man, who was whittling a dry-goods box, spoke up and said: "Weemen ain't fitten to vote. They ain't got no sence. I knows 'em." I told him he was entitled to the credit of having the courage of his convictions, and if his statement was correct, the women ought not to vote; that he was the only man I had ever heard give a reason for opposing equal suffrage; but that when he said women had no sense he reminded me of a man from the "dark corner of Wake" (as we call it), who came down to Raleigh to see Ringling's circus. It was the first one he had seen, and with round-eyed wonder he looked at the camels, elephants, lions, and tigers. But he did not notice one animal lying down in the corner chewing some hay. Presently the giraffe began to get up and unfold himself until his head touched the tent pole. The countryman staggered back and said: "They ain't no sich animal!" And I told him that when a man said that the women did not have at least as much sense as the men, I would say to him, "They ain't no sich animal!"

#### THE ELEMENTS IN OPPOSITION.

The elements that really oppose woman's suffrage are: (1) The liquor interests, who know that women are in earnest in opposing their business. Votes of the women at the last election carried the only four States that voted for prohibition, and every one knows that in all the other States that have prohibition their indirect influence has been the great motive power for prohibition.

If they had had the ballot they would have voted liquor out of all the States long since. (2) The political machines are opposed to equal suffrage, for where they have the men rounded up they fear to lose their control, for they know that they cannot fool the women as readily. Then there is the vice trust and those who make their profit by handling child labor and by oppressing the women in sweat shops, and all those who are opposed to a cleaning up of the community morally and physically.

I do not mean to say, by any means, that all who are opposed to woman's suffrage belong to one or more of these classes. This would be untrue and unjust. The largest number of those who oppose the suffrage do not belong to these classes; but the classes I name are those peculiarly interested in opposing the admission of women to the suffrage.

#### SOME OF THE OBJECTIONS.

I will mention briefly some of the objections that are made to this movement:

First. It is said that it is a fad and a mere temporary delusion. The sketch that I have given of what equal suffrage has achieved in the last fifteen years throughout the world and the marvelous progress that has been made in the last thirty days is a sufficient answer to this. No movement unless based upon the fundamental economic needs of the age could make such world-wide and irresistible progress. If it were a fad, it would be repealed when experience had demonstrated that it was injurious or needless. But it has not been repealed anywhere, and, on the contrary, wherever it has been tried it has spread to the adjoining States.

Second. It is said that women are too emotional for the ballot. When Mr. Bryan put Wilson in nomination at Baltimore the demonstration lasted for nearly an hour before any one could be heard, and the tramping and marching and shouting resembled that of a lunatic asylum. When Roosevelt was put in nomination at Chicago this record was more than surpassed. I might mention many other instances. I am not condemning the enthusiasm of the men on these occasions. But I wish to say that the women have never equaled such emotional displays as those.

Third. It has been said seriously that if women are allowed to vote they will vote for the handsomest man. I now understand why some politicians are opposed to women voting.

Fourth. It is urged that the vote is not necessary for women, because they vote through their husbands. But do the husbands always vote the views of their wives? If they did, we would have a cleaner government and cleaner towns everywhere. We would have had prohibition long ago—and have had it enforced. We would have seen other evils disappear which are now tolerated, though forbidden by law. Who casts the vote that expresses the views of the drunkard's wife? Then there are in the United States 8,000,000 of adult women who have not chosen to marry. What man casts the ballot expressing the views of those 8,000,000? Then there are several millions of men who have no wives. What woman's views do they vote?

Fifth. Then it is said that ballots are a substitute for muskets, and therefore women have no right to vote. More than one-half of the men who have a right to vote would be rejected by any recruiting office in the world. And, on the other hand, one-half of the men who fight are under 21 and have no right to vote. So those who carry muskets and those who vote are by no means the same element. Besides, if the women do not bear arms, they raise the soldiers who do carry the muskets, and should have a voice in saying whether there should be war or not. If the women vote, they will soon abolish war and its villainies as they are abolishing liquor and child labor and other iniquities.

Sixth. It is said that woman's sphere is her home, and that she cannot leave the children to vote. It will not take on an average more than half an hour once in two years for a woman to cast her ballot, and if she is so overwhelmed by her duties that she cannot get that much leisure, she certainly needs the ballot badly. We might as well say that a man's sphere is his store, his office, his workshop, and following the plow, and that he cannot neglect these things to cast a ballot. That was the argument in old times, and the class with leisure and wealth assumed the control of the Government and opposed manhood suffrage upon the identical ground now urged against woman's suffrage—that the masses had to make a living and were not competent to aid in governing.

Seventh. It is said that women have had no experience in politics. Their brothers when they become 21 have had no experience, but they are at once admitted to the ballot. Girls when they become 21 are in exactly the same state of preparation for taking a part in the government which is to tax them and their property and to pass laws governing their conduct.

Eighth. It is said that there is too much filth and mire in politics, and women should not be exposed to it. If there is filth and mire in politics, the men put it there, for they alone have been running the business. And it is high time we gave the women a chance at housecleaning. This is exactly what has happened in suffrage States. The women have caused the polling places to be removed from the barrooms and placed in decent surroundings, and then they have proceeded to remove the barrooms themselves out of the community.

Ninth. A very popular opposition argument at one time in the South was that to permit the women to vote would be to allow the negro women to vote. As the grandfather clause would apply to negro women equally with negro men, there is no reason to believe that the "chivalry" will be less able to keep the negro cooks from the polls than they have been in keeping the husbands of the negro cooks from voting. They cannot be chivalrous if they can do less for their wives and daughters than they have done for themselves. Besides, there are only some 125,000 adult negro women in North Carolina, and 275,000 adult white women. The votes of the white women, therefore, will be 25,000 more than those of the negro women and of the negro men combined, if the latter should be readmitted to the suffrage by a decision of the United States Supreme Court under the grandfather clause. Indeed, if the latter event should happen, the votes of the white women will be necessary to maintain white supremacy. I do not say that all the white women will vote the Democratic ticket. Equal suffrage has never proceeded along party lines, and the women would scorn the suffrage if they were not free to vote for what measures and parties they saw fit. But I do say that the vote of the white women will be sold as one woman in maintenance of the integrity of the white race and of the right of their children to control this country.

