

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN CONGRESS

by

Harriet G. Webster

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, of the

University of Arizona

1 9 3 3

Approved: N. A. Hubbard 12/26/33
Major adviser Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u> I.	Introduction.....	1.
<u>Chapter</u> II.	Form of Activity.....	7.
<u>Chapter</u> III.	Movement in Congress from 1865 to 1913.....	21.
<u>Chapter</u> IV.	Final Efforts; Success.....	38.
<u>Chapter</u> V.	Conclusion.....	50.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The demand for the franchise was directly connected with the movement for the emancipation of women. Suffrage was one phrase of the woman's rights movement. The movement was closely allied with the natural rights theory and the women soon protested, as their forefathers had in the preceding century, against taxation without representation, and like the men who drew up a Declaration of Independence they drew up a Declaration of Sentiments. From the beginning suffrage had its rise with the abolition of slavery and Temperance movements and developed along with them.¹ The first efforts to obtain suffrage started in the States, but after the Civil War the movement toward obtaining an amendment to the Constitution was begun.

In the colonial period there was no organized attempt to secure suffrage. The colonists had brought with them from England the old Common Law concerning the position of women and their rights. Hard conditions combined with this to keep women in their "place."² The struggle for independence inspired a few with the ideal of liberty. Abigail Adams wrote her husband March 1776 when he was attending the Continental Congress, "to remember the ladies and be more favorable to

1 Stanton Gage & Anthony, History of Woman Suffrage, Vol. IV, p. 450.

2 Hecker, History of Woman's Rights, p. 150.

them than your ancestors." Mr. Adams paid no attention to the plea.¹ In 1776 New Jersey formed a new constitution and placed no sex restrictions on its voters. However the women took no advantage of this until 1797.² In the nineteenth century a demand for suffrage arose. Francis Wright came to America from Scotland and, disregarding the ridicule and criticism, lectured from public platforms. The Grimke sisters of the South aided the movement by lecturing for slavery reform and caused the country to acknowledge the right of women to speak in public. In 1808 Connecticut gave married women the right to make a will. School suffrage was granted by Kentucky in 1838. In 1839 married women were given some property rights by Mississippi, while Texas, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York, California, and Wisconsin followed suit.³

The American women had always been interested in the liberal Anti-Slavery Society, but when the world's anti-slavery convention met in London, the women delegates sent by the United States were refused their seats because the English delegates who believed in the doctrine of St. Paul, who had said, "Let the women learn in silence," refused to allow the women to take their seats. Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth

¹ Familiar Letters of John Adams, p. 149.

² This law was repealed November, 1807. Mrs. C.C. Catt says the reason was "the women had not supported the right candidate in the state election." Catt and Shuler, Woman Suffrage and Politics, p. 9.

³ Crothers and Hudnut, Problems of Citizen, p. 175.

Cady Stanton returned to America bitter at this distinction made between the delegates and called the first woman's rights convention at Seneca Fall, New York, in 1848. The news was startling to the surrounding country and the meeting was well attended, lasting a week instead of the two days first planned. The four women sponsoring it spent five days outlining a program and after a great deal of work drew up the Declaration of Sentiments patterned on the Declaration of Independence. It listed all of the grievances the women had concerning their suppressed position and explained what was needed to improve the situation.¹ This convention was followed by others and the women joined in groups for the furtherance of their own cause. The conventions soon became annual events. Such persons as Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Horace Greely, Wendel Philips, and William Garrison were prominent at each of them. Rather a hostile attitude was shown by the public to these meetings, and in some instances the mob spirit prevailed, and usually the police offered no assistance to the delegates. Most of the newspapers ridiculed and criticized.² During the Civil War period the women forgot their own cause; they naturally felt that at the close of the war Congress would bestow on them equal rights

1 The resolution which was not unanimously adopted was the one asking for the elective franchise. Even Susan B. Anthony was at first against this because of her Quaker training. Mrs. Stanton secured its passage by explaining that without the franchise no other rights could be secured or held. Harper, Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony, Vol. I, p. 39.

2 Stanton, Anthony, Gage. History of Woman Suffrage, Vol. I p. 215.

when they were taking care of the negroes. However, all prominent abolitionists withdrew their support from the cause saying that this was the "negroe's hour," so the women were obliged to see the word "male" written into the Constitution in the Fourteenth Amendment, and witness the omission of the word "sex" from the next amendment.¹

At the beginning of the Reconstruction period the workers for woman suffrage organized the American Civil Rights Association to promote the right of suffrage regardless of race, color, or sex. In 1869 when the negro was about to be given suffrage the group was deserted by the abolitionists so it dissolved.² The women then organized their own groups. The National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association were formed. The chief aim of the first was to secure suffrage by a national amendment; the other devoted itself to working in the various states. The national was the more radical of the two, and the difference of opinions of the officers kept the two groups on unfriendly terms. Twenty years after their formation, in 1889 the two groups drew together and united as the National American Woman Suffrage Association, and the work was continued in both the national and local fields. From then until 1918 annual conventions were held. The

¹ Stanton, Anthony, Gage. History of Woman Suffrage, Vol. II, p. 333

² I was not able to find any information concerning the organization of this group.

Association's organization was made up of a central governing body with state auxiliary branches. The officers were paid no salaries until 1904 and other expenses were met by membership fees, subscriptions, donations and bequests; after 1904 the officer's salaries were paid from two large funds left by two wealthy ladies.¹

In their disappointment over being left out of the Fourteenth Amendment several of the women voted at the polls attempting to prove that being citizens they had the right to vote. They were arrested and fined. A Supreme Court decision in 1875 showed the women that citizenship did not carry with it the right to vote.

The states began to respond to the active campaigns carried on to secure suffrage for the women. First Kansas granted school franchise in 1861. Michigan and Minnesota did this in 1875. Wyoming granted complete suffrage when it was a territory in 1875 and wrote this into its constitution when it became a state. Colorado, Utah and Idaho did likewise. Each year strenuous campaigns were carried on in each state but in most every instance they were unsuccessful. After 1910 California, Arizona, Kansas, Oregon, Montana, Nebraska, Illinois, and New York allowed the women to have suffrage victories.² This process was slow and expensive; it involved a tremendous amount of work and so often resulted

¹ Shaw, Story of a Pioneer, p. 194.

² Crothers and Hudnut, op. cit., p. 175.

in defeat and disappointment. The political parties of the states refused to aid the women and the liquor interests were always working against them. In some states it was practically impossible to amend their constitution so by 1912 the goal of the suffragists was a national amendment. It is the success of this movement that I have traced in this paper.

