

# Equal Rights

VOL. XII, No. 6  
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,  
MARCH 21, 1925



Mrs. Florence Prag Kahn

Newly-elected Congresswoman from California, who will serve out the term of her late husband, Congressman Julius Kahn. Mrs. Kahn is a woman of forceful and charming personality and expressed great interest in the Lucretia Mott Amendment when interviewed recently by members of the California Branch of the Woman's Party.

## Feminist Notes

### On the Qui Vive in Finland

FINLAND'S first presidential election is about to be held, with every man and woman entitled to vote who has reached the age of 24. As in the United States the voters cast ballots for electors merely, but these are chosen under a system of proportional representation, so that all parties are assured of representation in the electoral college. As an absolute majority of electors is required for election, and as no party is likely to have the required number, some inducements for coalition will probably have to be offered. Some of the issues at stake are said to be of especial interest to women voters, and these may have a better opportunity of advancing them under the circumstances.

### Something New in New Foundland

A WOMAN suffrage measure is to be submitted to the Legislature by the Premier of New Foundland this month. At least, such is the report which comes from there. To most readers it will be more or less of a surprise to learn that suffrage did not long ago become an accomplished fact in New Foundland, as in Canada and the United States. However, it is encouraging to note that even the backward commonwealths are moving.

### An Old Story Told Anew

THE "servant girl problem" is not an exclusively American institution. At the meeting in January of the women's organizations of Berne, Switzerland, a large part of the discussions was devoted to proposed solutions of this very question. There were the same complaints as in this country about unwillingness of young women to enter domestic service, about preference bestowed on factory jobs, and suggestions were not lacking that "there ought to be a law" to forcibly change matters. This has led a writer in the *Schweizer Frauenblatt* to suggest a remedy which is also heard here occasionally, namely, that hours of labor in domestic work be fixed as in factories, and be no longer. A law arbitrarily limiting hours of hired domestic labor exists in Switzerland, but has had little effect, being generally disregarded.

### Better Late Than Never

THE island of Jersey, in the English Channel, is at least not standing still. Its local Parliament on February 12th finally conferred on married women the right to dispose of their own property. This leaves Quebec as the only part of the British Empire which has failed to take similar action. Jersey thus escapes being at the extreme rear of the procession.

### Working Women and Industrial Accidents

INDUSTRIAL accidents appear to be a close second to protective laws in disabling women for industry. A report by Nelle Swartz, director of New York State's Bureau of Women in Industry, shows that, in spite of compensation laws, even some minor injuries prove a handicap to a large percentage of women. Of 500 cases investigated, only half had been able to return to work at the same wage as before the accident, while more than one-fifth were forced out of industry altogether. The rest were employed at reduced wages.

### Japanese Suffrage Still Lopsided

THE lower house of the Japanese Parliament has at last abolished the property qualification for voting and conferred the franchise on all men over 25, but if sex qualifications have been removed, the news dispatches fail to mention it. In all probability these still remain untouched.

### Financing the Swiss Movement

THE effort in Switzerland to raise funds for the suffrage movement in accordance with the requirement of the Leslie Foundation has resulted up to February 21 in bringing into the war chest the sum of 36 francs. This is the report made by the *Schweizer Frauenblatt*. Of course, there are other contributions being made, but this amount is what has come so far in response to the Leslie offer.

### Coeducation in China

THE first woman student has just been admitted into West China University in the city of Chengtu in the remote province of Szechwan. A dean of women has also been appointed. The belief that Harvard and Columbia Law Schools would summon up sufficient courage to become equally progressive turns out, however, to be premature.

### Some Slow-Coach Nations

WOMEN suffrage in a state of arrested development exists in Argentina if it still exists there at all. As long ago as 1862 the province of San Juan granted municipal suffrage, thus antedating even Wyoming, but Argentina has long been passed in this respect by other nations. France offers another example. Since 1848 she has had a provision in her constitution granting suffrage to all French citizens, but this has been constantly interpreted as excluding women. At the same time a similar provision in regard to taxation has been construed as including women.

### A Proposed Snag for Equal Rights

THOUGH possibly not aimed at the Equal Rights Constitutional Amendment, the Wadsworth-Garrett proposal in Congress to change the procedure of amending the Federal Constitution must necessarily increase the difficulties in the way of securing ratification by the required number of States once the Equal Rights measure will have passed through Congress. In essence the Wadsworth-Garrett measure allows a popular referendum in each State to nullify the act of a Legislature which ratifies an amendment, but does not authorize a referendum to pass on a legislative rejection. Opponents will thus be given two chances in each State to reject and advocates but one to ratify. At present when a Legislature refuses to ratify a proposal a later Legislature may reverse this action. This will be forbidden under the Wadsworth-Garrett proposal, thus enabling a small minority, one-fourth of the States, to block an amendment until it shall receive a second time a two-third's vote in Congress and be resubmitted. Furthermore, it enables defeat of a measure even when more than three-fourths of the States favor it by requiring ratification within eight years of submission. A small but well-disciplined opposition could, through filibustering and jockeying, delay action in one or more Legislatures until the required period had passed.