Tenth. It is said that if the women vote some bad women will vote. Men have never been disfranchised because there are some bad men who will vote. And the proportion of bad men is very far greater than that of bad women. The records of your courts and jails demonstrate that.

Eleventh. There are those who say that women do not want to vote. The best proof of this is that they have already achieved the ballot in so many States and countries and have made such wonderful progress as I have told you, in the last thirty days. In the States and countries where they vote about the same percentage of men and women vote. In some States equal suffrage was carried on the first trial at the ballot box. In some States it was voted on twice before they got it. In others three times, and in Oregon it was only carried when it was submitted to the ballot box for the sixth time, for you will

remember that only the men vote on the matter. Wherever the measure has been beaten, the next morning the women have reorganized their lines and started a new campaign. After the recent defeat of the measure in Ohio at the last election a New York newspaper said that the measure had been overwhelmingly defeated in Ohio. The editor of the *Springfield Republican* in Massachusetts, with more experience, said that that was impossible, because if an earthquake had shaken Ohio up so that no more ground was left than the size of a cart-wheel the women would be organizing on it the next morning for equal suffrage. When a man volunteers to say that the women do not want the suffrage it reminds me of an instance that took place down here in Pamlico at a wedding. When the preacher got to that part where he asked the woman "Will you take this man to be your wedded husband?" etc., the response came in a deep masculine voice, "I will." Thinking that there was some mistake, he repeated the question, and there was the same response in bass. Thereupon a little fellow in front, seeing the embarrassment, shouted to the preacher, "Parson, she is deaf, and I am answering for her." These men seem to think that the women are deaf and deficient.

Twelfth. It is said that politics will degrade women. It has not had that effect in any State, county, or town that has ever tried it. If it had, the movement would not continue to grow. Suffrage has not degraded the men, but it has elevated and broadened them. It will have exactly the same effect on the women—with this addition, that the women will broaden and elevate politics.

#### SOME REASONS WHY.

Only a few words now as to why suffrage for women is just and is needed.

1. We fought the Revolutionary War upon the principle that there should be no taxation without representation. Our Government is founded upon that proposition. The women in North Carolina own probably one-third of its property. Whatever share they own, be it little or more, is taxed; yet they are denied the right of any voice in saying how much should be taken from them for taxes and for what purposes it should be spent. Mr. Jefferson said that it was "incomprehensible that Government should refuse the ballot to the most intelligent women while giving it to the most besotted and ignorant men."

2. The women bear the burdens of government even more than the men. If there is lack of sanitation, their children suffer and die. If public morals are not guarded, the evils fall upon their sons. If wars consume the youth of the land, they suffer more than the fathers. They have even more interest in good government and in preventing bad government than the men. They are as intelligent and as patriotic as the men. It will add to the stability of the Government to give them a share in its control.

3. Mr. Lincoln in his celebrated Gettysburg speech said that this is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." The United States Supreme Court has solemnly decided that women are people. We knew it before the court told us so. Yet we have a government of all the people, for all the people, but by half the people. No wonder Mr. Lincoln said that it was unjust to exclude the women from the suffrage.

4. There are those who are afraid that the women will seek office and thereby crowd out the men. But that has not been the experience where equal suffrage obtains. As a rule, they do not seek office. They have more sense than men in this regard, as well as in some others. Their interest is more in obtaining good government and seeing that the men run it right. They remind me of an instance that I observed when I was in Kansas. There was a fine field of wheat of some 80 acres near Topeka, and a gentleman told me that a man and his wife had raised the crop and harvested it. I told him I had seen

the man on the reaper, but I had not seen the woman taking any hand. He said that she had done so all the same; that she had always sat at the door and whenever the man sat down to rest she had shaken the broomstick at him. That is the vocation of the woman, as a rule, where they vote.

It does not follow because the women are not office-seekers that they are incompetent to fill office. We know that in scripture times Deborah was "judge over all Israel." Besides many other female rulers, the best two sovereigns that England has ever known were Victoria and Elizabeth. The greatest sovereign of Russia was Catherine the Great; in Austria Maria Theresa, and in Spain Isabella, to whom the world owes the discovery of America by the aid she gave to Columbus.

#### A LOGICAL DEVELOPMENT.

5. Equal suffrage is not only a development of democracy which has gradually extended the suffrage to all men and is now extending it to women, but it is also a logical development of the movement which has elevated women to the rights of human beings. Up to about one hundred years ago, as a rule, they were not educated. When the first college for women was established some eighty or ninety years ago its dangerous tendency was denounced even more than suffrage is now. After education was acquired, then the movement began to give them property rights. Up to 1868 in this State, upon marriage all a woman's personal property became absolutely that of her husband, and her real estate became his for life. When it was proposed to change this, there was a howl all along the line that if women owned their own property every couple would become divorced. But that movement succeeded. Up to 1874 the Supreme Court of this State held that if a man thrashed his wife with a switch no larger than his thumb and did not permanently injure her, that the courts would not protect her. In that year, just forty-one years ago, Judge Settle of this city conferred lasting honor upon himself and upon the Supreme Court of this State by holding that we have "at last advanced from that barbarism," and denied the right of husbands to flog their wives any longer. In the last few years the Court has held that if a woman acquired any property by her needle or otherwise it became the property of her husband, and that if, like Mrs. Price, of Charlotte, she lost a limb in a railroad accident her husband and not herself was entitled to pay for her physical injury and suffering and loss of time. The Legislature has since changed this and many other unjust things which would never have existed if the women had had the right of suffrage.