The movement for a change in women's status of which woman suffrage occupied an important position, was the result of a preceding social movement which centered around the efforts of the common man to get control of the government. The woman movement with its goal, the freeing of women from masculine domination, advanced along with the other liberal movement. As women were forced into factory work their status changed and they became more economically independent than before.¹ Driven from their old position in their homes to hold jobs and even to enter the professions the women began to think seriously of their political and social status, and so it was that industry was responsible in a large way for the growth of the feminine movement of which the enfranchisement of women was a climax.¹

¹ Catt and Shuler, op. cit., p. 4.

Chapter II

FORM OF ACTIVITY

For more than half a century the State Legislatures and Congress were troubled with the woman movement; it is hard to determine just how much of their action was a reflection of public opinion. During the whole time efforts were being made to get a Federal amendment in Congress numerous petitions were being sent to that body. During the nineteenth century most of these petitions asking Congress to pass a federal amendment enfranchising the women were received from the National Woman Suffrage Associations, its state branches, and a few groups of individuals.¹ One of the most persistent petitioners during this time was the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association.² A few petitions came from the Royal Templars of Temperance and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.³ By 1891 many of the labor organizations were sponsoring the women's cause and they sent petitions to Congress. The Cigarmaker's Union of Indianapolis, Indiana; the Farmer's Mutual Benefit Association of Moultrie County, Illinois; the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners Union of Long Island City, New York; and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Fireman of Oswego County, New York were representative of

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. XV, p. 176.

² Congressional Record, Vol. XIV, p. 2679.

³ Congressional Record, Vol. XXI, pp. 3008.

¹
this type of petitioner.

From 1900 until the passage of the amendment an enormous number of petitions were sent to Congress. In one day alone the following typical petitions were presented by the various Senators. Petitions from Kansas with 10,000 signatures, New York with 50,000 signatures, South Dakota with 4,500 signatures, Territory of Arizona with 1,000 signatures, Mississippi with 120 signatures, Wisconsin with 6,849 signatures, New Hampshire with 2000 signatures, Oregon with 3000 signatures, New Jersey with 7,500 signatures, Idaho with 1,200 signatures, Georgia with 5000 signatures, California with 17,000 signatures, Iowa with 3,263 signatures, Virginia with 364 signatures, Kentucky with 2000 signatures, Missouri with 4,460 signatures, Massachusetts with 25,000 signatures, Washington with 6000 signatures, Illinois with 16,000 signatures, Nebraska with 8,000 signatures, Pennsylvania with 10,000 signatures, Montana with 1,298 signatures, Colorado with 6,439 signatures, Ohio with 13,200 signatures, Texas with 707 signatures, Connecticut with 4,141 signatures, and ² Michigan with 3000 signatures.

Various civic groups and branches of the women's organizations throughout the country, as well as mass meetings of citizens of small towns and at political rallies, unwilling to be left out of the movement which was being played up by

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. XXII, p. 1220-3407.

² Congressional Record, Vol. XLV, p. 2145.

all the newspapers hastened to draw up petitions, get as many signatures as possible and send them to their national law making body. The following is a list illustrative of this type of petitioner: Federal Woman's Equality Association, Union and Confederate Soldiers meeting at the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburg, Bozeman, Montana Civic Club, Democratic State Committee of Arizona, women voters of Eighth Congressional District of Kansas, Delaware Branch of the National Woman's Party, Louisiana League favoring Susan B. Anthony Amendment, Florida State Convention of Educators, Wayne County mass meeting of men, members of the Supreme Court of Colorado, South Dakota Suffrage Club, Religious Society of Friends, mass meeting of citizens of Tucson, Arizona, and petitions which had been circulated by the¹ Hearst newspapers containing 150,000 names.

The bulk of the petitions came after 1910, most of these were from the Northern and Western states although all parts of the country were represented with even a few coming from the Southern women. In the last year of the struggle the number of memorials was swelled by those sent in by the legislatures of practically all of the equal suffrage states. These memorials were received from the legislatures of Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah,

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LI through Vol. LVI.

Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming favoring the nineteenth amendment. The Legislature of Louisiana sent a memorial¹ opposing the proposed addition to the Constitution.

The early petitioners asked Congress to enfranchise the women so that they might be equal with the black man,² but those coming after suffrage had made a foothold in a few of the sparsely settled Western states asked for suffrage so that women of the East might be equal with their sisters in the West.³ Other petitions asked Congress to remedy the situation which then existed--a nation one half free and the other half in bondage.⁴ A majority of the entreaties, based entirely on theory, urged that Congress grant the request of the women because suffrage was a right and a matter of justice⁵ and without it a large part of the population, who would improve the moral and economic welfare of the country, were deprived of a part in the government.⁶ After 1913 these requests received by Congress, pleading for the women's cause, used an entirely different line of reasoning. As might be supposed at this time war was the foremost thought in the mind of the nation, and so the petitioners urged that Congress grant suffrage to the women as a war measure or rather as an award for their war work.⁷ Others pointed to

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LVII, p. 1726.

2 Congressional Record, Vol. XXXI, p. 1495.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, p. 4109.

4 Ibid., p. 8951.

5 Ibid., p. 3457.

6 Congressional Record, Vol. LIV, p. 2381.

7 Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 10169.

England, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Sweden, and the Central Powers, who had enfranchised their women during the war, as example to be followed by the United States. Far the largest majority of the petitions, however, asked Congress to grant woman suffrage so that a nation which was fighting "to make the world safe for democracy" might have democracy at home.

There is no way of telling just what part these numerous and varried petitions played in determining the final vote on the amendment but in every case they were presented to one of the law making bodies and then referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee.

Various organizations interested themselves in equal suffrage and attempted to aid the movement. From the time of early suffrage campaigns the labor unions had endorsed woman suffrage. In all of the states the Grangers advocated suffrage, and after 1911 when the first women's trade unions were formed they acted as spokesman for the working women. As soon as women went into the industrial fields they found themselves at a disadvantage. In 1888 the Commissioner of Labor reported: "A generation ago women were allowed to enter but few occupations, today women can be found in some three hundred and forty three occupations with an average earning of about five dollars and twenty-four cents per

1. Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 167.

