

# Equal Rights

VOL. XII, No. 1  
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,  
FEBRUARY 14, 1925



**Delegation of Members and Officers of the Woman's Party who appeared before the House  
Judiciary Committee in the National Capitol on February 4 in behalf of  
the Lucretia Mott Amendment**

## Feminist Notes

### Woman's Position in the Philippines

THE women of the Philippines, in all matters relating to the household, are conceded to be the business heads. The Filipino husband is said usually to act under his wife's direction in embarking upon or carrying out any important business enterprise. In the purchase or sale of a home it is nearly always the woman who conducts negotiations and closes the matter. But politics is left entirely to men and every bill to extend suffrage to women has so far been tabled in the legislature without much dissatisfaction over the matter. Governor Wood has strongly recommended suffrage, but the feeling toward him is such that his support of a measure is more likely to hurt than to help.

### French Political Parties Favor Equality

ALTHOUGH equal suffrage in France is still in the future, women are eligible to membership on equal terms with men in the People's Democratic Party, formed in June, 1920, and composed mostly of prominent Catholics. The Republican Socialist Party has always admitted men and women on terms of equality and adopted a women's political rights plank almost unanimously at its national convention in 1924. Other political parties open to women are the Republican Federation, the Republican Democratic Party, the Democratic Party, the Radical Socialist Party, the League of the Young Republic and the Socialist Party. The Federation de la Seine has appointed a commission, headed by Mme. Marguerite Durand, to investigate women's affairs.

### Still Unaccustomed to Women Lawyers

THAT some things considered here scarce worthy of notice may be new and strange in other countries is again illustrated by the fact that within the present year a woman appeared for the first time to conduct a case in the Southwestern Police Court of London. To the surprise of the magistrate she did her work well and received his congratulations. On this side of the ocean it will be a surprise to many that such an event should be considered new or strange anywhere in the English-speaking world, and that there should be a magistrate who would look upon such a matter as anything else than a matter of course.

### Educational Opportunities in Cuba

THE first school of commerce for women in Cuba has just been established.

### Italy Again in Doubt

PREMIER MUSSOLINI, Italy's dictator, is reported as wobbling in his attitude toward woman suffrage. He promised municipal suffrage to the Italian Feminist Association after the International Women's Congress in 1923, and he has a bill for that purpose now pending in the Italian Parliament. He has, however, been so sharply criticized by the opposition, including many of the Fascist party, that his attitude has become doubtful. A parliamentary commission to which the matter has been referred is divided with the majority opposed. It is now considered uncertain whether Mussolini will withdraw the measure or insist that the Fascist deputies approve regardless of their personal views.

### The Queen of Roumania for Suffrage

A LETTER commending the equal suffrage movement and equality in political, civil, social and economic affairs has been sent by the Queen of Roumania to Mme. de Ruess Jancoulescu, president of the National Suffragist Party of Roumania. The letter has been sent, according to *El Suffragista* of Cuba, to all the suffragist parties of the world united in "The International Alliance of Woman Suffragists, composed of 49 nations.

### Cuban Suffragists a Unit for Equal Rights

THE first plank in the platform of the Partido Nacional Suffragista of Cuba declares not only for the promotion of woman suffrage, but for "all those reforms of the civil code which are necessary to the establishment among men and women of real political, civil, economic and social equality."

### Missouri's Lone Woman Legislator

MISS EMMA KNELL, the only woman member of the Missouri Legislature, has already distinguished herself in two ways, although there may be difference of opinion as to whether these ways are creditable. She has so far refrained from making a speech, and has also refrained from introducing any bills. She declares that there are too many laws on the statute books already and does not wish to add to their number, although if convinced of the need of any measure declares herself willing to introduce it. As to speechmaking, there does not seem to be such a scarcity of that as to make her feel duty bound to add to the supply. She will, however, take part in discussion when there is occasion to do so.

### Equalization of Teachers' Salaries

EQUALIZATION of the pay of women teachers in the Baltimore high schools is at last on the way toward actual accomplishment. The School Board has suggested it and awaits the approval of the Board of Estimates, the local body which passes on all public expenditures. If approved there will be some heavy increases in salaries, and some not so heavy. In one case a teacher occupying a very responsible place will have her salary increased from \$1740 to \$2700. In another the annual increase will be only \$60. The movement is not really the work of the School Board, but is due to an act of the Legislature, which requires that women teachers in the high schools be given the same pay as men. It was one of the few equal rights measures which the Legislature could be prevailed upon to pass.

### Credit Improperly Given

ATTORNEY-GENERAL OTTINGER of New York was given considerable credit when he appointed a woman, Miss Amy Wren of Brooklyn, as one of his assistants. It seems now that those who gave him such credit may have cause to reconsider. After holding the place for two weeks Miss Wren handed in her resignation on the ground that she had been given "the meanest and lowest paid job" it was within the Attorney-General's power to bestow. Her pay was \$3500, while all other deputies received more. Her position was in fact not one requiring legal training, but merely equivalent to that of chief file clerk. What she held to be the worst indignity of all was that she was required to punch a time clock on leaving or entering the office. The male assistants were not compelled to do this.