I will not take the time to mention numerous discriminations in the law against women, which have obtained because they had no voice in choosing legislators and judges. The shadow cast by the coming era of equal suffrage has already caused some of these discriminations to be repealed. At this session of your Legislature they have already permitted women to add to their means of livelihood the fees of the vocation of notary public, and they have enacted (reversing the decision in *Gill v. Commissioners*, 100 N. C., 175) that on all propositions to lay a local tax upon realty where a petition of "freeholders" is a prerequisite, that women shall be deemed freeholders. They have also radically changed the statutes by which property, real and personal, has heretofore all gone to the father instead of equally to the father and mother upon the death of children. When women vote for judges and legislators there comes a change in the attitude of courts and legislatures.

One of the greatest discriminations in the law, aside from that of the custody of children, is the effect that a lack of equal suffrage has upon the pay of women. Justice demands the rule of equal pay for equal services. Tho in Oregon and Washington and other suffrage States, the teachers of both sexes

are paid the same compensation for the same services, the rule in North Carolina is, I am told, that female teachers get about one-third of the pay that is given the men for the same work.

INEVITABLE.

Finally, we might as well recognize the inevitable. This world-wide movement is irresistible because it is founded upon justice and the economic demands of the times. If the friends of equal suffrage shall organize and urge the movement methodically as it has been done in other States, I prophesy now and here that the very next Legislature that sits in Raleigh will pass the bill to submit equal suffrage to the people by a two-thirds vote with promptness and cheerfulness, and that at the succeeding election it will be carried at the ballot box. Like Davy Crockett's coon, the opponents of the measure might as well "come down." Some years ago I was at Atlantic City. Those of you who have been there will remember that they have placards on each side of the walkways on which there are inscriptions, amusing or instructive. One of them reads thus: "God made the world, and rested. He then made man, and he rested. He then made woman, and neither God nor man has had any rest since." I will say to the unconverted that they will have no rest until this question is settled, and settled right.

I had not intended to talk more than thirty minutes. I have been led on by the subtle flattery of the attention of this audience. It reminds me of what my friend, Major Hale, now our distinguished minister plenipotentiary to Costa Rica, told me happened to him on the subway in London. They call it there the "Tuppenny Tube," because the fare is 2 pence. Some of you have been on it, and will remember that the car doors are on the side of the coach and the seats are crossways the track. He said that once when nearing Charing Cross station a lady in the little compartment seemed quite excited. It is not the custom there to speak to any one without being introduced, but she seemed so much alarmed that, like a true Southern gentleman, he asked if he could be of any service. She said, "Sir, I wish to go to Trafalgar Square and need to get off at Charing Cross station." He said to her, "What prevents it?" "Why," said she, "you see I am a bit stout, and when I get off, I get out backwards, and the guard (they call the conductor the guard over there) 'e sees me and thinks I am getting h'on. He rushes up and shoves me h'on and slams the door, and I have passed my stopping place three times already." I fear that I am like the good lady. I have passed my stopping place several times.

I thank you for your attention.

*Shall work be dropped on the Federal Amendment and efforts confined to State legislation?*

While I am convinced that there is a field for appropriate National legislation in obtaining suffrage for women I am one of the many who do not believe that the pursuit of the so-called S.B. Anthony amendment to the Federal Constitution is ~~desirable~~ *profitable*

It is perfectly clear that the amendment is by no means necessary to the success of our cause. It is usually advocated chiefly as a means of saving time and labor; in a word, as a "short cut" to woman suffrage. It is my purpose by a brief review of constitutional history to show that on the contrary it is *long drawn out* difficult and precarious.

As we know, the present Constitution of the United States superseded in 1789 the Articles of Confederation under which the country had been governed since 1778. The Articles of Confederation were distinctly a league among independent and sovereign states. But this league of sovereign states having proved unequal to the strain of the Revolutionary War in 1787 Congress called a convention to formulate a new constitution. By the genius of its statesmen, especially of Alexander Hamilton, the Convention finally formulated a constitution deriving its powers from, and acting directly upon, the People of the United States instead of the several States in their sovereign capacity.

But notwithstanding that the league among sovereign states had failed to meet the requirements of national life, the attachment of the people to State sovereignty was so strong that it appeared probable the Convention would find it impossible to come to an agreement between the advocates of a centralized government of the people and those of State sovereignty if a delegate, Dr. Johnson, had not suggested a means of compromising the opposing claims by *distinctly recognizing* ~~having~~ the sovereignty and equality of the States *giving each of them* ~~represented~~ by an equal number of members in the Senate of the National Congress while the people of the States should be represented by varying numbers in the lower House. But even with this and other concessions it was difficult to persuade the Convention to make

*NAWSA  
Speech at  
Atlantic  
City in  
Sept., 1916*



the sacrifice of some rights of sovereignty of the States which Hamilton and others of like views felt to be necessary for a more perfect union of the people. The State of New York so resented the trend towards surrendering them <sup>sovereign rights</sup> that all of her delegates except Hamilton withdrew from the convention. Even after the factions <sup>in the Convention</sup> had come to a reluctant agreement the refusal of the people to ratify the constitution seemed imminent, and was averted only by the strenuous efforts of such statesmen as John Jay, James Madison, and especially Alex. Hamilton. It was by the promise that ten amendments, limiting the new powers of Congress and affirming those of the States, should ~~immediately~~ be submitted immediately that the ~~necessary~~ States were induced to ratify it. Virginia finally signed with the declaration that she was at liberty to withdraw from the Union whenever its powers were used for oppression; and New York signed after Hamilton had declared that no State could ever be coerced by an armed force.

The country <sup>immediately</sup> divided into two parties, - the Federalists, who were in favor of a strong centralized government, and the <sup>Republicans as the word</sup> anti-federalists, <sup>several were</sup> who held to the sovereignty of the States. As we all know, this division has persisted ever since, though parties have had various names.

The 11th Amendment was passed to affirm a right of State sovereignty which had been denied by a Supreme Court decision; and the 12th Amendment merely altered the method of electing the President and vice-president.

Until after the War of the States no more amendments were passed. Then came the three which are called the War Amendments. The 13th Amendment forever forbidding slavery was submitted in 1865. All but two of the 36 States ratified it, either with or without conditions. The secession States which had taken steps for readmission on the principles of the Amnesty Proclamation of President Lincoln, by their new legislatures rescinded the acts of secession and ratified the 13th Amendment.