2. Ibid., p. 747.

3. Calhoun, History of Family in United States, p. 73.

week.¹ In all lines of labor women were over-worked and under-paid. Some writers attribute the suffrage movement to this type of women who having no organization behind them and very little chance of joining the labor unions, joined together in a movement to free themselves from their hard conditions. In 1914 Rev. Anna Shaw wrote of suffrage, "Like all great revolutions, it came not out of the whim of a little body of revolutionists, but through pressure of necessity."² Another writer said, "The much thought of and too much talked of woman suffrage is being brought about by what are known as working women rather than the restless reformers." So it might be said that the entrance of the American woman into industry and the labor unions did much to increase her interest and demand for suffrage.³

Other organizations were also backing woman suffrage.

The most important of these were:

1. General Federation of Women's Clubs⁴
2. Young Women's Christian Association⁵
3. Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
4. American Federation of Labor
5. Anti-Saloon League
6. International Nurses Association
7. United Mine Workers
8. National Bricklayers and Masons
9. National Letter Carriers
10. National Teacher's Association

-
1. Fourth Annual Report of Commissioner of Labor, p. 73
 2. Shaw, Story of a Pioneer, p. 103
 3. Dorr, What Eight Million Women Want, p. 293.
 4. This organization represented the professional class and married women rather than working women.
 5. Organizations of this type merely helped to organize the women of the nation and to keep the subject of equal suffrage alive.

- 11. International and National Women's Trade Union League
- 12. Ladies of the Maccabees
- 13. Tri-State Grain Grower's Association
- 14. National College Women's League
- 15. International Retail Clerk's Protective Association
- 16. Western Federation of Miners
- 17. National Association of Post-Office Clerk's¹

As the list of the sponsors of the suffrage movement grew, more pressure was exerted against the leading political parties; they heeded the urge of many of their members in the equal suffrage states and endorsed the movement by 1916. The National Woman Suffrage Association had sent delegates or a message to every national nominating convention from the time they organized until the adoption of the nineteenth amendment. The Democrats and Republicans received the women, granted them hearings and perhaps even a place of honor on the speaker's platform but always evaded the suffrage question.² However the minor parties put a suffrage plank in their platform. The Prohibitionists and Socialists early adopted such a plank, but they did more to hinder the movement rather than to aid it. The opponents of woman suffrage continually cried, "Suffrage means Socialism." Alice Stone Blackwell, a journalist and editor of a woman suffrage magazine, explained that the Socialists included suffrage in their "theoretical platform" only because of the principle of the thing. Although women were admitted to the party

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LII, Appendix, p. 95.

² Mrs. C.C. Catt claims the dominant political parties "used their enormous organized power to black every name on behalf of woman suffrage." Harper, op. cit., p. 594.

on the same basis as men the proportion was one to ten. In the Presidential election of 1912 Socialism increased in all of the states except those with woman suffrage, and the strongly Socialist wards of Milwaukee gave a majority against woman suffrage. Naturally only the most doctrinaire members of the party really advocated woman suffrage while the opportunist Socialists wanted to keep it from coming in until after they had won a nation wide Victory.¹

By 1912 a goodly number of the states had equal suffrage. In the Presidential nominating conventions of this year the Republican party split and the Progressive Party adopted a woman suffrage plank. It gave as its reason for doing this the party's desire to bring about "true democracy."² The Democrats and Republicans, however, were still silent on the question. By 1915 state conventions of the Republican party recommended submission of a constitutional amendment to the voters of New York, Maine, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Vermont. In Illinois, Maryland, North Dakota, Montana, and Arkansas the same party declared for the principle but made no recommendations. The Democratic state conventions of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Connecticut recommended submission of an amendment to the people in the same year. Conventions of this party in North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Vermont came out for the

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LII, Appendix, p. 100

² Harper, op. cit., p. 594.

principle only. In a few states with complete suffrage both of the parties adopted planks for the first time calling for a nation wide woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution¹ of the United States. In 1916 when the presidential elections were coming up and woman suffrage states controlled ninety-one electoral votes both the Democratic and Republican parties put a suffrage plank in their platform. Both advocated suffrage by the state method and President Wilson who had opposed the adoption of the amendment wrote the plank for his party. After the women received the endorsement of the main political parties it was only a few years until Congress awarded their work by granting the amendment.

It is beyond question that the liquor interests worked against the women. This was an invisible influence that controlled elections, delayed the coming of woman suffrage, kept the Congressmen from fulfilling their promises to the suffragists and prevented the two dominant political parties from adopting a suffrage plank. This great enemy sent masses to the polls to vote against any proposed equal suffrage amendment and spent unlimited sums to defeat the² women.

For years groups of women had made attacks on saloons and in 1874 the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was formed by such women who favored prohibition so it was that women

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LII, p. 95.

2 Catt & Shuler, Woman Suffrage and Politics, p. 132

were considered an important factor in the movement which was demanding "total abstinence for the individual and prohibition for the State." In 1918 the United States Senate had the Judiciary Committee make an investigation of the United States Brewer's Association. A good many things were made public that had not been disclosed before. It was found that in 1831 the Brewer's Convention had adopted an anti-suffrage resolution declaring that prohibition would be far less dangerous to the trade than woman suffrage because the former could be repealed at any time. From the documents taken from the bureaus of the association a great deal of evidence was collected. It was found that:

1. The same man or men who conducted the anti-prohibition campaign directed the anti-suffrage contests in Legislatures, constitutional conventions and referendum campaigns.
2. Money to oppose woman suffrage was taken from the funds placed in the hands of the political committees organized by the liquor interests to fight prohibition.
3. A given quota of votes to be secured against suffrage was customarily assigned each saloon in referendum campaigns¹.
4. By definite agreement, in secret conferences, the liquor forces determined to conceal their opposition to woman suffrage so far as possible².

¹ In the Oregon campaign the brewer's and wholesale liquor dealers Association sent out the following circular. "The members of this association have worked hard for a long time on both matters; (woman suffrage and local option law) it will take fifty thousand votes to defeat woman suffrage; fifty thousand to pass the local option law. That means every retailer must bring in twenty-five votes; every retailer can get twenty five votes--besides his employees he has his grocer, butcher, landlord, laundryman and every person he does business with." Harper, op. cit., Vol. VI, P. 132.

² Catt, op. cit., p. 136.