### One Woman's Record

MISSOURI'S State Industrial Inspection Department has for three years and a half been under the supervision of Mrs. Alice Curtice Moyer-Wing, the first woman to head a department in that State. Her administration has now been heralded by a State newspaper service as "a concrete example of law enforcement," the particular laws in question being those regulating industry and aiming to safeguard workers. Mrs. Moyer-Wing declares that on taking office she had resolved that she "dare not do anything but succeed," since that was essential to a showing "for the sake of other women." She now claims as to her accomplishments: "I am most happy to have contributed one more proof that a woman is as likely to possess the ability to discharge the duties of an important position as her brother."

### Women Tars

THE first ocean steamer to sign women as warrant officers is the President Arthur of the America-Palestine Line. It sailed on March 13th with Miss Rebecca Adelman and Mrs. Bernice Schmitt holding places of minor authority hitherto monopolized by men.

## Mrs. Florence Prag Kahn

THERE are 531 members of our National Congress. Of these members, 529 are men and 2 are women. Thus does sex dominate politics. One of the women is Mrs. Mary Norton, Democrat, of New Jersey, the only woman member elected at the November elections, and the other is Mrs. Florence Prag Kahn, Republican, of California, who was recently elected to fill out the unexpired term of her late husband.

Outside of the Fourth Congressional District of California, which elected Mrs. Kahn to Congress, the impression may prevail that her election was largely a matter of sentiment. In her own district, however, no such idea exists.

Last December in the same district when Congressman Kahn died, after representing the "Fourth" continuously in Congress since 1898, it was undoubtedly

sympathy and sentiment which prompted the movement to have his widow serve out his term.

Since then, however, conditions have changed. Strong opponents came out against Mrs. Kahn, and it was necessary that she put up a real political fight to win. She did. Among other things she went out and made a lot of good political speeches. In them she showed such a comprehensive knowledge of national affairs that the voters forgot about sentiment and voted for her on her merits.

Apropos of her own plans in Washington, Mrs. Kahn says:

"One of the things which I learned during twenty-five years as the wife of a Congressman is not to meet issues until they come up and not to talk too much. Two years hence I expect to go before the same voters who elected me this time and

ask them to re-elect me solely on my record. There is no reason why, just because I am a woman, I should not make an efficient member of Congress. In fact, there is no good reason why women in general can't do just as good work in politics and public office as men. *It is my belief that women as women, to be effective in politics, must have greater numbers—for instance, in Congress if we had enough women members we might have a woman's bloc. But lacking enough members for a bloc, I propose to do the best I can.* Possibly I may do well enough to convince other States that they want to have woman Congress members, too."

The women of America are to be congratulated not only on increasing their representation in Congress 100 per cent. by Mrs. Kahn's election, but also in having so progressive and high-minded a woman in our National Congress.

## The Lucy Stone Pep

By Ruth Pickering

A FEW weeks ago the Lucy Stone League held its fourth annual banquet in the Hotel Pennsylvania. Mrs. Helena Normanton, English barrister, who has kept her own name against great opposition, and who came to America on a passport that bore that name, was the speaker of the evening. What she had to say on the subject of women's surnames has been printed, in part, in EQUAL RIGHTS, and it is not her thorough discussion of the absolute legal right of the woman to that surname through life which I wish to discuss here. What interests me particularly is the Lucy Stone League itself.

Why has this organization, based on the statement of Lucy Stone, "My name is the symbol of my identity and must not be lost," achieved the tremendous amount of publicity that it has, since it was founded four years ago under the clever leadership of Ruth Hale and Jane Grant?

In the first place, there seems to be something comic about the League in the mind of the public. That fact I do not lament, but rather cherish as to our advantage. If the organization seems freakish to many, nevertheless the individual effort to keep one's own name is less and less freakish, because people hearing so constantly from the newspapers, plays, and public speakers of the Lucy Stone League know that more and more women are keeping their names, amusing as it is for the dear ladies to be doing it.

I'm inclined to attribute part of the humor in the situation to that solemn figure of the nineteenth century, William Wordsworth. To the twentieth century the name "Lucy" is un-modern because Wordsworth took it seriously. When one

mentions Lucy Stone, few think of the forceful personality of that woman herself, but of a shy Victorian maiden, which the name of Lucy Stone connotes. Scramblingly funny in conjunction with a group of passionately individualistic, strong-minded women.

Then, too, it is so puzzling to the skeptical that a woman married to a famous man should not prefer to share his lustre rather than wilt in her own obscurity. From our psychology, of course, the more familiar the husband's name is, the more inner necessity we feel for struggling to keep our own individual head bobbing—even if it drift into darkness. That, at least, is a darkness of our own making. Well, now, there is something hilariously incongruous about that. The laugh is on us, because many of us actually do drift into obscurity only to emerge occasionally because we are freaks and laughing stocks. And that's a galling kind of publicity. Nevertheless, the inner necessity remains.