Mrs. Coars,  
Cannot concentrate, because  
in some States the people  
will not concentrate on  
an invasion of State  
sovereignty.

Our power can be used  
in ~~forcing~~ constraining  
our present constitution  
rather than amending it.

Mrs. Raymond says  
that neutrality will not  
be pursued if our only  
Congressional measure is  
one contrary to the doctrine  
of State sovereignty.

Some participation is not  
possible with only one  
Congressional measure.

Ignorance in our previous no  
reason why we should continue  
a method which bears the  
marks of crudeness. We are  
seeking for a principle  
on the best methods.

That great-minded woman is  
most honored by choosing  
the best methods.

Our enemies can combine on  
the State legislatures easier  
than the voteless women.

More than 7000 State legisla-  
tors.  
States Rights not a Southern  
doctrine

The legal right of secession for which they had fought had passed into history as The Lost Cause. The slaves had been emancipated as a war measure; and the Amendment was accepted <sup>as</sup> a logical outcome of the war and the conclusion of a controversy which had raged from the establishment of the government.

The history of the other two war amendments, which are those involving the doctrine of States Rights, is stormy. Congress proposed the 14th Amendment. Only 23 States out of 37 would ratify it. Then Congress passed the Reconstruction Acts. The governments of ten of the secession States were not recognized; they were put under military government and refused re-admission <sup>and representation in Congress</sup> to the Union until the 14th Amendment should be ratified. Under this coercion those ten States ratified the Amendment and carried it; though four non-secession States <sup>insurgent</sup> never ratified it.

*In* that provision of the 14th Amendment by which States were to lose representation in Congress in proportion to the number of male citizens who might be excluded from suffrage there was incorporated in the Constitution for the first time a provision for protecting male citizens which did not extend protection to female citizens; and the women of the United States <sup>the result of the Reconstruction</sup> by ~~one and the same~~ acts were discriminated against <sup>in</sup> the supreme law of the land and given nearly a million of new political masters in the persons of the emancipated negro men.

The 15th Amendment was carried by the same tactics; though the number of non-secession States <sup>insurgent</sup> which did not ratify increased to eight.

The Anthony Amendment is a repetition of the 15th, with the substitution of the word "sex" for "race, color or previous condition of servitude". Before it can become law it must be ratified by the legislatures of 36 States. It is hardly to be supposed that the ten coerced States now will subscribe voluntarily to a principle which they rejected formerly; and if even three of the eight others which refused to ratify the 15th Amendment remain of the same mind the Anthony Amendment cannot

be ratified. Nothing but coercion made the 15th Amendment possible; and what reason have we to suppose that anything less than coercion will pass the Anthony Amendment? In fact, I believe it is usually admitted by those most zealous to push that amendment at any cost that coercion will be necessary; and as military coercion is no longer among the possibilities they propose a political coercion by the votes of women who have won ~~them~~ <sup>Charters</sup> by ~~the~~ peaceable methods in conformity <sup>with</sup> the well-defined ~~divisions~~ <sup>divisions</sup> between State and Federal powers. Yet why should such revolutionary action be expected of enfranchised American women? The results of those two amendments are far from conclusive proof of their wisdom. The Reconstruction Period in our history can never be forgotten as an illustration of what may happen when one section of our country is ruled by an unsympathetic majority in other sections. Moreover, all over the world in every government in which federation in any form is a feature the principle of limitation of centralized power is growing stronger, whether it is called State sovereignty, as in our country, or Home Rule, as in the British Empire, or by whatever name it may be known. Even now, while Europe is convulsed with war, non-centralized self-government is considered so vital to free institutions that the heroic struggle for it in Ireland under the name of Home Rule attracts ~~an~~ interest and sympathy from freedom loving people that cannot be diverted even by that terrible ~~conflict~~ <sup>war</sup>.

The two Amendments recently adopted, the 16th and the 17th, are not in the same category with the two preceding, as they bear only on matters of method which the States could not adjust separately. Since the establishment of our Constitution only these 17 Amendments have been passed, though it has been computed that more than 1700 have been introduced into Congress.

In view of these enormous difficulties, added to by the likelihood that our Association cannot continue its advocacy of the Anthony Amendment without involving itself in partisan politics, I believe it is wise for our Association to work ~~only~~ <sup>in obtaining an amendment</sup> for such Federal legislation as does not require from the States the surrender of any portion of those rights reserved to them by the Constitution. <sup>above</sup> <sup>of the</sup> <sup>Constitution</sup> <sup>and</sup> <sup>under</sup> <sup>such</sup>

Sara Clay.

The New York Times in denouncing that speech. One of the memories of the Convention which I shall always cherish is the fact that Jane Addams seconded my nomination.

I grew to believe in Woman Suffrage, not because of associating with women whose chief interest was in Woman Suffrage, but because of finding out that the women from whom I received most aid in endeavoring to grapple with the social and industrial problems of the day were themselves believers in Woman Suffrage. For a long time I have been interested in such questions as the betterment of the tenement house conditions, the abolition of sweat shop factories in tenement houses, the betterment of the conditions of work and life of working girls, the establishment of children's courts, the establishment of playgrounds, putting a stop to the employment of children, and dozens of other like matters. Now, the way I got into touch with each different kind of such work was to get hold of some men or women who knew about it and could guide and instruct me and enable me to see for myself what the facts were. The man to whom I owe most in this matter is Jacob Riis, and I shall never forget all he did for me during the time I was Police Commissioner. In exactly the same fashion I have profited by the teachings and experience of Judge Ben Lindsay, of Colorado; of Judge De Lacey, of Washington; of Charles Stelzle, of Father Curran, of Homer Folks, of Paul Kellogg, of Mannis, of Raymond Robbins, of Weyl and McCarthy and Kingsbury; of many, many men connected with the work of organized charity or with private or religious charity, and of many, many clergymen, priests and rabbis—I cannot begin to enumerate all of them. Well, in precisely the same way I grew acquainted with women who were doing the same kind of work—with Miss Addams, with Miss Kellor, with Mrs. Kelly and many others. I talked with them and worked with them just as I did with men. I found that they had the same zeal and earnestness and judgment that the men had, and differed among themselves just as the men did. I also found that as a result of their actual experience they felt that working girls would be helped by the suffrage just as the working men are helped, and that in our warfare against certain dreadful evils of our social life the help of the women would be of peculiar value. Very much of what I learned to believe from them they were quite unconscious of having taught me, and it was this largely unconscious teaching of theirs and my study of what had been done in the States where suffrage exists that gradually turned me into a believer that women should have the same right to vote that men have. I do not believe that there is identity of functions between men and women, but I do believe that there should be equality of right. I see no reason why voting should interfere with women's home life any more than it interferes with the every day work of the man which enables him to support the home.