5. The liquor interests applied the boycott to men favoring woman suffrage as they did to those favoring prohibition.
6. By the same coercive methods they sought contributions for anti-suffrage campaigns from firms with which they dealt.
7. In States reputed strong for both suffrage and prohibition the attitude of Congressmen and State legislator's on both questions was reported to the national political committees of the liquor interests with equal care.
8. The allied organizations that were set up to oppose prohibition opposed woman suffrage by the same methods."²

This same investigating committee found that annual taxes and contributions were levied by the liquor association. In order to defeat state campaigns each state organization was forced to raise a sum equal to the amount given by the National Association from their general fund. In order to do this the state manager levied a tax of twenty cents per barrel. Other³

¹ A Senator in a State Legislature who had promised to vote for a bill for woman suffrage not only broke this promise but made a speech against it. When pressed by the women for an explanation he frankly said: "The client giving me the most business is a manufacturer who is tied up with the liquor interests. The most powerful newspaper in the town gives me all its legal business but the newspaper is wet in policy and also opposed to woman suffrage. If I become too pronounced as a champion of woman suffrage, the liquor interest would put the screws on the manufacturer and he in turn would notify me that he had found it convenient to seek legal counsel elsewhere. The newspaper would let me know that my services could be dispensed with. I have a nice home, a little Ford for business and pleasure, and two sons to educate. I cannot afford to lose the patronage of my two best-paying clients." Catt, *op. cit.*, p.152

² Brewing and Liquor Interest; Senate Investigation, Vol. I, p. 116-300.

³ Ibid.

methods of raising sufficient funds to fight woman suffrage are revealed by the following letter sent out by the liquor organization in Montana:

"The local wholesalers and retailers are working un-animously to maintain for Montana the proud position of being the wettest State in the Union. This takes money. Our local retailers are doing all they can but the burden is too heavy for them to carry alone and it is only right that those who are enjoying and making a profit from the sale of their goods should help us in conserving for them their accounts and goods."¹

Percy Andreae, chief of a publicity bureau for the Brewers' Association urged the group "to rely no longer upon contributions and favors as the sole means of controlling parties and politicians, but to add the threat of large blocks of voters which would go for or against the party or candidate who did not do the bidding of the trade." According to his plans this block of voters was to be recruited from the foreign population but to have the appearance of voluntary bodies with public-spirited aims.² The Russian vote was used against woman suffrage in the Dakotas, the German vote in Nebraska, the Negro vote in Kansas and Oklahoma and the Chinese vote in California.³ Numerous societies professing to be anti-suffrage but really sponsored by the liquor interests⁴ were the National Association of Commerce and Labor, Home

¹ Catt, op. cit., p. 140

² Ibid., p. 146.

³ Ibid., p. 150.

⁴ Mr. Andreae organized this group and became its first president. It pretended to be a business man's organization.

Rule Societies, Personal Liberty Leagues, Traveling Men's or Merchant's Leagues, Men's Anti-Suffrage Associations,¹ and the Farmer's Union.

The German-American Alliance was a strong opponent. It was organized in 1907 and many of the leading brewers were influential members. The National Bulletin, official organ of the group, established a lobby in Washington and the rent² was paid by the brewers. The National Hotel Men's Association was an active and open opponent of woman suffrage. The drug-gists and dealers in liquors and tobacco as well as tobacco manufacturers were all opposed. Numerous Eastern manufacturers were also opposed as were all groups who were interested³ in keeping the status of their women employees from changing.

During the struggle for the nineteenth amendment there was a widespread belief that the Catholic Church was officially opposed to woman suffrage, but possibly this opposition was only imagined, for His Eminence Cardinal James Gibbons stated: "The church has taken no official attitude on the subject... The statement that the church is opposed to the enfranchisement of women is incorrect." The Right Reverend Paul P. Rhode, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, Illinois, on hearing many of the foreign women hesitated to register without the sanction of the church wrote a letter

¹ Catt, op. cit., p. 147.

² Ibid., p. 148.

³ Ibid., p. 142.

which was read in all the churches of Chicago urging the women "to accept the new prerogative of their citizenship with which they had been invested by the extension of the suffrage to them by law."¹

The Woman's Protest, an anti-suffrage paper, accused the suffragists of being allied with the Mormons and Industrial Workers of the World. They claimed that the Mormon church had been largely responsible for the spread of suffrage in the West. Probably this was propaganda put out in an attempt to defeat the movement.²

Justice David J. Brewer of the United States Supreme Court said that doubtless some of the opposition to woman suffrage came from personal ambition defeated by the women voters. He cited the case of Judge Ben Linsey of the juvenile court of Denver who was denied renomination by each of the large political parties and who came out as an independent candidate and was elected largely by the women. Justice Brewer believed that the defeated candidates felt and express³ themselves after this against woman suffrage.

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LII, Appendix, p. 100.

2 Congressional Record, Vol. LII, p. 1423.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. LII, Appendix, p. 102.

Chapter III

MOVEMENT IN CONGRESS FROM 1865-1918

After the Civil War the Fourteenth Amendment was receiving the attention of Congress and Susan B. Anthony started to work against its passage.¹ During 1865 Senator Henderson of Missouri offered a petition signed by twenty-seven New York women asking to have the word "male" erased from the proposed amendment. The Senator admitted that they had the right of petition, but he believed women should not descend from their sphere to enter politics.² Senator Sumner, who was a strong advocate for negro suffrage remarked that petitions for woman suffrage at that time were not judicious as they would only compromise the "great question of equal rights for an enfranchised race" which was then before Congress.³

During these early years in the suffrage fight, Congress was continually besieged with resolutions which, if adopted,⁴ would have introduced suffrage into the various territories. Representatives Julian of Indiana and Storm of Pennsylvania were particularly active in trying to secure woman suffrage for the territory of Utah believing that it would abolish the practice of polygamy.⁵

1 Stanton, Gage, & Anthony, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 33.

2 Congressional Globe, 39th Congress, 1st session, p. 951.

3 Ibid., p. 952.

4 Congressional Record, 42d Congress, 1st session, p. 681.

5 Ibid., p. 306.

In 1871 the House of Representatives was considering a bill which provided for a new government for the District of Columbia. Among the amendments offered, was one which called for striking out the word "male" in Section 6 of the bill which provided for enfranchisement of all male voters over twenty-one years in the District. Representative Julian of Indiana, who was sponsoring this amendment, felt it should be passed so that the District of Columbia might be the first "to enjoy democratic principles." The amendment was voted¹ on and one hundred seventeen Congressmen voted to reject it.

In 1875 Susan B. Anthony formulated an amendment which was intended to enfranchise women. She hoped at that time to make it the Sixteenth Amendment but it was destined to become the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Miss Anthony was unable to secure the introduction of her amendment in Congress until 1878. At that time Mr. Sargent of California presented it to the Senate. From then on an almost constant effort was made to get it passed. In every session both Houses were presented with at least several joint resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution enfranchising women. These were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Very few of them were reported back and all of these were tabled.