Then, of course, the newspapers pretend that all this fuss about a mere name should be pooh-poohed. But would they be so interested if the pother were not about names? Ah, no! They know and the newspaper readers know what's really interesting in a news story or a social item or whatever, is names. Names fascinate; they have from the beginning of time, because they mean identity and individualism and all the things the members of the Lucy Stone League are fighting for in their various ways. Husband's names mean much to them. That's why they want their wives to carry them.

And that's why there's something subtly insulting to them in the notion that some wives won't. What's the matter with my name? Really, to them, the question is "What's the matter with me?" You see? I and my name are all blended. Needless to say, there's nothing the matter with the husband or his name. The wife simply says, "What's the matter with me and my name?"

Another suggestion of something laughable is the fact that here is a woman—Lucy Stone—with a league behind her. Suppose you had formed a Percy Fleming League, few knowing who Percy Fleming was. That might be slightly amusing, but when the League has a woman's name attached it's really amusing. Amusing as all women leaders of a group always are to men and men's women. Because, forsooth, we stalk the male singly and not in packs, and we are grotesque in any case out of the home or the hotel.

And now, because of all this absurd burlesque about us, everyone in the country knows that women want to keep their own names and are doing it. Ridiculous, perhaps, but certainly simple and easy to understand, though difficult to systematize; childish, perhaps, but certainly not mysterious.

If you want to keep your name after marriage, just do it. Go ahead and try (yes—try). There are no legal obstacles and plenty of precedent. Precedents it has been the function of the Lucy Stone League to make known, and it has done this widely partly through the able journalism of Jane Grant and the courage and persistence of Ruth Hale—and partly because it's all so queer and quaint and laughable. "A Lucy Stone gathers no Boss." This life is a merry one.

# 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 Teland Benedict   | Inez Haynes Irwin       |
| Ruby A. Black            | Ada Davenport Kendall   |
| Elaine 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 Plin Scott       |
| Zona Gale                | Doris Stevens           |
| Elen Davenport Gibbons   | Sophie Treadwell        |
| Joan 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 1366

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, Anita 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 Walnwright, D. C.

Headquarters Director, Martha Souder, Pa.

Hqrs. Furnishing Chrn, Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.

Organization Chairman, Laura Cramer, Mich.

Anne Archbold, Me.

Florence B. Boeckel, D. C.

Mrs. R. J. Caldwell, N. Y.

Lavinia Egan, La.

Zona Gale, Wis.

Sara Grogan, Ga.

Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.

Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.

Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal.

Dora Lewis, Pa.

Sophie G. Meredith, Va.

Dora G. Ogle, Md.

Helen E. Scott, Md.

Lois Warren Shaw, N. H.

Dr. Caroline Spencer, Colo.

Amelia Himes Walker, Md.

Florence B. Whitehouse, Me.

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.

## A New Departure

THE following letter has been sent to Mr. and Mrs. Simon Guggenheim by the National Woman's Party in recognition of their magnificent endowments for fellowships on which no limitations of sex, marriage, race, creed or color are placed:

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Guggenheim:

"It is my purpose to inform you that at a meeting of the Council of the National Woman's Party at Washington on March 2 a resolution was adopted in recognition and gratitude for your recent munificent gift to men and women in the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowships.

"To our knowledge this is the first international scholarship which not only includes women, but married women as well, and of any race, creed or color. As an organization working for equal opportunities for women, we hail with delight the just and generous regulations of your scholarships, and assure you of our gratitude and deep appreciation.

(Signed) "FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES,  
"For the National Woman's Party."

The Guggenheim Scholarships have attracted widespread attention, not only because of their munificence, but also because of their breadth and scope, and their lack of sex limitations, frequent contrasts being made with the Cecil Rhodes Scholarships, which not only are not available for women, but are not available for married men.

The Guggenheim Memorial Foundation provides for scholarships to permit study in foreign countries.

## Taking Sex Out of Politics

MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT of Pennsylvania has recently been quoted in the press as saying, "It is distasteful for me to differentiate between men and women in politics. Men and women should think of their responsibilities at the polls, not as men and not as women, but as human beings and citizens. Those who think alike, be they men or women, should combine their forces to the end that their ideals may be successful."

One important daily has interpreted this statement to mean that "There should be no Woman's Party," but this interpretation is neither born out by the statement nor by the facts. On the contrary, the work of the Woman's Party is essential to putting politics on a non-sex basis.

At the present time when people go to the polls their whole viewpoint is coloured by sex. No matter how superior a woman candidate may be, the mere fact of her sex militates against her. The same situation obtains in nominating caucuses and conventions. Just because a woman is a woman her qualifications for public service through governmental channels are of no avail. No leading party would dare at this juncture to put up a woman, say, for the office of President, even though the leaders in the party were convinced that she would fill the office more efficiently than any male competitor. They would argue, and with justice, that the mere fact of her femininity would prejudice the election.