### Women for Chicago Council

THREE women are candidates for the office of city councilman in Chicago at the election to be held on February 24. They are Rev. Rowena Morse Brown, a Unitarian minister and a most eloquent speaker; Mrs. Irene M. Lefkow, an attorney, and Mrs. Frank Townley Brown, best known as a club woman.

### Dawn in Egypt

FROM Egypt comes the report that prominent Egyptian and French women are making arrangements to publish a feminist periodical in both Arabic and French. An Egyptian women's club is also reported to be in process of formation.

## Delegates Enjoy Banquet

AS a festive and inspirational relaxation from the exacting work of conducting two Congressional hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment, and attending two hearings by the opposition to the amendment—who dared not oppose the principle of equality—the delegates attending the hearings and members of the District of Columbia Branch and their guests met at dinner at the Grace Dodge Hotel on Thursday, February 5. Mrs. Marjorie Miller Whittemore, secretary of the Michigan State Branch, was toastmistress.

A silent toast was drunk to Alice Paul, absent to complete her work for her master of laws degree, and now in Europe for a short rest.

Sue White, James L. O'Donnell of the International Molders' Union, Edith Houghton Hooker, Ruby A. Black, Gail Laughlin, Florence Bayard Hilles and Mrs. John Jay White were among the speakers.

Miss White pointed out the fact that the legal discriminations against women have their root in age-old customs, and she welcomed the feminists who are not yet members of the Woman's Party as powerful allies. "Thousands of women the world over," she said, "are not yet enrolled in the organized feminist move-

ment, but they are doing their part toward changing public opinion."

Mr. O'Donnell declared that labor is not really opposed to equal rights—"not the rank and file of labor," he said. "Labor is not so much misinformed about equal rights as it is uninformed. See that they know what equal rights means, and they will be your best allies."

"You and I can knock the arguments for protective legislation into a cocked hat in thirty minutes if we show the men the real effect of so-called 'protective' legislation. When women first went into industry men tried to drive them out. Then, when they could not do that, they began to hedge them about with restrictions to cripple them in competition. But these tactics, combined with negligence in organizing women, serve only to make potential scabs of women."

"The leaders do not represent the American Federation of Labor. We do our own thinking and our own acting. The president and the executive council of the American Federation of Labor cannot dictate what we think. The number seeing the fallacy in so-called protective legislation is growing. When the subject was presented on its merits in my union, and we took a vote on it after the debate, only two dissenting votes were

cast against the resolution we adopted endorsing the Equal Rights Amendment.

"You women in the Woman's Party can get your message to labor. What I admire about you is your persistence and your singleness of purpose. With those qualities you can get the American Federation of Labor as your ally."

Miss Black maintained that the strength of the equal rights movement lay in what she called "the frustrated lives" of women. She told of her own work in the field of journalism and showed that opportunities, especially those "at the top," were not open to women on equal terms with men. "From their own disappointments, from their own difficulties in the economic struggle," she said, "women came to recognize the importance of organized work for equal rights. Only by the passage of the Lucretia Mott Amendment can women be assured fair play in earning a livelihood."

Mabel Vernon, executive secretary of the Woman's Party, raised \$500 at the dinner toward the support of the campaign.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of the Homemakers' Council, was in charge of the dinner and provided a delicious menu.

## Discriminations in Government Service

EXAMPLES of discriminations against women in the government service were given by Miss Jessie Dell, new chairman of the Government Workers' Council of the Woman's Party, at the regular Sunday afternoon meeting held at National Headquarters under the auspices of the District of Columbia Branch on February 1.

"We are told that men deserve more pay than women because the men are ambitious enough to go to the night schools in Washington to improve their education," Miss Dell said, "but I have noticed that when the men finish their education, they leave the government service, whereas the women remain after their graduation and give the government the benefit of their increased ability."

Miss Dell told of a woman who was getting only \$3,000 a year for a job that was much less valuable than that of a man who was getting \$7,000 a year. She also told of the refusal of the Department of Justice to permit the transfer of a woman from the War Department to do the same kind of work in the Department of Justice. She was told by the appointment officer that no women would be admitted to that particular office of the De-

partment of Justice, and was further told that he thought no woman was worth the salary she was getting—\$1,900! When an influential friend wrote to the Department on her behalf, protesting against this discrimination, the appointment officer replied that he would not admit women to the office for which she was an applicant because the job might require that its holder leave town on an hour's notice. At this the woman said, "I'll get that job, for I have been leaving town to go to distant places in the field on much less notice than that in the job I now have."

But she did not get it.

Miss Dell plead for recognition of the dignity and the value of the government service, and protested against President Coolidge's attitude toward salaries for men and women in the employ of the government.

Mrs. Laura Berrien, former chairman of the Government Workers' Council, said, "The only place in the government service where women have equal opportunity with men is in getting low-paid positions. The only place where they have more opportunity than the men is in keeping low-paid positions."