Until 1882 these resolutions were referred either to the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Elections and

¹ Congressional Record, 41st Congress, 3d session, p. 646.

Rules. However, at that time Representative Kelly of Pennsylvania proposed that the House appoint a Committee to which all matter pertaining to the extension of woman suffrage should be referred. This resolution was reported back favorably by the Committee on Rules and a few days later it was voted upon and passed.¹ In the Senate the proposition to create a Committee on Woman Suffrage came up at the same time. Senator Hoar of Massachusetts presented the resolution proposing that a Committee of seven Senators be appointed by the chair to deal with all bills and petitions relating to equal suffrage.² Mr. Vest of Missouri was a bitter opponent of the new committee. He claimed that there were too many committees and that such action would only be a step toward recognizing woman suffrage which "would do mischief to the institutions and society of the nations." Mr. Beck of Kentucky opposed it because he felt that the colored women's votes could be bought for fifty cents a piece. Senator Morgan of Alabama portrayed the wrecked homes which would result from equal suffrage.³ The Senate remained unaffected by these speeches and voted to create the new committee.⁴

In 1836 the forty-ninth Congress was presented with a joint resolution by Senator Blair of New Hampshire asking

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. XIII, p. 175.

² Ibid., p. 51.

³ Ibid., p. 120.

⁴ Ibid., p. 268.

the Senate to consider an amendment granting equal suffrage. Mr. Blair presented a long speech in favor of his resolution. His arguments may be summed up into two main ones. First, every human being, being equal in other respects, should be equal in suffrage; and secondly, women want suffrage. The opposition was led by Mr. Brown of Georgia, who declared the Creator intended the spheres of males and females to be different, and that it was the duty of the man to discharge his family's duty to the state. Mr. Vest of Missouri, who had opposed the creation of a Woman Suffrage Committee again argued against the measure. He believed emotional suffrage¹ was the greatest evil in the country. When the vote was taken on the question of submitting a Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution to the State Legislatures for ratification it was defeated in a 16 to 34 vote. All of the affirmative votes were Republican; of the negative twenty-four were² Democratic and ten Republican.

During the various Congresses from the year 1865 to 1914 several bills were presented which would allow women to vote for the members of the House of Representatives. No³ action was taken on these and they produced no results.

In the years that Congress had been taking a half-hearted interest in passing a national amendment, the women were very busy in every part of the country working for

1 Congressional Record, Vol. XVIII, P. 35.

2 Ibid., p. 1002.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. XXIII, p. 8369.

suffrage by state laws and amendments to state constitutions. By 1914 fifteen states had equal suffrage. The power this gave the women over the Congressmen of these states along with Congressional hearings, deputations to the President, and petitions to Congress aided to bring about a spirited fight in the Sixty-third Congress, sitting in 1914 and 1915, in an attempt to pass the Federal amendment.

On May 4, 1914 in the House of Representatives, Representative Mondell of Wyoming introduced a joint resolution which provided for amending the Constitution to extend the right of suffrage to the women. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee, reported back without amendment, and placed on the calendar to come up for discussion in January 1915.¹ It was from this time on that the Houses divided geographically on the amendment. The Northern and Western men in most every case favored the amendment and urged its passage. The Southern and Eastern Congressmen generally opposed the measure. These divisions can be found in the records of the votes. It is quite likely that the opposition of the Eastern manufacturers and foreign population to any change in woman's status was reflected in the Congress by members from this section. The typical arguments of the member of the South was that woman suffrage would affect the race question and the old principle of state rights which had long been dangerous questions in the South. The

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LI, p. 8393.

North and West had always been more progressive and it was in these states that women were first granted the suffrage. In the West most of the other reforms of the day originated, such as referendum and initiative, so it is only natural that the men from these sections should advocate equal suffrage.

When the discussion on the amendment began in the House all of the Northern Congressmen speaking favored the passage of the amendment. Congressman Lindbergh of Minnesota addressed the House and said that he favored equal suffrage because the women already had the moral and legal right to vote, and the only reason they did not was because half of the population, meaning the men, were too selfish to permit it. Representative MacDonald of Michigan secured the floor and made the frank statement that the opponents of the measure claimed that chivalry would be killed if the measure were passed, but he explained that in private conversation and in the cloak-room the members frankly admitted the reason for their opposition. They feared the enfranchised women would vote in prohibition. When a member was asked in such a conversation whether his state was a suffrage state or not he would answer by saying whether his state was wet or dry. Representative Garman of Illinois also stated what groups he believed to be the opponents of the movement. First "those masking their selfish greed and fear behind the doctrine of state rights," and secondly, "those who believed that women were

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LII, p. 1417.

² Ibid., p. 1441.

not capable of intelligent participation in governmental¹
affairs."

Only one Eastern representative spoke in favor of the amendment but none from this section opposed the measure on the floor. Representative Kelly of Pennsylvania, long a friend of the amendment, said he favored the resolution because there was a national and not a sectional demand for² it. The Western Representatives made no argument for the amendment on the floor, but Representative Mondell of Wyoming introduced the measure and Representative Hayden of Arizona was responsible for having it reported back by the committee and brought up for a vote.

The Southern Representatives with the aid of one Northerner sponsored the opposition. Representative Jones of Virginia stated that he was informed that woman suffrage organizations had prepared a blacklist upon which were the names of nine senators and nine representatives, and that he believed the speeches³ made by some of the members that day were efforts to remove their names from this list before the November elections. Representative Henry of Texas spoke against the measure. Since the Democratic representatives⁴ had met in caucus during this Congress and had decided by a record vote that suffrage was a state question, he felt the Democrats were bound to live up to this decision.

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LII, p. 1462.

2 Ibid., p. 1409.

3 Ibid., p. 16430.

4 Ibid., p. 1407.

Representative Clark of Florida presented some unusual arguments against the amendment, saying that he preferred to cling to the "old-time" religion of our fathers and that he believed in the Bible from Genesis through Revelations and could not support the "idiosyncrasy" of woman suffrage. He¹ quoted at length from the Bible to support his theory.

Oddly enough Representative Abercombie of Alabama deserted his Southern colleagues and urged the passage of the amendment. He claimed the opposition came from four sources. Those numerous persons who had not investigated, a small percentage who had investigated with preconceived opinion and deep prejudice, those who were beneficiaries of special or illegal privilege, and the forces of vice and² crime.