This fact is well evidenced in the extraordinarily small number of women nominated by political parties for electoral office. It is not possible that the discrepancy between the number of men and women nominated represents an equal discrepancy between the ability of the two sexes in governmental affairs. Take our National Congress, for example. Is it credible that the difference in the proportionate number of men and women constituting that body actually represents the proportionate ability of the two sexes to serve as legislators in national affairs?

Sex dominates politics at every turn in America today. To make the balance true and to eliminate sex from politics it is necessary for the moment to stress precisely what we would prefer to overlook. Other things being equal, we demand that women as women shall be preferred to men until their number is equal, not to instill sex into politics, but to get it out.

Men, just because they are men, are now preferred to women in the whole government service. It is to destroy this sex linked ideology in every sphere of life that the Woman's Party has come into being. The ideal is one thing; its method of achievement is quite another.

## Industrial Hearing at Albany

LAST week New York working women spoke for themselves on the 48-hour bill for women only now pending before the New York State Legislature. This week the second installment of the abridged transcript of the hearing appears as follows:

Mrs. Dorr: We have present three members of the National Woman's Party who wish to present their point of view. I will first call upon Mrs. Clarence M. Smith, Chairman of the New York State Association.

Mrs. Clarence M. Smith: The Woman's Party appears before you today, as it has for the past two years, in defense of the principle of Equal Rights for men and women in industry. We say to you, as we have said before, that we are not in favor of long hours for either men or women in industry, but that we are opposed to any legislation unless it is amended to apply to both men and women. If that is done, women may compete on an equal footing with men in earning their livelihood.

The impression is given here in New York that all organized labor is opposed to equal rights for women in industry. That is not so. Gradually, little by little, owing perhaps to the trend of the times, organized labor in some of the progressive Western States is beginning to see the light. Since appearing here last year, the largest and most important labor unions in the State of Washington have pointed the way for the Eastern labor groups by endorsing Equal Rights for women in industry.

On April 25, 1924, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of St. Paul and Minneapolis passed a resolution asking for Equal Rights for women in industry.

On March 12, 1924, 188 labor unions and working people's societies assembled at the Farmer-Labor Federation in Minnesota, passed a resolution endorsing the equal rights amendment, which included equal rights for women in industry.

This proposed legislation restricting women in industry is based on the claim that women are weaker than men and therefore should be restricted.

In the celebrated case of Muller vs. Oregon, when the ten-hour law for workers was upheld, the Supreme Court was greatly influenced by the alleged physical inferiority of women and especially their inability to remain long on their feet.

Among other authorities cited, we find an elaborate statement by Dr. Ely van der Warker, in the report of the Maine Bureau of Industry and Labor Statistics (1875), to the effect that "woman is badly constructed for the purpose of standing eight or ten hours upon her feet, because

*Editor's Note: On February 27th in the State House at Albany, New York, a joint hearing was held before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees on the bill providing that women and female minors may not work more than 48 hours a week in gainful occupations. We are indebted to the New York State Committee for the transcript of the hearing.*

of the shortness and curve of the legs, and the formation of the knee joint and other physical peculiarities."

Mrs. Smith then cited recent records showing the extraordinary endurance of women dancers, and concluded with "We do not base our claim to equality of labor legislation on the feats of a few female dancing dervishes. But we submit that working women or any other kind of women are not in need of special laws that practically class the whole sex as invalids." (Applause.)

Miss Doris Stevens was the next speaker. She said in part,

"A few moments ago you gentlemen laughed when a woman stood before you and said that she did not object to working longer hours than she now does. You thought it was humorous. I should think you would be ashamed to laugh at the state of industry, the state of women in that industry, so demoralized that these women come before you and say that they do not care how long they work. Here is the point: They would rather work long hours, under undesirable conditions, than to be legislated out of a job. You, with your superior knowledge, could have gotten that from them if you had not laughed at them and twitted them.

"On the one hand, men have owned, operated, promoted, financed industries and have hired, fired and exploited women. On the other hand, there have been the men of organized labor, who will come before you today in support of this bill. The traditional policy of the A. F. of L. and its predecessors throughout the entire existence of organized labor in this country from 1825 to 1925 has been a policy of antagonism, hostility and exclusion. Instead of extending the helping hand, they have kept women out, until women have been the scabs on labor. Women have taken the worst-paid jobs because the A. F. of L. from the earliest times has not genuinely desired to help women.

"You will hear men representatives of labor organizations speak today of their efforts to protect women. I am not concerned with what the employers say about this. Of course they want women to work as long as they will and for as little as possible. *I am concerned with what organized labor has done and will do.* You will find that in the earlier days

organized labor said that work for women in industries 'is not only injurious to women's health, but is a menace to the competition of men.' Later, the labor leaders got more canny, dropped out the fear of competition, and stressed only woman's health. In 1852, when American women in industry were already hard pressed by the influx of aliens from Europe after the revolutions of 1848 and the famine in Ireland in 1851, organized men fostered and secured the passage of the first law to protect women only. (Ohio, 1852, a law to keep women out of industries.)