## Mr. Roosevelt's Speech on Suffrage, delivered at St. Johnsbury, Vt., August 30, 1912

Of all the planks of the Progressive platform, and they are all of them good, the two which most go to my own heart are the one which deals with social and industrial justice and the one on country life. Not only the present Republican and Democratic platforms fail in any way to deal with these matters as our platform deals with them, but no platform previous to ours has ever even shown an intellectual understanding of what social and industrial justice was. Our proposals are definite and concrete, and they are absolutely practical. We treat our whole platform as a covenant with the people, binding upon ourselves and upon our candidates in State and in Nation. We pledge ourselves to legislation looking to the prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases. We intend to deal with the problem of involuntary unemployment and of overwork. We intend to secure compensation for men or women who are killed or crippled in industry; to prohibit sweated labor; to secure a minimum wage standard for working women, and a living wage in all industrial occupations. We pledge ourselves to secure one day's rest in seven for all wageworkers, and an eight-hour day in continuous twenty-four hour industries, the prohibition of night work and the establishment of an eight-hour day for women. We pledge ourselves to the abolition of the convict contract labor system, and the application of prisoners' earnings to the support of their dependent families. We recognize that in all matters such as these women are as vitally concerned as men. We recognize that there cannot be identity of function, but that there should be equality of right, between men and women, and we are therefore for equal suffrage for men and women.

The New York Times of August 20th, in an interview to a prominent citizen who has repudiated it, criticised and denounced Jane Addams for nominating me, and also criticised the Progressive Party for permitting women to be in the Progressive Convention. It attacked Miss Addams' conduct as "spectacular and in very bad taste," and also criticised me as being spectacular because I "had the bad taste to publicly compliment her on her action and thank her."

My only reference to Miss Addams was contained in the following sentence: "I wish to tell those who proposed and seconded my nomination that I appreciate to the full the significance of having such men and such a woman put me in nomination." It will be noticed that in this sentence I did not even mention Miss Addams' name, and if President Eliot really considers

this allusion to Miss Addams as being spectacular and in bad taste I should feel a mild curiosity to know just what he would regard as non-spectacular and in good taste.

It would not be worth while to pay any heed to this article in itself; but it illustrates an attitude of mind sufficiently common to deserve consideration. Among the other sentences in the article were the following: "Women have no proper share in a political convention. We need women to bear children and attend to their homes. The men ought to be able to regulate their own politics and meet all needs without direct assistance of the women."

Of course it is entirely right to say that we need women to bear children and attend to their homes; just as it would be right to say that we need men to beget children and make the homes in which the women can live and the children be brought up. One statement is as true as the other and both come under the head of the obvious. I have said not once, but scores of times, that I put the domestic life above every other kind of life, that I honor the good and wise mother as I honor no other woman and no man, and that the perpetuity of the nation depends primarily upon the average man and average woman therein being the father and mother of healthy and happy and wisely brought up children, children trained, boys and girls alike, in industry and decent conduct and to the habit of meeting with wisdom and with high courage the many and difficult problems that confront each of us in his every-day individual life, and all of us in our collective life.

I think the highest life, the ideal life, is the married life. But there are both unmarried men and unmarried women who perform service of the utmost consequence to the whole people; and it is equally foolish and wicked for a man to slur the unmarried woman when he would not dream of slurring the unmarried man. Bishop Brent, in the Philippines, is unmarried. He has done admirable work there, just as Jane Addams has done at Hull House. When the Times says that it dislikes to see Miss Addams "held up in the limelight as an example for all other women to follow" it speaks offensively, and its words are true only in the sense that they would be true if it had used them about Bishop Brent or the late Phillips Brooks. Again and again I have heard Bishop Brent held up as an example, and I have held him up as an example myself; and so of the late Phillips Brooks. And in just the same way, I am heartily glad to say, I have heard Jane Addams held up as an example and have thus held her up myself. The cases of the three stand on the same plane; all three by their lives have added to, and are adding to, our heritage of good in this country; and it is an absurdity to say that in recognizing this fact as regards one of them we are in any shape or way explicitly or implicitly failing to take the position that we ought, as a matter of course, to take about marriage and the happy married life.

Now for the statement that women have no proper share

in a political convention, and that men ought to be able to regulate their own politics and meet all needs without direct assistance from the women. That man knows little of our political, social and industrial needs as a nation who does not know that in political conventions the politics that ought to be "regulated" are the politics that affect women precisely as much as they affect men; and he must be unfortunate in his list of acquaintances if he does not know women whose advice and counsel are pre-eminently worth having in regard to the matters affecting our welfare which it is of most consequence to have dealt with by political conventions. I suppose the trouble is that the Times fails to understand that we intend from now on to make participation in "politics" a method of applying ethics to our public life, and both ethics and economics to our industrial life. Such a theory of public conduct is wholly incomprehensible both to those who dominated the Republican Convention at Chicago and to those who dominated the Democratic Convention at Baltimore. The Progressive Party is the one party which since the war has dealt with real issues; and these real issues affect women precisely as much as men. The women who bear children and attend to their own homes have precisely the same right to speak in politics that their husbands have who are the fathers of their children and who work to keep up their homes. It is these women who bear children and attend to their own homes, and these men, their husbands, who work for their wives and children and homes, whom the Progressive Party is endeavoring to represent and in whose interest the Progressive Party proposes that the governmental policy of this nation shall hereafter be shaped. Such being the case, it is eminently wise that the women should share in the political conventions, and that they should join with the men in regulating the politics, which are in no proper sense only "the politics of the men," as the Times says, because they are of as vital concern to the women as to the men.