"But it is our own fault. We do not protest enough. Women should make articulate demands for equality in the government service in opportunity, appointment, assignment, title, promotion and pay. Only we women in the government service can bring about that equality. We must furnish information to the Woman's Party so that it can help us, and we must demand our rights."

Miss Berrien read an invitation from the Susan B. Anthony Foundation to the Woman's Party and all its members to attend a celebration of the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony at the Congregational Church, Tenth and G streets N. W., Washington, at 8 o'clock on the evening of February 15. Members were requested to wear regalia.

Miss Edith Ainge, one of the vice-presidents of the Woman's Party, spoke of the Declaration of Sentiments of the Woman's Rights Convention in 1848, and said that today we are asking for the remaining points of equality demanded by those pioneers, only one—that of equal suffrage—having been granted in the seventy-seven years since that convention.

# Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN  
of the  
**National Woman's Party**  
Capitol Hill  
Washington, D. C.

Published weekly  
at 19 West Chase Street  
Baltimore, Md.

Edith Houghton Hooker, Editor  
Dora G. Ogle, Business Manager

Associate Editors:

- |                           |                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Nina E. Allender          | Rebecca Hourwich        |
| Zoe Beckley               | Ruth Hale               |
| Brenda Euland Benedict    | Ines Haynes Irwin       |
| Ruby A. Black             | Ada Davenport Keudall   |
| Elsaine Sterne Carrington | Katherine Leckie        |
| Lucia Chamberlain         | Hazel MacKaye           |
| Mabel Potter Daggett      | Edna St. Vincent Millay |
| Phyllis Duganne           | Ruth Pickering          |
| Crystal Eastman           | Alice Rohe              |
| Ernestine Evans           | Maryse Rutledge         |
| Rose Feld                 | Miriam Finn Scott       |
| Zona Gale                 | Doris Stevens           |
| Heleen Davenport Gibbons  | Sophie Treadwell        |
| Jean Grayson              | Mary Winsor             |

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,  
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 A Year

### OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Lincoln 1886

- President, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.  
 Vice-Presidents, Alice Paul, N. J.  
 Doris Stevens, N. Y.  
 Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N. Y.  
 Margaret Whittemore, Cal.  
 Mrs. J. D. Wilkinson, La.  
 Myrtle Cain, Minn.
- Chairman National Council, Elsie Hill, Conn.  
 First Vice-Chairman, Gail Laughlin, Cal.  
 Second Vice-Chairman, Edith Alnge, N. Y.  
 Secretary, Aulta Pollitzer, S. C.  
 Treasurer, Sheldon Jackson, D. C.  
 Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.  
 Executive Secretary, Mabel Vernon, Del.  
 Finance Chairman, Sarah Pell, N. Y.  
 Headquarters Chairman, Evelyn Wainwright, D. C.  
 Headquarters Director, Martha Souder, Pa.  
 Hdqrs. Furnishing Ch'n, Florence Bayard Hillis, Del.  
 Organization Chairman, Laura Cramer, Mich.
- Anne Archbold, Me. Dora Lewis, Pa.  
 Florence B. Boeckel, D. C. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.  
 Mrs. R. J. Caldwell, N. Y. Dora G. Ogle, Md.  
 Lavinia Egan, La. Helen E. Scott, Md.  
 Zona Gale, Wis. Lois Warren Shaw, N. H.  
 Sara Grogan, Ga. Dr. Caroline Spencer, Colo.  
 Edith Houghton Hooker, Md. Amelia Himes Walker, Md.  
 Ines Haynes Irwin, N. Y. Florence B. Whitehouse, Me.  
 Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal. Mary Winsor, Pa.

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY**

Annual Dues.....	\$10.00
Associate Members.....	\$1.00
Subscribing Members.....	\$3.00
Founders.....	\$100.00
Life Members.....	\$1,000.00
Endowers.....	\$5,000.00
Sustainers.....	\$5,000.00

**OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY**  
 To remove all forms of the subjection of women.

**THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT**  
 "Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."  
 "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"  
 [ Senate Joint Resolution Number 21.  
 House Joint Resolution Number 75. ]

Introduced in the Senate, December 10, 1923,  
 by SENATOR CHARLES E. CURTIS.  
 Introduced in the House of Representatives,  
 December 13, 1923,  
 by REPRESENTATIVE D. R. ANTHONY.

## Knock and It Shall Be Opened

IT is almost with a sigh of regret that we record that the first hearing on the Equal Rights Amendment that ever was held in America before a Congressional Committee is over. There will be other hearings and we may all participate in them again, but never more will there be a "first" hearing from now 'till the end of the world. It was an extraordinary occasion. Possibly the most remarkable thing about it being the sense of life, palpitant, glowing, immortal, that hung in the air. The speakers presented the various aspects of the subject, calmly, rationally, without undue emotional concern; they spoke as it is fitting to speak before a judicial body, but their words filled the room as with a golden mist presaging a new day. The faces of the listeners, of the ever courteous members of the committee, lighted up as the argument proceeded, as if actually in practical fact, the dawn of a new era was flooding into their eyes.