The crux of the situation, as we see it, is the question of protection for all workers—not for women only; that we shall not always have to be incapacitated in offering our labor to industry, but that we may offer it on the same terms as men. That is the crux of the matter—not how much you can get out of us, but what do you want to produce out of the men and women in industry? Because you men cannot go leaping ahead, leaving the women in industry behind, without paying the price, inevitably.

Last year we offered this principle to you, which we repeat today in stronger conviction than ever. Since then England has taken a step in advance. I do not expect you to be guided politically by what England does, but I would like to have you socially stimulated to study this question. A member of Great Britain's Industrial Court recently said that the Court had found it detrimental rather than beneficial to women to have legislation passed on the basis of sex only, and that hereafter all regulation of wages and limitation of hours would be determined for all workers, not for women only.

Holland, conspicuous for low employment and fair labor stability in the midst of a Europe suffering severe depressions and labor difficulties, has an eight-hour law for "persons" not for "females."

Last month in St. Louis the United Hebrew Congregations, with the Associations of Temple Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, went on record adopting a program of social justice, in which they asked that hours be limited for all workers. They did not say for women only. They also asked a minimum wage, but we are not discussing that today. This convention said,

(Reading) "The eight-hour day is most important for all industrial workers, and a compulsory one day of rest in seven for all workers; also the regulation of sanitary conditions, environment, and so on, for all workers."

Now, I want to say a word on another

subject—the subject of maternity, which is mentioned so often in these discussions. I would like to say that maternity is not a disease. Maternity is something that you prepare for not from the moment of your birth, but you prepare for it before it comes upon you, while it is upon you, and for a period after it is upon you. It is almost more than we can bear to hear, that the whole normal, intelligent, creative life of women, shall be built around this legend that because some day we may be mothers, we shall not cross a street alone.

Mr. Hackenburg—Do you know of anything that is more important to the human race?

Miss Stevens—I know of nothing that is more important than to preserve woman's creative abilities, not only for reproducing the race, but to produce a society in which the children that are brought into the world shall be properly cared for. I think that a legislature which does not vote to protect children, has no right to say that it shall vote to protect mature, adult women against their wishes. If you wish to protect society, begin with the child.

Now, the working class stronghold is the last stronghold to give up its discrimination against women, that is to say, the industrial field. All the professions have had to yield, and the better paid executive jobs are slowly breaking down. The political parties have been invaded. The halls of Congress have been invaded. Legislatures have been invaded. Judgeships have been invaded. The Governor's chair has been invaded. Political life is no longer the sole possession of men. You have to learn to work with your colleagues of our sex. But the industrial field, always the last to be penetrated by a new idea, will be the last field to relinquish discrimination.

Now my time is up and I have got to stop. Do you think we have any sympathy for the man who comes here and says the girls are perfectly satisfied? Of course we have not. We know that one group of humanity is overworked, and that a smaller group has too little to do. Nor are we in sympathy with those who conceive women to be frail, and who conceive us to be wards.

If you gentlemen conceive yourself to be our guardians, I will tell you that the children have gotten out of hand. If you are a wise parent, what do you do, if your child decides to elope? You argue with him, or you reason with him—you probably speak eloquently, or at least vehemently, and you try to persuade him what to do, and to dissuade the child from taking the step which he is contemplating. And what does he do? He goes off, in spite of all your protests, and elopes. Then, if you are a wise parent, you welcome him back. You prepare the

best possible atmosphere for him. You forgive him, and you continue to live your life in as satisfactory and sweet a relationship as possible.

Now, women today are exactly in the same position—whether you like it or not, we have eloped, out of the home, and into industry. That must be accepted as a permanent social change. You cannot mitigate it. All you can do is to welcome the women, and make this permanent change as easy as possible, make us as happy and as productive as possible. (Applause.)

Mrs. Mary Murray, President of the Women's B. M. T. Railroad Association, member Industrial Council of the National Woman's Party, and member of other working women's clubs.

Mrs. Murray—The women whom I represent, all working women, are opposed to this forty-eight hour bill. They know that it will defeat the very purpose which it is supposed to accomplish—the preserving of the health and the improvement of the conditions of working women.

If this bill becomes a law, it will mean a dismissal from their employment of many, many women. Do not be deceived by the proponents of this bill when they tell you it will not happen. No one knows better than they that it will happen; and they want it to happen.

The organizations that are sponsoring this bill are the same organizations that sponsored and forced through the legislature, just six years ago, a bill of this type that caused the dismissal of thousands of women in Brooklyn and New York City. They told the legislators that it would not happen! Their bill was going to cure all the ills of industrial life. It was going to put the working women on Easy Street. It put them on the street, all right (laughter), and when we asked the President of the Interborough Railroad in New York City, if he would take back the women, should we be successful in winning the repeal of the bill, he very bluntly told us no. He said, "The women are hedged in and hedged around by too many restrictive laws, which say that they cannot do this and they cannot do that, and they cannot do the other thing. The men we can have when we want them. We do not have to hand out any pink teas to the men." And he kept his word—he did not take back the women. And in spite of that fact, these same proponents of that bill are asking the legislators to pass this bill now, to bring into more women's homes and lives, privation, misery and suffering; and to keep under cover the real purpose of this bill, the proponents wave the flag of maternity, bewailing the future of the human race if the working women are put on an equality with the men, and trying to make the legislators believe that all women in industry are potential mothers.