I doubt if there ever was a convention more really representative of the people, and with a higher average of individual character among the representatives, than was the case with the Progressive National Convention at Chicago. The spirit in which it met was a spirit of deep and genuine religious fervor, using the word "religious" in its broadest and truest sense; a spirit which found expression in singing the noble Battle Hymn of the Republic—a hymn, by the way, which was written by a woman, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, who as wife and mother, and in all relations of both public and private life, was one of the best citizens this Republic has ever brought forth. I am glad to say that among the representatives to our convention was a number of women; and not only high in purpose, but in wisdom, in character, in cool-headedness and in far-sighted understanding of the needs of the nation, they stood on an exactly equal footing with the men. Our National Committee will publish Jane Addams' speech; I ask you to read it yourselves and then pass judgment on the good taste and wisdom of

W. C. J. H. Bangert. Feb. 11, 1913.

A NEW TOOL.

Madam Toast-Mistress and Friends,

I suppose there is no organization of women or of men which is actuated by a more earnest and steadfast desire to uplift the people out of a vice which degrades and out of the conditions which contribute to it than the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It has brought to the attainment of its objects wonderful powers of organization, patient persistence, continuous self-sacrifice,—the very spirit of mother-love. May I say, in tribute to the practical genius of this age, that not the least of its merits is that it has also brought into service a quite uncommon measure of common sense, which has kept it on the alert for new tools to help in its work?

For long it has used, even exhaustively, all the old tools whereby women have exerted a share of influence in the affairs of home and country. Women have dug down deep for the moral foundations of temperance and prohibition; they have trained the young; they have adorned their appeals to the mature mind with song and story and have pressed home the truths they taught with all womanly tenderness and pathos. There are many who are not disposed to flatter who say that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the strongest force for temperance and prohibition which the age has put forth. And yet none are more sadly aware than the women who compose it that much remains to be done;— that long years of toil stretch before them, strewn with ruined lives and broken hearts, before even such restraints as are possible to human menas can be laid upon the social habits and legal license which permit this waste of life and happiness. And so the women are exercising that common sense which they have consecrated to this cause and are directing their attention to getting a new tool whereby they may shorten these years of toil and hope deferred.

They see in the political ballot just the tool they need. If they had that they could do for themselves certain important things they are spending

time asking men to do. They could always vote as they pray, you know. They could stop man-traps from being laid at the doors of school-houses in the form of saloons. They could elect officials who are able to see when the "lid is off" on Sundays and other forbidden times. If they had that tool there would seldom be need for women to work weeks before elections to array the school children, drill them in marching and singing; and at daylight on election day lead them in procession through the streets, whilst other devoted women served coffee and sandwiches to the men, white, black, drunk or sober, assembled around the polls, along with a gentle entreaty to vote for home and the children. Women could do that themselves, if they had this new tool. They could do all these things with nothing more spectacular than what is done when a letter is posted.

To be sure, there has been effectiveness in the use of the old tools up to a certain point, ~~for men~~ for men have put many good temperance laws on the statute books without women's votes, though it can hardly be claimed that they would have done so much without the help of women. But after the laws are on the statute books the equally hard task of enforcing their execution still remains. The methods of women to rouse public opinion to the point of enacting laws are not adapted to keeping up the "eternal vigilance" which is the price of executing them. For this task the perseverance which women are credited with possessing in larger measure than men seems to be the quality most needed. But they are not helping as they might, because the vote is the tool required.

Really, it would seem that men are entitled to have the help of women in a matter which so much concerns the well-being and happiness of women. It would seem that women would say at once, "Yes, we will help; we will get the vote". But right here we have been met with a knotty problem which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union must help to solve before they can secure the new tool. We find that for some abstruse reason all our states former-

...and a strong pull and a pull altogether, we hope to win the new tool  
 ...of social conditions to lend a helping hand. And then with a long  
 ...and woman who believes that suffrage for women is good for the  
 ...which certainly expects every organiza-  
 ...for women. It has been stated by the

*W. C. T. U.*  
 ...



ly left women out of the list of those who exercise the right of suffrage. They did not only leave women out, they also left out idiots, lunatics, felons and minors. Now on the face of it there seem to be reasons why these other classes of persons should be left out which do not apply to women. Why were women excluded? This omission has caused a great deal of learned discussion among scholars, reformers and also the common people for a half-century or more. Controversy has raged around this question. The time would fail to rehearse even briefly the reasons given for this anomaly; but certain small societies of opponents have finally appeared to decide that the reason is that women have not the time to think of questions requiring votes, and they ought never to go further than to influence men to vote as women think they ought to vote. Now if this is true in what a position does it place the women of the Christian Temperance Union! They are spending a great deal of time on a reform which in many particulars is one to be settled purely by votes. If they have not time to make up their minds how to vote themselves how can they have time to make up their minds ~~xxx~~ to decide how to influence men to vote? to say nothing of the time given to those marches, those sandwiches and coffee-entertained before, in short, all those instrumentalities they have spent time in using to influence voters? Why are women thinking at all of a political question if they have not time for it? and why are men frequently appealing to them to "exert influence" upon the settlement of such subjects if they think women have not time to think about them? In fact, why are ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ both men and women quite inconsistent with themselves about this thing?

Now it may be that there are both men and women who have not that faculty of mind which will enable them to come to a conclusion upon these points; but I am confident this assemblage feels that this is a case where the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will cut the discussion short by the use of that common sense which it has contributed to the solution of other

problems; and it will decide that women are able to think on all subjects of human welfare, and that they will equip themselves with this new tool for the betterment of human conditions, and right here in Kentucky, too.