There was a majesty about it, impalpable overwhelming. The immortal plea for liberty, rephrased, wholly modern, but invincible, vital, of intimate and universal concern. Everyone in the room, no matter what their years, was for the moment young. They were part of a great onward sweeping movement and their faces were turned in faith, in hope, in confidence toward the wide vista of the future.

It was a moment such as one experiences when on a mountain top the mist lifts suddenly and one beholds the glorious panorama of range and lake and stream.

Outside young hands were knocking at the door. Erect, strong, confident, women released from the long slumber of the ages, stood upright and serene, claiming their equal right to freedom. Already one could hear the grating of the rusty hinges, sense the exultant moment when the door of opportunity would swing open wide.

## Protective Legislation a Misnomer

THE human argument for equal rights was never better phrased than when Mrs. Mary Murray, ticket agent of the B. M. T. R. R. Co. spoke before the Senate Judiciary Committee. We present her appeal in her own words as being a graphic comment on protective legislation. Mrs. Murray began her statement by telling how she had been left a young widow with five children to support and how she worried constantly at her day-time job.

"Every time a fire engine passed I wondered if my children were in a burning house," she said. "Every time a police patrol passed or an ambulance I wondered if my children had been in an accident. When meal time came I wondered if they were being properly fed and not left to go hungry. The worry interfered with my work. I could not put forth my best efforts. Finally I took a night job. I was able to be with them during their waking hours, to give them a mother's care and companionship. I watched them, tended to their meals, ministered to their wants, cared for their clothing, developed their characters. I learned to know them by heart. In the evening I saw them safely in bed before I left home, with careful instructions on whom to call in case of sickness or accident. I was able to work free from worry. I got home early enough to get a few hours' rest, to prepare their breakfasts, to get them off to school and snatch a few hours' rest. I felt free. Imagine then my consternation when this new State law in New York took away my freedom. I was not allowed to work after ten o'clock at night. I was to be thrown back again into my state of worry.

"It was only because we were strong enough to organize as women and go to the State Legislature and get our branch of occupation exempted from the night work law that I was enabled to return to my job. But what of the thousands of women who cannot organize for exemption, who must obey the law, and relinquish the jobs of their choice—the jobs where the remuneration is greater—at the time when their children are less in need of their care, less a source of worry?

"Protective legislation merely protects women out of their jobs. The whole industrial field should be open to competition on a fair basis and not be restricted by sex."

## The Congressional Hearings

By Ruby A. Black

THOSE present in Washington during the history-making week of February 1-7 could not fail to feel that great advances toward the complete liberation of women were made during the series of hearings before the House Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Equal Rights.

The House Judiciary Committee manifested great interest in the legal aspects of writing the principle of equality into the Constitution of the United States, and plied Burnita Shelton Matthews, chairman of the Legal Research Department of the National Woman's Party, with questions on current discriminations against women in the laws of the United States and the individual States. Mrs. Matthews' lucidity, accuracy and readiness in answering all legal questions seemed to make a deep impression on the lawyers who constitute the Judiciary Committees.

The subcommittee of the Senate, of which Senator Ernst of Kentucky is chairman, displayed more concern with the industrial question than with the legal question. Senator Ernst and Senator Shortridge of California (Senator Walsh of Montana being absent) both indicated early in the hearing that they favored the removal of all legal discriminations against women except the laws restricting women in industry. They asked many questions of Mrs. Matthews and Miss Gail Laughlin, all concerned with the attitude of the Woman's Party toward the so-called "protective legislation."

WOMEN who had been in the early fight for suffrage compared and contrasted the attitude toward Equal Rights with the attitude toward suffrage when it was first introduced. While the same arguments are being advanced against Equal Rights as were advanced against suffrage and against opening colleges to women, legislators are eager for information on all aspects of Equal Rights, while they either violently opposed suffrage, or ridiculed it when the first hearings on suffrage were held.

At both hearings Miss Maud Younger, congressional chairman of the Woman's Party, pointed out that when the first Declaration of Sentiments was made at the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, the demand for full equality was made by those pioneer women. She said:

"In appearing before your committee for the first hearing in history in favor of an Equal Rights Amendment, I am impressed by the fact that it was nearly sixty years ago since Congress was first asked to act on this subject. When the Fourteenth Amendment was under dis-

cussion, the Equal Rights Society, led by Susan B. Anthony and others, asked Congress to wipe out discriminations against sex as well as against race. This was not done. It remains for the men of this generation to do justice to women.

"For three-quarters of a century women have worked in the States to remove the discriminations in the laws. For the past few years the Woman's Party has been active in the States introducing specific bills for the removal of specific discriminations. Though many of the discriminations have been removed, many still remain and new ones are constantly springing up. In order to remove all discriminations once and for all, and to prevent new ones, the Woman's Party urges the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

"It is in effect a mandate to the States to equalize their laws. Nothing impairs the powers of the States to enact any laws they wish or to adopt any standard of equality that they wish except that the principle of equality must be substituted in the State laws for the old common-law attitude toward women."