They tell us that the functions of women are different in this life from the functions of men. Of course they mean only working men. Are we to assume that industry is normally the function of men, and that adult working women, the mothers and grandmothers, must be classed as children, and only permitted to work special hours, under special supervision, subject to special restrictions by the Legislature?

Women in industry bitterly resent the continued efforts of those organizations to keep them a class apart, not only from men in the higher paid occupations, but a class apart from other women, supposed to have no family obligations, with lesser influence, with a lower level of intelligence, and only fitted in this life to become domestic servants.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that none of these statements is true. Ex-President Taft said, as one of the joint chairmen of the National Labor Board, that he found out that it was quite possible to masquerade as protectors of women, and that he became convinced that women need protection from their protectors. (Laughter.) We women in industry, Mr. Chairman, ask you and the gentlemen of the committee to protect us poor women in industry from the self-appointed would-be protectors—the non-working and professional uplifters. I thank you. (Applause.)

Mr. Boyle: What were the women employed in at the time of the passage of this prior law on the railroad? What was their work?

Mrs. Murray: Just as it is now—the ticket agents, and women on the cars as guards—pressing a button—no hard work; just pressing the button, you know—the conductorettes. In the booths in the subways and on the elevated. Ticket agents.

The very next year our legislators here saw the injustice of it, and when they saw that we were able to take care of our own health and morals, they repealed the bill.

Mrs. James G. Wentz, President of the Women's Republican Club of New York: The Women's Republican Club has taken action against this 48-hour bill, and we also took action against that bill that was passed six years ago. We are still of the same opinion \* \* \* if you have one law for the men and another law for the women, and the men can work longer than the women, the men naturally are going to be employed. When you reduce the hours of all, that will be fair, but living costs will go up.

We believe that the American woman in industry has sufficient brains and character to know her responsibilities, why she wants to work, how she wants to

work, and when she wants to work.

The law that has been referred to, that was repealed a few years ago, turned out so many thousands of women—women who were working for their bread and butter, women who were working for their children, or for old members of the family—they were turned out completely, and were out for months. Some of them never got their positions again.

We go on record, as Republicans, that we are absolutely opposed to any law that militates against the working women.

Mrs. Beatrice V. Stevenson: We Republican women of King's county do not oppose 48 hours for workers, but we only wish to say that we want it for all workers. I would like to make that very clear.

In order to emphasize that, so that there can be no misunderstanding, the King's county organization has its own bill, sponsored by Assemblyman Clayton, which calls for a 48-hour law for persons, which would apply to all workers, men or women; and we are not sponsoring any innovation or anything else that is strange or weird or unnatural; and if you will refer back, you will find the International Labor Conference in 1919, which represented the larger part of the civil-

ized countries, stood for the regulation of the hours of labor for persons, and not for women only.

Now, I would like to call your attention to just one thing, which has already been mentioned, and which apparently needs to be reiterated over and over again in relation to women workers. Women are not in industry or in any occupation for pleasure, or because of a liking for the particular piece of work; but the original motive that drives them in is because they have to earn a living. I can speak from experience, because there was a time when I earned my own living.

The question comes up of hours, and again I can speak from experience in protest of the regulation of hours, because in the particular occupation in which I was engaged it was impossible to have any regular hours to be observed, day or night. I was a professional nurse then. I mention that particularly, because we are in favor of the Stapley Bill. (The Stapley Bill, sponsored by the Woman's Party, would permit women to work at night on the same terms as men.)

It is, I think, a very great question as to whether we want any legislation. By all means, if you must pass a bill, I urge

and beg that you will give consideration to the King's County Bill, Mr. Clayton's bill, No. 1234, which requires the regulation of hours for all workers. I believe Mr. Boyle has a companion bill which accomplishes the same thing. Take your choice. We don't care which you pass; but either of those two bills. I do think it is worthy of emphasis, however, that possibly we are legislating too much in this respect, when I read that a garment contract has just been entered into in which a 40-hour week is contracted for, with an advance in wages and various privileges for the workers in that particular industry—not women only, but for all the workers. Also a strike which has been in operation for the white goods workers is settled with a contract for 44 hours.

Now, if it is possible for men and women workers—not only of these groups, but I think the percentage was about 95 per cent. of women—if that kind of terms can be obtained without legislation, I do not know why it is necessary to pass any law.

Again I urge, however, that if you must pass a law, take Clayton of Kings or Boyle of Suffolk county's bill.