The one northern representative to oppose the measure openly was Representative Lenroot of Wisconsin who said he was against the resolution because he was for democracy, and certainly that would be violated if states should be forced³ to accept woman suffrage against their wishes.

Late in the afternoon the vote was asked for and taken,⁴ resulting in 174 yeas, 204 nays, and 46 not voting. The suffrage leaders declared the vote had been taken at an inopportune moment and immediately started organizing their

¹ Ibid., p. 1413.

² Ibid., p. 1443.

³ Ibid., p. 1413.

⁴ Ibid., p. 1483.

forces for the next attempt.

During the debate in the House a similar resolution was before the Senate. It was the first vote in the Senate since 1887, and although the amendment failed by eleven votes it indicated nevertheless that Congress had been forced to take some action on the equal suffrage amendment. April, 1913 Senator Chamberlain¹ of Oregon presented in the Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution enfranchising women. Senator Ashurst of Arizona of the Woman Suffrage Committee reported this back favorably two months² later. The Senate divided geographically on the measure. The North and West combined to urge its passage while the South and East fought to defeat it.

Among its staunch Northern defenders was Senator Jones of Washington. He took this opportunity to answer all of the arguments he could find against suffrage. He declared that there was a widespread demand for this amendment, women were capable in school and local elections, genuine politics would advance women intellectually, the patriotic class would be increased, woman's influence was needed to clean up politics, women should aid in making laws concerning women, and equal suffrage would strengthen the home ties.³ The junior Senator from Washington, Mr. Poindexter, spoke in favor of the measure.

¹ Congressional Record, Vol.L, p. 57.

² Ibid., p. 1988.

³ Ibid., p. 5119.

amendment or rather ridiculed those who opposed it because¹ it might change custom and established order. Senator Clapp of Minnesota attempted to justify the forcing of woman suffrage on those states which did not desire it. His line of reasoning was that the Constitution had given the people the power to impose upon all of the states any condition which the majority deemed wise. He believed democracy could exist only when all were allowed to participate in the affairs of the government.² He had certain definite ideas as to who was preventing the passage of the national amendment and listed "the men who thrive upon the toil of over-worked women, the men who profit from the white slave traffic, the men who thrive upon the pollution of sources of American political activities, and the men who thrive upon the traffic that drags down manhood and destroys it" as the enemies of the suffrage movement.³ Senator Gronna of North Dakota was in favor of giving the vote to women to stamp out the liquor problem as they had in North Dakota.⁴

Since the adoption of suffrage by states began in the West it was from this section of the country that the movement spread. As one might expect, the Senators from the Western suffrage states all made speeches for the amendment, some of which no doubt were meant to please their lately

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. L, p. 4959.

² Ibid., p. 4147.

³ Ibid., p. 4195.

⁴ Ibid., p. 5088.

enfranchised constituents at home. Two Western Senators were responsible for the introduction and vote on the resolution. Mr. Chamberlain of Oregon introduced the measure and Mr. Ashurst of Arizona kept it before the Senate and even dared the wrath of the Congressional Union to bring it to a vote on May 2.¹ Senators Clark of Wyoming and Work of California expressed their belief in equal suffrage but admitted they were concerned over their duty in the matter. They were inclined to believe that it was a matter for each state to deal with, but they declared that they did not intend to let their doubts get the best of them and that they would vote for the resolution. Senators Bristow of Kansas and Smoot of Utah defended woman suffrage by explaining its success in their states.² Mr. Thomas of Kansas also listed the reforms accomplished by the women in his state and explained that the evils of suffrage predicted by many were not present in Kansas.³ Senator Shaforth of Colorado had figures to show that only one-half of one percent of the immoral women of that state voted. He presented sixteen letters from judges of Colorado courts answering his inquiry as to the number of divorce cases in their courts caused by disagreements arising over politics or candidates. All of the judges had never had a divorce case arising from this

¹ Loc. cit.

² Congressional Record, Vol. LI, p. 3598.

³ Congressional Record, Vol. L, p. 4271.

¹
 cause. Mr. Works of California tried to persuade the senators to vote for the amendment by showing how many women in his state took advantage of their voting privilege.²

The Colorado and Arizona Senators stated that the denial of suffrage to the women was against the principle of our government. On this point Mr. Shaforth of Colorado said that since women were an element of society that is governed logically under the Declaration of Independence there must be consent upon her part and consent can only be obtained by the elective franchise.³ Senator Ashurst felt that the people included the women, who could not be denied suffrage without doing violence to the fundamental principles of our government. He elaborated upon this idea and continued to advance other reasons why women should vote. He believed that changing conditions cause constitutional amendments, and since the vast majority of the people do not have time to promote the needed reforms they leave this to their public servants, who turn out to be "faithless trustees" when they fail to accomplish these reforms. He stated that political liberty was essential to the citizen, and without it the workingmen were worse off than serfs. He proclaimed suffrage as a political right, and said the right to vote comes from the state but that the right of certain citizens to be

1 Congressional Record, Vol. L, p. 4135.

2 Ibid., p. 2943.

3 Ibid., p. 2941.

exempted from certain discriminations is granted the Federal Constitution. Going back a few years he explained that Abraham Lincoln was the first prominent person to declare for woman suffrage when in 1836 he published a letter in the Sangamean County Journal stating that he was in favor "of granting the ballot to all citizens possessed of certain qualifications, by no means excluding females." Striking a humorous vein the Senator said that it was argued that when women voted the men would no longer be chivalrous toward them.¹ He thought Cervantes was supposed to have killed chivalry, nevertheless whether it was gone or not the age of justice was here, and women were obedient to the law and taxed for the upkeep of the government so they should be allowed to vote. As though he had not given sufficient reasons for voting for the resolution he proceeded to give a list of reforms which women would bring about when they voted and made the laws. These reforms were: Sanitary regulations, conservation of public health, better roads, sharing of wealth, safety for workers, improve public offices, prison reform,² and prevention of war.

Senator Pittman of Nevada agreed with Mr. Ashurst in this last argument and said he would vote for the amendment because the women would bring about reforms and their votes³ would be for the essential good of the country. Senator

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. L, p. 2024.

² Ibid., p. 2025.

³ Congressional Record, Vol. LI, p. 5100

Sutherland of Utah spoke for suffrage for women. He did not believe the households would suffer if women were given the vote because women had stepped over other ancient conventionalities and this had not been the case. Senator Owen¹ of Oklahoma closed arguments of Northern Senators saying he believed women should vote because they educated the children, and they deserved to be honored by them as possessing equal honor with the men.