MABEL VERNON, executive secretary of the Woman's Party, after a brief resume of the work of the Woman's Party culminating in the Equal Rights Amendment, and pronouncing it a mere continuation of the struggle for Equal Rights that started with the first introduction of the woman movement, said:

"It makes no difference whether you members of the Judiciary Committee express yourselves for or against this measure—every one of you must recognize the inevitability of its success. It is just as inevitable that this principle of the equality of men and women will be written into the Constitution of the United States as it was certain that suffrage would be eventually gained by the women of this country. You could not possibly defeat this measure for all time, but it does lie within your power to speed its success."

Mrs. Nelson Whittemore of Detroit spoke on maternity legislation and mothers' pensions at the House Judiciary hearing.

"I am from the State of Michigan, where gentlemen tell us we live under the most ideal conditions. Nevertheless, these same gentlemen profess astonishment when they learn of some of the inequalities which are prevalent. For instance, mothers and fathers are not equal guardians of their own children. In the last Legislature, and again in this one, we are introducing a bill which, if passed, will give to mothers an equal share of the

services and earnings of minor children. This covers questions of injury as well. When now the mother has no right even to institute suit for the injury of the child if the father is alive and the natural normal provider of the family. Under the old English common law which operates in Michigan the father is the sole guardian. Several States have no equal guardianship laws whatever—Rhode Island, for instance. Virginia offers the most amusing spectacle, providing, of course, one's sense of humor is sufficiently developed. In 1916 the State of Virginia passed an Equal Guardianship Law, a very good and much-needed law, and the State operated under it for three years. Then in 1919 three men were appointed to revise the laws of Virginia. The following Legislature adopted the laws as revised and later discovered that the Equal Guardianship Law had been revised out of it, so that now Virginia has no Equal Guardianship Law whatever.

"Which is, gentlemen, another reason why we are appearing before you today asking for a Federal amendment to the United States Constitution. What Legislatures can grant they can also take away, and the position of women will be forever fluctuating until this great question has been taken care of, once and for all, by the passage of the Lucretia Mott Amendment.

"For sheer impertinence the State of Florida deserves a reward. That State allows a statute to remain on its books saying that for the death of a child by accident the father may recover damages for the mental pain and anguish of the mother as well as for the injury to his child.

"ONLY recently, after the disaster of your Knickerbocker Theatre here, a fine young man of 17, an athlete in the pink of condition, was instantly killed. He was survived by a mother and father. Three months later the father died. When the mother appeared in court to collect damages for the death of her son, her case was thrown out because of a statute in the District of Columbia, viz: that only the nearest of kin can sue for damages, and that at the time of the death of her son the father was alive and he alone could be considered the nearest of kin.

"There is also anxiety on the part of some people as to the fate of the so-called mothers' pensions which have been instituted in many States. The name is in itself a misnomer, as the pension is for the child, and in no way for the mother. Pensions are paid for the care of the children to fathers incapacitated by ill-

ness or serving sentence in the penitentiary, or in any way unable to care for their family. Certainly men can receive the same benefit as women, inasmuch as the money is paid by the State for its wards."

Mrs. Matthews then pointed out the disabilities under which women exist in many of the States and answered questions concerning them.

During Mrs. Matthews' exposition of the legal status of women before the House Judiciary Committee an amusing interlude was provided by Chairman Graham. Mrs. Matthews had stated the discriminations against women in the immigration law, showing that the foreign wife of an American man may be brought into the United States exempt from the quota law, while the foreign husband of an American woman is not exempted from the quota provision.

"But," interrupted Representative Graham, "you forget that when an American woman marries a foreigner, she ceases to be an American citizen."

This error on the part of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, through whose hands the Cable Bill must have passed before it became a law, was greeted with merry laughter throughout the well-filled committee room. Mrs. Matthews and several of Representative Graham's colleagues on the committee informed him that the Cable Bill providing that marriage does not affect citizenship has been in effect nearly two years.

During Mrs. Matthews' entire testimony the committee displayed a fine spirit of give and take, of humor and of desire for information. Nearly every Representative asked about conditions in his own State.

MRS. MATTHEWS pointed out that Blackstone considered these discriminations against women in the control of their property, their children and their persons were in the interest of women, just as the advocates of welfare legislation claim their pet measures are "protective." She quoted his summing up of the disabilities of women, particularly married women, under the common law. Blackstone ended his summary with the comment, " \* \* \* so great a favorite of the law is woman."

"That is a man's point of view. We still hear it from our fathers, our brothers and our husbands. But what I am giving you is the woman's point of view," she said.

Mrs. Mary Murray, president of the Women's League of the Brooklyn, Manhattan Transit Company, member of the Industrial Council of the National Woman's Party, which consists of more than a thousand working women in Greater New York, spoke to both committees for the industrial group. She said, in part:

"One of the great objections to the

Equal Rights Bill lies in the fact that it demands justice for working women. It demands that working women be given an equal chance with men to compete in the labor market for their livelihood.