## Equal Rights by Radio

Friends and Neighbors:

As the Lucretia Mott Amendment is now before Congress, we are sure that you will be glad to hear of the just cause of Equal Rights. Many persons are under the impression that when women were given the privilege of voting they were given Equal Rights in everything, but this is far from being true. The Lucretia Mott Amendment reads: "Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction." Lucretia Mott, for whom the amendment was named, was born in 1793 on the island of Nantucket of Quaker parents. She was first interested in the anti-slavery activity. Later she became the mainstay of the feminist movement, and she is regarded as the founder of the cause of Equal Rights for women in America. The National Woman's Party exists solely to support this principle.

Representative Anthony of Kansas introduced the amendment in the House, December, 1923, saying:

"I feel it a privilege to be chosen to introduce the Equal Rights Amendment in the House and thus have a share in the struggle for Equal Rights, which has been going on in this country for seventy-five years. Instead of spending generations wiping away one discrimination against women in this State, another in

*Editor's Note: Mrs. Genevieve Thomas Wheeler of Kansas City, Missouri, Vice-Chairman of the Missouri Branch of the National Woman's Party, recently gave the accompanying reading over two of the largest radio casting stations of the Middle West.*

some other State, and knowing all the while that these gains are not necessarily permanent, I believe it is wise to turn to our National Constitution, just as women did in suffrage and to write the principle of equality for men and women into the highest law of our land permanently. The amendment is concise and direct and will establish what I have been brought up to feel a democracy should establish—equality for men and women in all fields."

Did you imagine that in Nebraska a husband has a legal right to sell his wife's clothing or jewels without her consent? If she sells a picture of her own creating, unless her husband has signed the bill of sale, he can reclaim that picture! There is not one State in the Union in which men and women live under equal protection of the law. More than half of the States do not permit women to serve on juries. In Missouri a husband may break his wife's will. In every State the husband practically owns the services of the wife. For instance, in Washington State a woman was deserted by her husband. She took in washing for a living. In an accident she was so injured that her

leg was amputated. She brought suit for \$10,000. In the course of the trial her lawyer informed her that her husband, whom she had not seen for two years, had settled the suit—out of court—for \$350. He took the money and used it to get a divorce from his crippled wife! If you wish to know more of the discriminations against women, you may find them in the official paper of the National Woman's Party, called EQUAL RIGHTS.

Women want Equal Rights that they may advance the cause of righteousness.

How we have all loved the words, "The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world," but our world has not honored that sacred hand of motherhood by giving its possessor the freedom it has given to the most ignorant of men!

Do you admire Lucretia Mott and others for their efforts in freeing the negro? We invite you, then, to join in our crusade in behalf of freedom for women! Remember that we have Bible authority for the basis of this amendment, for we read therein that God Himself "is no respecter of persons." So, my friends, dip your pens into the wells of blended justice and progress and write at once to President Coolidge, to the members of Congress from your States and tell them of your desire that the Equal Rights Amendment be passed without delay! I thank you.

# News From The Field

**D**R. LOUISE STANLEY, director of the Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, will speak at Woman's Party Headquarters March 22 on "The Modern Home in Relation to Feminism." Ruby A. Black will preside.

**T**HE New York State Branch of the National Woman's Party has circularized its members asking that they write to the Honorable Ernest E. Cole, State Senator, urging him to report favorably the Teachers' Equal Rights Bill. A hearing on the two teachers' bills, the Mastick and the Nicholl bills, were held on March 5 before the Senate Public Education Committee. Margaret Loring Thomas is Legislative Secretary of the New York State Branch.

**D**O you know that the National Woman's Party representatives have been broadcasting our message from Gimbel's Radio Studio, New York? Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, Mrs. Clarence M. Smith, Doris Stevens, Anita Pollitzer, Cornelia Bruere Rose, Mrs. Alfred S. Rossin and Julia Hoyt have spoken.

Try to be the first to send applause by telephone, telegraph or letter. Why not have a radio party to listen-in at the speakers? This will be a good way to get new members for the National Woman's Party.

**A**T a meeting of the Woman's Club of Haworth, New Jersey, held last week, Anita Pollitzer, National Secretary of the Woman's Party, spoke on national and state legislation of interest to women. Dr. Ruth Johnson Keith, chairman of the legislative department of the City Club, introduced Miss Pollitzer. At the close of the talk many questions were asked concerning the Woman's Party, eighteen members were secured, and a number of subscribers to EQUAL RIGHTS. Dr. Keith accepted the chairmanship of the Haworth branch of the National Woman's Party and is now co-operating with Leila Enders, New Jersey chairman, in securing the passage of the Equal Rights bills now before the legislature. Since the meeting Dr. Keith has written, "When we begin working out there I know I can find more members for this very important work."

**M**ARY WINSOR of Pennsylvania has sailed for Spain, where she will interview the leading feminists of that country on the progress of feminism among Spanish women.

**T**HE National Woman's Party gave a tea at the home of Mrs. Robert M. Fotheringham, 410 Bird avenue, on Saturday afternoon, March 7th, from 2 until 6 o'clock.

The speakers were Mrs. C. Allespach Mueller, LL.B., J.S.D., of Buffalo, N. Y.; Mrs. Frederick Kendall of Hamburg, N. Y.; Miss Emma Wold, LL.B., LL.D., of Washington, D. C.