The only Senator East of the Mississippi whose approval of the amendment was recorded was Senator Sherman of Illinois who addressed the Senate to censor the militant suffragists by calling their demonstrations cases of lawlessness and comparing them to the Industrial Workers of the World. He² admitted he was for the resolution.

The strongest opposition to equal suffrage had always come from the South and so it was now in the Senate. These Southern senators with the aid of a few Eastern men succeeded in defeating the issue. The main argument of the Southern senators who voted against the amendment was that it went against the doctrine of state rights. In general their arguments were that suffrage was a matter for state regulation and that the Federal government should not attempt to prescribe the qualifications of electors and amend the Constitutions of the states against their wishes. The Senators feeling.

¹ Congressional Record., Vol. LI, p. 3600.

² Ibid., p. 4325.

that there were no reason why equal suffrage should be thrust upon a protesting majority represented the following Southern and Eastern states: Florida, Mississippi, Connecticut, Ohio, Louisiana, Kentucky, Maryland, and Texas.¹ One Northern Senator joined with these state rights men, this was Mr. McCumber of North Dakota.²

Several of the Southern Senators were alone in their reasons for voting against the amendment. Senator Reed of Missouri did not want the measure voted on because he believed that there were more important measures which should be acted upon, and the women had succeeded in getting along without suffrage for 6000 years.³ He also repeated that he had heard that any man who voted against this joint resolution was to be annihilated "politically, morally, intellectually, and possibly physically."⁴ Evidently Senator Reed was not one to be intimidated. Senator Martine of New Jersey said he intended to vote against the measure because he was opposed to woman suffrage on principle and because he had received many letters from prominent women of Colorado who wrote that suffrage for their sex was a failure in that state.⁵ Senator Tillman of South Carolina felt woman suffrage would affect the morals of the country, and he claimed that if the birth rate, death rate and divorces were checked in states with

¹ Congressional Record., Vol. LI, p. 5102.

² Ibid., p. 4211.

³ Ibid., p. 4006.

⁴ Ibid., p. 4005.

⁵ Ibid., p. 5094.

equal suffrage he was sure it would be found that female suffrage would have affected these things injuriously. Mr. Bryan of Florida gave figures to prove that the divorce¹ rate was higher in states having woman suffrage.

Next to the state rights argument the one most used was that this new suffrage would have a serious effect on the race question in the South. Senator Borah of Idaho declared himself against the amendment until he could be sure that it would be enforced so as to include all of the women in the Southern states. If the amendment was not to be enforced in all parts of the nation then there was no² reason why it should not be left to each state. Senator Oliver of Pennsylvania called attention to the lack of enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments in the South and asked that the Senate not pass another amendment which would not be enforced. Senator Bryan of Florida said that the white man would continue to rule the country and there was no way to stop him. The passage of the amendment would only add difficulty to the situation. In any event the white women would refuse to go to the polls where³ negro women were voting. He showed that in the Western states there were 115,040 Asiatics, and he said California would plunge the country into a war before she would allow

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LI, p. 4209.

² Ibid., p. 4148.

³ Ibid., p. 4201.

the government to regulate her internal affairs.¹ Senator Thorton of Louisiana stated he was certain that woman suffrage would have had effects in many of the Southern states "by adding to the perplexities of a problem connected with suffrage that had long troubled them."² Senator Vardaman of Mississippi attempted to amend the amendment so that suffrage could not be denied by the states on account of sex but that each state might make all other qualifications for their voters. This amendment was voted upon and received 19 yeas and 48 nays. One Senator from Maryland was the only Southern Senator to vote against this proposal.³

Upon the rejection of the Vardaman amendment Mr. Williams of the same state moved the amendment be made to read: "The right of white citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." This change received 21 yeas and 44 nays and was a sectional vote, with the South voting solidly for it.

After this the joint resolution in its original form was voted on. It received 35 yeas and 34 nays but failing to receive two thirds majority it was rejected.⁴ This was a test of the amendment's strength and showed the suffragists just who had to be won over to their side before they could hope for a victory.

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LI, p. 4197.

² Ibid., p. 4900.

³ Ibid., p. 5106.

⁴ Ibid., p. 5107.

Chapter IV

FINAL EFFORTS; SUCCESS

The defeat of the equal suffrage amendment in both the House of Representatives and the Senate in the sixty-third Congress was somewhat discouraging to the suffragists. In the following Congress the amendment did not come up for a vote, but it received some attention.

Numerous joint resolutions were proposed to amend the Constitution and give the women the vote in both Houses. As usual these resolutions were brought up by Western men and referred to the proper committee; however, in this instance¹ they were not reported back and placed on the calendars. The reason none of these resolutions were brought before either House was explained by Senator Thomas upon whom the women's organizations depended to keep their fight before his group. He stated that he had made a poll of the Senate at Mrs. Catt's request by addressing a letter to each Senator asking if he would consent to taking up the amendment and submitting it to a vote without argument. The responses had been about equal in the number objecting and consenting, so he realized the uselessness of trying to secure the amendment's passage at that time.² Although the National Woman Suffrage Association favored a disposition of the question

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 197.

² Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, p. 10417.

immediately, the Congressional Union was working hard to prevent such a thing.¹

It was at this time, 1916, that the militants were so active in denouncing President Wilson and picketing the White House, since they felt that the defeat of the amendment in the preceding Congress could only be changed by their "wearing down" the President. Throughout this Congress criticism of these women and their methods was expressed in both Houses. Representative Emerson of Ohio spoke against the pickets at the gate of the White House saying he favored equal suffrage, but that he considered their methods of obtaining it an insult to the President.² Representative Timberlake of Colorado, also a suffrage supporter, criticized picketing but admitted that he believed the offenders were being illegally imprisoned.³ Even Senator Thomas, a lifelong advocate of equal suffrage, complained against the heckling of the President at a dedication and berated the militants for obstructing action on the pending Susan B. Anthony amendment.⁴ Representative Baer of North Dakota was unsuccessful in his attempt to have a resolution passed by his House calling for an investigation of mob violence against the picketers.⁵ Numerous telegrams and

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, p. 10417.

2 Congressional Record, Vol. LIV, p. 1618.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. LV, p. 6144.

4 Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, p. 10417.