King of Our <sup>no name</sup> sister states have this new tool and are ~~xxxxxxx~~ employing it to the confusion of our enemies. Washington has had it but two years and in that state the "wets" have gained two towns and the "drys" have gained 115. ~~xxxxxxx~~ California has had it only a little over a year; in 1910 it had only 200 dry towns, and now it has 682. The testimony from the older ~~xxxxxxx~~ states is similar.

It is worth while for the Ky. Woman's Christian Temperance Union to devote time and labor to obtaining the new tool; and the hour has struck to begin. For the campaign is on for winning votes for women in Kentucky. It has been started by the State Equal Rights Association, which certainly expects every organization and every man and woman who believes that suffrage for women is good for the uplift of social conditions to lend a helping hand. And then with a long pull, and a strong pull and a pull altogether we hope to win the New Tool, <sup>1915</sup> ~~in 1915~~.

BOND

# THE BOWDLE SPEECH

As delivered in the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., January 12, 1915.

Excerpts printed from the author's manuscript before being expurgated for the Congressional Record.

[Introductory Note: From the anti-suffrage side of the debate on the Mondell resolution in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 12, 1915, Representative Stanley Bowdle, of Cincinnati, Ohio, made a speech which was loudly applauded and enjoyed by the majority of the House. When his time had expired, and he asked for an additional ten minutes, there were cries of "Give it to him, give it to him!", and by unanimous consent of the House the extension was granted. When Mr. Bowdle had finished, members rose from their seats to greet and congratulate him with handshake and spoken approval.

For printing in the Congressional Record, Mr. Bowdle furnished an expurgated copy of his speech. The Congressional Committee of the National American Woman Suffrage Association was able, however, to obtain a manuscript copy of the speech as delivered on the floor of the House, and to consult, besides, the stenographic report taken down by the official reporter. The Committee has reproduced here with the larger part of the speech in its original language, for the purpose of informing the public what manner of thing was permitted and applauded by the majority of the National Congress, during the serious consideration of a public question and in the presence of women auditors.

ANTOINETTE FUNK,

Vice Chairman Congressional Committee, National American Woman Suffrage Association.]

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice the position of an unnumbered multitude of good women of America relative to the suffrage Movement. A multitude of women whose voices are not heard in the street: who do not seek the rostrum of political debate: who, though life is not exactly what some of them would have, do not defame their husbands and brothers because they have been unable to declare the Kingdom of Heaven to be at hand: women who are not ashamed of their sex-lot, though it disqualifies them from many functions allowed to men. These I represent.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the women of this smart capitol are beautiful—indeed, their beauty is positively disturbing to business: their feet are beautiful; their ankles are beautiful—but here I must pause (prolonged laughter)—all this I do assert on that kind of evidence required by Greenleaf's first rules (applause and laughter)—but they are not interested in affairs of state; they are not interested in politics; insofar as I can judge, they are getting their information on these subjects from the source commanded by St. Paul, for which I do heartily commend them. (Laughter.)

Who knows, maybe we shall live to see a Mrs. at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue as President of the United States. Who knows, a Mr. may hook up and unhook the nation's Chief. (Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker: the functions of women are of a character that disqualifies them from acting as jurors or judges. If I were to defend a man on a capital charge, and a woman were to offer herself as a juror, there are some very intimate questions that I should insist on putting to her as to her *then* condition and were she over forty-eight, I should want to know something about her change of life. And that man or woman does not live who would want to submit his or her personal property rights to a judge or juror who was with child.

It is the great distinctive function which is at the basis of that consideration which men instinctively show to women in so many ways; even to the point of suspending the criminal laws in their favor.

There are a thousand duties to which you cannot summon women who are gestating or rearing children. And every vigorous woman, even though unmarried, may be invited into that legal relation which brings those powers into play.

Women have a great function. Her functions are not man's functions. Men and women are different. They are different in every atom. Right here is where women set up a grouch. Many women resent the limitations of sex. But they quarrel with God, when he has the final word. I might as well weep because I cannot gestate a child.

This world is not just what each of us would have it. But, Mr. Speaker, blessed is that man who recognizes the fact cheerfully. Were I given the remaking of this world, I don't know just what I should do. Ingersoll said he would make it not rain so hard in the Sea: but coming from Ohio, where we have had terrible floods, I should make it not rain so hard on the land. Of course, the Suffragists would recommend some changes. One said to me that she would make papa bear the children. (Laughter.) And this, Mr. Speaker, only bears out the claim that this movement, like the whole modern feminine movement, is a simple expression of sex resentment. Only the other day some sociological person examined the roster of a certain Woman's Club of a western city, and out of seventy-two women members, all married and able, not a child had been born within the year.

I would respectfully suggest to the patriotic ladies that when next they meet, instead of denouncing the distinguished member from New York, Mr. Levy, because of the condition of the back gate of Monticello, they resolve on an investigation of this race suicide question: that they give some attention to the feminine clothing question and the millinery question.

Edmund Burke used to say that every law of the British Empire had for its ultimate object the getting of twelve honest men in the jury box. I think he overstated it, for there is something that precedes even the administration of justice—it is marriage. The ultimate object of every law of every civilized country is to get one man in love with one woman. Unless that is the object the Nation must come to an end. Mr. Speaker, a civilization cannot be erected that favors celibacy. If it could, the arrangement would be quite temporary. There might be some justice in giving unmarried women the ballot, but every unmarried woman is ready to marry, and she should sacrifice something (if it be a sacrifice) to that institution which all the world hopes she will finally enter. It is best for the unmarried that our laws should favor the married. The unmarried need no special laws. And the unmarried know this, and hence unmarried suffragettes claim that their special value at the polls and in the legislative Halls will be to reduce infant mortality. They need not concern themselves. The married will care for the children of this world. Should suffrage become a fact, the Old Man will parade the floor as usual in his night-shirt. (Laughter and applause.)

All history, Mr. Speaker, is nothing but the record of an affair with a woman. Happy is that man whose affair is honorable.