**R**EPRESENTATIVES of thousands of colored women from all parts of the United States heard Margaret Whittemore, vice-president of the National Woman's Party, speak on Equal Rights on Saturday, March 7, in Washington. Following Miss Whittemore's talk, many of the colored women spoke from the floor in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment, and not one against it.

The meeting was the occasion of the opening of the National Headquarters of the National Legislative Council of Colored Women. The president and congressional chairman of the Council is Mrs. M. Mossell Griffin, who is a member of the Pennsylvania Branch of the National Woman's Party.

**A**NITA POLLITZER, secretary of the Executive Council of the Woman's Party, is in Detroit, Mich., speaking at a series of meetings on equal rights. The Woman's Party bought out the house at the New Bonstell Theatre the evening of March 9 for a benefit performance. Miss Pollitzer spoke between acts. On this evening Gordon Mendelssohn gave a box party for the author of "The Goose Hangs High," the play that was presented.

The New Bonstell is owned and managed by Miss Jessie Bonstell, who is deeply interested in equal rights. Many memberships in the Woman's Party and subscriptions to EQUAL RIGHTS resulted from these activities. The theatre programs were decorated with stickers containing the words "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

**A** MEETING on equal rights will be in Chicago on March 22, Helena Boetcher writes to headquarters. Besse Garner, Detroit attorney, will speak.

Miss Garner will debate on equal rights before the American Association of University Women in Madison, Wis., on March 20, and before the Milwaukee branch of the A. A. U. W. on March 21. She will address a Woman's Party meeting in Milwaukee on the same day.

**F**LORENCE BAYARD HILLES spoke on "The Irresistible Advance of Equal Rights" at the Allerton House, New York, under the auspices of the New York City Committee of the National Woman's Party on February 6. Mrs. Abram J. Rose presided.

## Two Million Dollar Fund Treasurer's Report

SHELDON JACKSON, *Treasurer*  
NETTIE TRAIL: *C. P. A., Auditor.*

**R**ECEIPTS of National Headquarters, December 7, 1912, to March 17, 1925, \$1,293,620.34.

Contributions, membership receipts and other receipts, March 7, 1925 to March 13, 1925

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Miss Mattie L. McMorris, D. C.....            | \$5.00 |
| Miss Pearl Heaps, Md.....                     | 1.00   |
| Mrs. Zaida E. Udell, Ill.....                 | 1.00   |
| Miss Laura Berrien, D. C.....                 | 20.00  |
| Miss Charlotte A. Jones, Md.....              | 1.00   |
| Mrs. J. H. Darlington, N. Y.....              | 25.00  |
| Mrs. Augusta M. Gutheim, Md.....              | 10.00  |
| Mrs. Grace Henshaw, Mass.....                 | 10.00  |
| Miss Louise Bayard, Del.....                  | 90.00  |
| Miss Mary L. Smith, D. C.....                 | 1.00   |
| Mrs. M. Woodcock, D. C.....                   | 1.00   |
| Mrs. Emma Walther, D. C.....                  | 1.00   |
| Dr. Margaret H. Stewart, D. C.....            | 1.00   |
| Miss Anna G. Carr, D. C.....                  | 1.00   |
| Miss Clara Shanafelt, D. C.....               | 1.00   |
| Miss Bertha A. Koon, Mich.....                | 15.00  |
| Mrs. H. S. Holden, N. Y.....                  | 3.00   |
| Dr. Bertha M. Bigelow, Md.....                | 1.00   |
| Cash collection at Sunday afternoon meeting.. | 8.22   |
| Sale of photograph.....                       | 1.00   |
| Sale of literature.....                       | 2.00   |
| Rent of rooms at Headquarters.....            | 40.00  |
| Per Equal Rights Committee:                   |        |
| Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.....            | 10.00  |
| Mrs. Richard Wainwright, D. C.....            | 10.00  |
| Mrs. Bertha M. Fowler, Colo.....              | 10.00  |
| Miss Marie F. Moreland, Minn.....             | 10.00  |

Total receipts, March 7, 1925, to March 13, 1925.....\$279.22  
Total receipts, December 7, 1912, to March 13, 1925.....\$1,293,899.56

### The Vanity Hat Shop

*Original and Imported Designs*

MRS. KLEIN PETER

727 Seventeenth Street

WASHINGTON, D. C.

### The Ugly Duckling Tea House

*(Opposite Library of Congress)*

115 B Street Southeast

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Special Table d'Hote Dinner

75 Cents

Vegetable Dinner

60 Cents

Luncheon

Tea

### DAY PRINTING COMPANY

*Printers*

LIGHT AND LOMBARD STREETS

Entrance on Balderston Street

BALTIMORE

**Jelleff's**  
1216 F St. N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Announces a New Service for Discriminating Women in the Establishment of

A Fine Apparel Shop

featuring fashion garments from

HICKSON, Inc.

FROCKS SUITS WRAPS NOVELTIES

1216 F Street Northwest.