"Those who oppose the Equal Rights Bill because of its demand for industrial equality for women are fearful, they say, that it will injure that wonderful structure called protective legislation for women. They are not fearful of this result because they themselves seek protection within sheltering arms. Oh, no—they are not nor will not be affected by this legislation. If told that they were to come under its laws or provisions, they would rend the air with their howls of protest. They are asking for it for other women, for us women in industry, not for themselves. They are trying to make our legislators believe that we women in industry are a class of weaklings, a special class of creatures devoid of both moral strength and physical stamina, totally unfit, mentally, morally and physically, to decide for ourselves, to judge between right and wrong, good and bad.

"**W**OMEN in industry are bitterly opposed to protective legislation because protective legislation deprives us women of a chance to compete with men for our living. Protective legislation makes a criminal of an employer if he keeps a woman five minutes over eight hours, no matter what the emergency. He is liable to a heavy fine or imprisonment. If a law prohibits women from working overtime or before or after a certain hour and places no such restrictions upon men, obviously men have the advantage over women when seeking employment, and this protective legislation, which has been advertised throughout the States to benefit women, proves a cruel handicap. Protective legislation, just five years ago, threw thousands of women out of work in Brooklyn and New York City, three thousands off the railroads, many out of candy stores, ice-cream parlors, drug stores, elevator work, restaurants, newsstands—widows with dependents, women with invalid husbands, sons or daughters, and women who had acquired good-for-nothing husbands and were forced to become the breadwinners of the family—thrown out of work in the name of protecting their health and their morals. Many did not know where their next month's rent was coming from, many the price of their next meal. Where did these women go? What became of them?

"Women work for precisely the same reason as men—to earn for themselves and their dependents clothing, food and lodging. If they do not work, they must starve, accept charity or live in prostitution. Now we working women are intelligent enough to know that good health and good morals are derived from good food and lack of worry. But we

also know only too well that the only way we can get all those good things for which we have to pay the same price as the men is to have an equal chance with the men to earn the price. Isn't it strange that the same women who are asking for protective legislation are also demanding full political equality in civil law, and in their demand they say that a woman can hold three or four jobs, can take care of her home, her children, her business, and go throughout the States spellbinding, looking for votes, accept a little job like Senator, Congressman or commissioner, of which we now have several—all receiving the same salary as men, the duties of which will not only take them from their homes and children nights and days, but weeks, at a time.

"Yes, they say a woman can do all this, but if a woman goes into a store, factory or shop to work for a wage, they cry out that she changes her status as a woman. She becomes a weakling. She must be put in the class with children, a subject for laws and regulations that make her of as little value to her employer as a child 16 years of age."

**A**T the Senate subcommittee hearing Mrs. Whittemore told the story of why the Woman's Party undertook the campaign to remove all discriminations against women in law and in custom.

"When we met in 1921, after the suffrage amendment was ratified, we invited all the national women's organizations to describe their programs to us. We found that there were organizations devoted to everything but the improvement of the status of women. We found that they knew all about problems of health, all about child problems, all about educational problems. But none of them knew what the status of women was.

"So, though we were tired after our long and arduous suffrage campaign, and we should have liked to go to our own homes and our own businesses, we felt that we must find definitely where women stood. We had thought that the job was done when we got suffrage. But in my own State of Michigan we found that we had to make a fight through all the courts to prove that women could hold public office. We found that women could not sit in the Legislature of Iowa. We then asked many lawyers if they could tell us the exact status of women. None of them had made digests of the law for this information.

"So we immediately organized our research department so that we could know the exact status of women. When that work was sufficiently under way, we saw that we still had a great task before us in removing legal discriminations against women as well as the disabilities and disadvantages custom places upon us."

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, Chairman of the Homemakers' Council of the Woman's

Party, said: "We are proud that so many women now stand for the great principle of justice. No matter who is against us, so great a principle cannot fail. In June our paid membership was 8000. We have only picked up the torch handed to us by the pioneers of this great fight.

"I am a homemaker. There are many homemakers in the Woman's Party. The home is the unit of society, the last line of defense of the nation. We homemakers furnish the power-house from which the workers go out to their tasks. We have passed through the transition stage of protection. We now demand that women be given the opportunity to reach their full stature as human beings."

MRS. FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES of Wilmington, Del., told the Senate subcommittee of her experience while she was interested in "protective" legislation.

"I was legislative chairman of the Consumers' League in Delaware," she said, "and active in the Women's Trade Union League. In the Consumers' League we tried to get a 44-hour week for women in industry. We did not ask the working women if they wanted the 44-hour week. In fact, the women employed on the Pennsylvania Railroad opposed the measure, and asked us not to advocate it, as they would lose their jobs if it was passed. But we paid no attention to that. The 44-hour week was part of the program sent us by the executive council in New York, and we tried to get it adopted, in spite of the working women's protests. I am now glad to say that we failed. This opened my eyes seriously to the fact that protective legislation eliminates equal opportunity for women in industry.