I saw smoke curling up from a cottage chimney in a mountain glen. I followed it, and entered the house—it was an affair with a wo-

(Continued on other side)

man. I looked into the dimpled face of a babe—it told of an affair with a woman. I saw a myriad of black-grimed men emerge from the mine's mouth with lamps and dinner pails, and they smiled and went each his way, and I wondered why they worked amid such dangers, but I followed and found—it was an affair with a woman. I was in the cab of an express locomotive hurling up through darkness towards the city. I wondered at his willingness to endure the dangers, as block signals and switches and cars shot by: but I saw his face for a moment by the steam gauge light and he smiled, as we approached the division end—and I knew it was simply an affair with a woman. I was with the inventor in an upper room at night, where he had slaved for years on the turbine principle, and I marvelled at his constancy, but he showed me her picture, and, Mr. Speaker, it was an affair with a woman. And the words of Swedenborg came to me, "though men know it not, love is the life of this world."

Women, have they a mission? Yes, it is to rule in the world of love and affection—in the home. It is not to rule in the state. They have a function to perform which precludes the latter sort of rule. Man is King of this universe. Woman is Queen. The Queen rules when the King is dead—or becomes a Mollycoddle, and the American man is not that yet.

The great need of America today is more marriage. But many men are afraid to attempt to support the modern woman. And this suffrage question is making the women less attractive to men. Who would care to marry a pronounced suffragist? (Laughter.)

Yes, the need is more marriage. America needs a new Baptism of the old-time masculinity; and the baptism should be by immersion. We need the old type of feminine woman.

I know that marriage is by the economic condition unduly postponed or prevented altogether, and I deplore this; but I have never yet heard that the way to treat a disease was to make it worse.

Mr. Speaker: Many things are to be changed by feminine suffrage. One of them is the "double standard," so-called. Mrs. Pankhurst lately in this city assured us that this change is the first thing upon the suffrage programme. I should like to have her exhibit to me the statute she would pass on this subject. Its wording would be interesting. But pray—and let us be frank—who is it that treats fallen women most harshly? Is it not woman herself? Her bill would have to be entitled "An Act to Reform Women's views of Women." And who is it that treats a delinquent man with the most consideration? Is it not women?

But are not women's instincts right in this somewhat easier treatment accorded the young man? Here he is, equipped by nature with

powerful passions, out daily in the broad and tempting world, subjected to temptations which rarely encompass young women: shall he not be accorded this charitable treatment? What would Mrs. Pankhurst do with him? Let this famous lady try to put some legislative stigma upon him, (say on his forehead,) and the first persons to protest would be the young man's mother and sisters.

I deplore the immoralities of this age. I know how the energies of thousands of young men are dissipated. I would to God that every young man knew the true dignity of pure manhood. I would that every young man had written over the lintels of his heart the 7th Chapter of Proverbs as my Mother bade me write it. But this thing is unreachable by law. Self restraint is not begotten by statute.

And we all weep too much over prostitutes. Reform for them is easy. Any one of them in any American city, desiring to reform, can wash the paint off, clean up, go to the next town and get honest house work. Laziness and vanity are largely responsible for their chosen vocation. We are too lugubrious anyhow over evil people, lazy people, and criminals generally. Our stamina seems to be breaking down in this matter. It would be better were we sadder over the plight of some honest people. My sympathies are with the hard-working and honest.

Word has gone forth that nothing unflattering shall be said of women. But if women want to jump into politics they must not be astonished to have their pedestals jarred by an occasional truth. Hold on to your halo, when you enter politics, is a good motto. Women surely can't burn property and assault and insult State Ministers without hearing something about themselves.

Having declared man to be a tyrant, they must not get embarrassed when sternly asked to name the day and date when he became so, for our mothers did not regard him so.

Mr. Speaker: there is in America today a forgotten institution known as the "Old Man." I know him—you know him. Our mothers knew him and honored him, and he honored them. But he is now forgotten and often derided. Suffragists insult him. I looked upon his frozen features as he conquered the Antarctic Zone, while women burned up five millions of his property at home, made by him with back-breaking labor. I have seen his face in the deadly flames of molten metal, where a mis-movement meant death. I have been with him in the bowels of steamers and have seen him wipe the scalding sweat from his face as he fed hellish furnaces. I have been with him working on great engines, in work taxing nerves and strength, where a mistake of a

thousandth of an inch meant ruin. I have been with him in the grease and slime of repairs to great engineering apparatus. I have gotten up with him in the frosty darkness of the morning to go to the great shops of the cities, while leisure America slept. I have eaten with him his spare breakfasts. I have been with multitudes of him around the forges of the world at noon dining from buckets, yet always cheerful. I have seen him pinned beneath locomotives, with his flesh frying on his bones, and his hand still gripping the throttle, when his last question was to the passengers and his last message was to a woman. \* \* \*

This, Mr. Speaker, is man "the Tyrant." This is the being of whom Miss Shaw said the other day, "all we ask of man is that he stand out of our sunshine." This is the being who is no longer able to represent women, who indeed misrepresents them, though he furnishes the world its meal ticket. (Laughter.)

This is the last attempt of the "Old Man" to save his pants. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Speaker: the women of this land, who do not want the suffrage, are entitled to be heard on this floor and at the ballot box. Their case has seldom been adequately stated. Fear among men, I regret to say, has usually prevented its statement—fear of alienating votes. I have stated their case without fear. My personal regret is that a statement of the case wears the aspect of hostility to women and the suffrage. But no thoughtful person will say that this is so, for I have taken the position occupied by Mr. Roosevelt, which is that those whose status is to be changed shall themselves vote upon the question, democratically. In taking this position I am aware that many antisuffragists do not concur, believing that men alone should settle this question; but in a democracy it should be evident to any man that society could not long withstand even a twenty-five percent demand for the ballot. A ten percent today is quite sufficient to embarrass legislators and arouse their fears.

Mr. Speaker: I love masculine men and feminine women—not women of the rostrum, not senatorial ladies who cross their limbs in political wigwams. I love those women whose functions are so beautifully described in Byron's tragedy of Sardanapalus:

"The first of human life is drawn from woman's breast,  
Our first small words are taught us at her knee,  
And our last sighs are too often breathed out in a woman's hearing, when others have fled the ignoble  
Task of watching beside him who led them."