"Now the same women who protested against the ranking of women with minors as far as voting was concerned are trying to thrust wage-earning women into the class with minors, and keep them there."

Mrs. Hilles added that if the Ohio "protective" laws had been in force in France, the Women's Committee for the Restoration of Devasted France, of which she was a member, could not have done the work it did there. She pointed out that, while Colorado woman may and do study mining engineering in the Colorado College of Mines, women may not work in mines in that State, except in office work. She explained the Woman's Party's conviction that pay should be based on occupation, not on sex.

Mrs. Clarence M. Smith of New York City, New York State Chairman of the National Woman's Party, championed the plan of a Federal amendment as opposed to piece-meal or State legislation. She said, in part:

"It would take 75 years to secure Equal

Rights through the State method. In New York three years ago we women introduced twenty-five bills amending specific laws and four were passed. Last year we introduced twenty-three bills. Four were passed. At this session we have eleven more bills in the Legislature. We don't know their fate.

"In addition, women have to be constantly watching that the rights obtained from previous Legislatures are not taken away, as in the case of laws in Virginia and North Dakota. Plans are now afoot to repeal the equal pay for equal work law affecting teachers in New York.

"The fear has been expressed that this amendment will throw the State courts into confusion. The same thing was said about the suffrage amendment. In reality, each State harmonized its laws by supplementing laws to meet the new law without difficulty.

"In New York equal rights laws deal with equal guardianship and control of children, equal liability for sex offense, equal rights to be appointed administrators of estates, equal rights to sit on juries, equal responsibility for illegitimate children, a woman's right to own her own labor and services and equal rights for women in industry. Eight equal rights bills have passed covering equal inheritance and guardianship rights, equal pay for equal work for teachers, and equal responsibility under the poor law for the support of needy husbands and children, and they have created no confusion in the courts. The few States having restrictive laws for women in industry can equalize them by making them apply to men as well. Oregon has such a law pronounced constitutional by the United States Supreme Court. There are many test cases in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act, but no one suggests that it should not have been passed for that reason.

"**T**HOSE oppressing us say they believe specific laws should be passed in the States, but that a national amendment should not be passed. In New York not a single organization appearing now in opposition to the Federal amendment has supported any specific State equal rights bill, with the exception of jury service for women. In 1923 several of these organizations appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee of the New York Legislature declaring they believed in the principle of Equal Rights, but opposed all of the twenty-two or more separate equal rights bills then under consideration, four of which were passed."

"They say that 'Equal Rights' is a vague term," said Mrs. Matthews, who appeared next. "So are 'liberty,' 'privileges' and 'immunities,' but these appear in the Constitution without causing great confusion."

Miss Gail Laughlin of Portland, Maine, and San Francisco, most prominent and well-known woman lawyer in the country, argued the case for the amendment from the standpoint of women in business and the professions as well as in industry. Miss Laughlin was the founder and first president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, a brilliant advocate of woman suffrage, and one of the most eloquent upholders of Equal Rights. Miss Laughlin pointed out the difficulties which women had to overcome to gain admission into the professions and business, and contended that even now, after they have found their way in, they labor under many disadvantages of prejudice which the principle of equality, when written into the Constitution, will tend to erase.

"**W**HEN the Woman's Party was favoring a Federal amendment for suffrage instead of tedious State action, those who opposed it said that they represented a majority of the women of the country. If they did, that majority became a minority in an amazingly short time. The organizations which now say that they represent millions of women opposed to the Lucretia Mott Equal Rights Amendment have not put the question to their membership. Their executive councils have decided that the millions of women they represent oppose it. I belong to several of the organizations listed as opposing the amendment, and I know that no poll has ever been taken of the membership of these organizations to see whether or not they favor the amendment. They have not even been given the opportunity to study the question.

"It is time we knew the effect of this legislation masking as 'protective.' It is not a protection. It is a handicap. It relegates women to the undesirable jobs that no man wants. It cripples them in competition for a job. Any employer will take a man unhampered by restrictive legislation rather than a woman so hampered. It forces women to become clock-watchers, and it is an axiom of business that the clock-watcher does not advance to higher positions.

"Legislation that applies to special classes, not to persons, closes the door of opportunity to the classes it is directed against. So-called 'protective legislation' actually puts women into the less healthy jobs, because it keeps them in lower positions."

In response to a question from Senator Shortridge as to whether or not there were "eternal laws" differentiating men from women and requiring special legislation for women, Miss Laughlin said:

"We have no desire to repeal eternal laws. But we want to eliminate the limited human view of eternal laws that has

been woefully wrong. We cannot evade an eternal law. We need no human statute to enforce it. If some eternal law prevents women from doing certain things, we do not need a statute prohibiting her from doing it. We want every opportunity open to her so that she is not hindered from doing anything she is able to do.

"I said that this legislation masks as protective. It is protective—to men. It protects men from the competition of women. We are asking a constitutional amendment to forbid discriminations against women. Most of the 'protective' legislation was passed before women had the vote.

"Previous to 1919 there was no organization of business and professional women. In 1920 the National Federation of Business and Professional Women was formed. This federation has from the be-

ginning favored shorter work hours for people, but it has consistently demanded the same standards of hours, conditions and pay for men and women. We do not want women's freedom to contract abrogated at all. The California State Federation of Business and Professional Women adopted resolutions asking that minors be protected, but opposed labor legislation applying to women alone. In their October convention they reiterated this stand and came out for absolute equality in law and in custom.

"It is true, as some of the other speakers have said, that when the Woman's Party was first reorganized it did not intend to touch the industrial legislation now existing. I did not intend to become a member of the Woman's Party unless it did, however, for I had learned in my own work that 'protective' legislation is really hampering legislation.

"Except for the interpretations of the courts we should not need this amendment. The Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed the equal protection of the laws and provided that all persons born or naturalized in the United States were citizens, and that no State should make or enforce any law abridging the privileges and immunities of citizens. But the courts ruled that women, who once were thought to have no souls, and were only recently accorded minds, were not persons. That is why we are asking another mandate guaranteeing equal rights for men and women.

"All we want is a fair field and no favor. We are not asking more, and we shall not be satisfied with less."

Mrs. Murray concluded the Senate subcommittee hearing with a plea for justice for working women.

## News From The Field

**L**EILA ENDERS, chairman of the New Jersey Branch, National Woman's Party, reports that Senate Bill No. 10, an Act prohibiting discrimination on account of sex in the employment of teachers, was reported out of committee favorably in the New Jersey Senate, February 2. This bill was introduced by Senator Mackay of Bergern county.

**H**EADQUARTERS of the Texas Branch of the National Woman's Party have been opened at 404 Maverick Building, San Antonio. The Texas branch is working continuously on four bills to be introduced into the Texas Legislature this year when Texas has its first woman Governor.

The measures being worked for in Texas are: A bill giving married women full contractual rights; an equal guardianship bill; a bill equalizing the legal grounds for divorce, and a constitutional amendment giving women the right to serve on juries.

Mrs. Rena Maverick Green, Texas chairman, and Mrs. Esther Warrick are leading the organization work for the measures.

**A**SERIES of meetings on the measures before the Legislature removing discriminations against women, and on the general Equal Rights program is being held by the Ohio Committee. Meetings have already been arranged in Toledo, Dayton, Cleveland and Columbus. Headquarters have been established at Columbus, and work on the bills is progressing rapidly, writes Janet Hills.

**M**ANY visitors have come to the National Woman's Party Headquarters, 21-23 First street N. E., Washington, recently in search of information on the progress of the program for Equal Rights.

Among the visitors was Mrs. Ellen Crump, Mississippi State Chairman, who reported increasingly favorable sentiment for Equal Rights in her State. Dr. Lawrence of Massachusetts came to get information on the Equal Rights measures to be introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature. Mrs. A. H. Bright of Minnesota stopped by on her way to Florida to get material on Equal Rights.

Inez Haynes Irwin of New York, eminent feminist and fiction writer, visited Headquarters and helped Maud Younger lobby for the Equal Rights Amendment.

**H**EADQUARTERS for the Pennsylvania State Committee of the National Woman's Party have been established at the Woman's Club, 101 South Front street, Harrisburg, for two months. Assemblywoman Pitts has introduced the equal guardianship bill into the State Legislature. The other four Pennsylvania bills will be introduced by Assemblyman Sowers.

**W**ORK in Colorado for measures removing discriminations against women shows continued progress, according to Mrs. Bertha Fowler and Dr. Caroline Spencer. Dr. Margaret Long, a veteran worker with the Woman's Party, is now with the Colorado Committee.

**T**HE California Branch of the National Woman's Party has established headquarters at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. There a deputation met Mrs. Florence Prag Kahn, candidate for the United States Congress to succeed her husband, the late Congressman Julius Kahn, and discussed the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Governor Richardson, with whom Mrs. Genevieve Allen, California organizer, has held conferences, evinces great interest in the equal rights measures to be introduced into the California Legislature.

**A**N "Equal Rights Evening" is to be held by the Michigan State Committee in Detroit. The New Bonstell Theater, owned, operated and managed by Jessie Bonstell, has been obtained for the evening, and the proceeds of the play will go toward the support of the work. Following the play, a late supper and ball will be held. Speeches on Equal Rights will be made between acts. Miss Bonstell is deeply interested in the Woman's Party, particularly in the Actresses' Council, of which Minnie Maddern Fiske is chairman.

**La Zelle—Hats**  
1417 U Street  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
Specializing in Remodeling and Copying  
Hats Out of the Ordinary  
Gowns Remodeled

**DAY PRINTING COMPANY**  
Printers  
LIGHT AND LOMBARD STREETS  
Entrance on Balderston Street  
BALTIMORE