5 Congressional Record, Vol. LV, p. 6144.

letters were read in both bodies protesting against the unusual methods of the agitators; most of these came from local branches of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

In one thing only were the women not disappointed by the House which refused to allow their amendment to come up again. Representative Raker of California introduced into that House a resolution amending the rules of the body by adding a new Committee to be known as the Committee on Equal Suffrage.¹ The Committee on Rules reported this back favorably, suggesting that the new committee be made up of 13 members and that all proposed action touching on the subject of woman suffrage be referred to it.² President Wilson approved of the move and wrote: "I most heartily approve. I think it would be a very wise act of public policy and also an act of fairness to the best women who are engaged in the cause of woman suffrage."³ Representative Blackman of Alabama and Mr. Meeker of Missouri were against the Committee because they felt that it was desired only to secure a favorable report and bring up the suffrage question again.⁴ No doubt Congressman London of New York who explained he was going to vote for the proposal because "it is a miserable sop which politicians give to would be politicians,"⁵ expressed the reason held by most of those voting for it.

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LV, p. 128.

² Ibid., p. 7639.

³ Ibid., p. 7370.

⁴ Ibid., p. 7371.

⁵ Ibid., p. 7377.

Whatever their reason, 180 voted for the new committee and 107¹ registered their disapproval. Scores of Congressmen tried to refute the idea that picketing had had anything to do with their action. Mr. Cantrill of Kentucky expressed the ideas of many when he said that he believed that "millions of Christian women in the nation should not be denied the right of having a Committee in the House because of the mistakes of some few of their sisters."²

The following year, 1918, the House of Representatives allowed the suffrage amendment to come before them for a vote. Several Congressmen presented proper resolutions; however, the one brought up by Representative Raker of California³ was reported back without amendment by the Committee on Woman Suffrage which had been created in the past⁴ session.

Seven Western Representatives and one from the South defended the resolution on the floor. Representative Cantrill of Kentucky related how he had worked to secure his own and other Democratic candidates election, and how when the presidential returns first began to come in he surmised that Judge Hughes was elected. However when the Western returns began to come in the woman suffrage states of the West brought in a Wilson majority. He resolved at

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LV, p. 7384.

2 Stevens, Jailed for Freedom, p. 172.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 543.

4 Ibid., p. 699.

that time to show his appreciation of the Western women's votes by helping along their amendment, and he urged all Democrats to award the women for the part they played in letting the Democratic party have its chance at "world¹ leadership."

It was on the eve of the vote that President Wilson made his first declaration in favor of the amendment. Mr. Cantrill reported it to the House during his speech. He said in part:

"It was my privilege yesterday afternoon to be one of a committee of twelve to ask the President for advice and counsel on this important measure (laughter and jeers). Mr. Speaker, in answer to the sentiment expressed by part of the House, I desire to say that at no time and upon no occasion am I ever ashamed to confer with Woodrow Wilson upon any important question (laughter, applause) and that part of the House that has jeered that statement before it adjourns today will follow absolutely the advice which he gave this committee yesterday afternoon. (Laughter and applause.) After conference with the President yesterday afternoon he wrote with his own hands the words which I now read to you, and each member of the committee was authorized by the President to give full publicity to the following:

'The committee found that the President had not felt at liberty to volunteer his advice to members of Congress in this important matter, but when we sought his advice he very frankly and earnestly advised us to vote for the amendment as an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world.'"

Mr. Cantrill finished by urging all members to stand by² the President.

As the whole world was thinking of the war, many of the Congressmen brought it up in connection with this amendment.

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 764.

² Ibid., p. 764.

Miss Rakin of Montana, the first woman member of Congress, plead with the House to pass the measure because a Congress which voted for a war "to make the world safe for democracy" would not be able to refuse to give this small measure of democracy to the women of the country. Representative Raker¹ of Colorado also argued that this act was a war measure and should be taken care of by this Congress.² Representative Dyer of Missouri felt that Congress should pass the act to show its appreciation for the women's sacrifices during the war.³

The friends of the measure did a great deal of romanticizing about the women. Representative Langley of Kentucky said, "Give all of them the ballot and we will have better laws, better government, better men, and brighter and better world."⁴ Mr. Cox of Indiana was for it because the women were obliged to battle for a living on the same plan as the men and should have the same opportunities for power as the men. Mr. Dill of Washington paid woman the following tribute: "It was woman who first learned to prepare skins of animals for protection from the elements, and tamed and domesticated the dog and horse and cow. She was a servant and a slave..... Today she is the peer of man." Mr. Little of Kansas tried to bring his colleagues down to earth by

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p.. 772.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 793.

⁴ Ibid., p. 730.

suggesting: "It seems to me, gentlemen, that it is time for us to learn that woman is neither a slave nor an angel, but a human being entitled to be treated with ordinary common sense in the adjustment of human affairs."¹

A political tilt took place when the opposition lead by the Southern members proceeded to attack the amendment. Representative Hersey of Maine, Republican, represented the attitude of many of his party when he retorted to the Democratic slogan, "Stand by the President." He said: "Mr. Speaker, I am still standing with the President, or in other words, the President this morning is standing with me." Mr. Clark of Florida felt himself rather overcome by the President's "political speed." He said: "God knows I want to stand with him (the President). I am a Democrat, and I want to follow the leader of my party, and I am a pretty good lightning change artist myself sometimes; but God knows I cannot keep up with his performance. Why, the President wrote a book away back yonder"... and he continued by quoting from the President's many statements² defending state rights in his early writings.

Mr. Parker of New Jersey objected to any measure being brought before the House which was not a war measure. Two other Eastern Congressmen declared they would attempt to³ defeat the amendment. Mr. Greene of Massachusetts said

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 796.

2 Stevens, op. cit., p. 252.

3 Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p. 763.

bitterly he would vote against it because he disapproved of the picketers. He felt that the banner carried by many of them, "Kaiser Wilson, what will you do for woman suffrage?"¹ was very objectionable. Mr. Kerns of Ohio took the position that a member, when he knew the feeling of his constituency, should follow it. Knowing Ohio was against the movement,² he felt unable to vote in the affirmative. As had been the case before, the South furnished the most ardent opponents. Representative Moon of Tennessee felt that his duty and loyalty to the Democratic platform prevented him from supporting the bill although he was in favor of enfranchising the women.³ The remaining Southern opponents joined together in protesting that the proposed amendment would strip their respective states of their constitutional rights. Mr. Clark of Florida believed his own state should be left the right to fix the voter's qualifications.⁴ The Texas, South Carolina,⁵ and Alabama,⁶ Representatives expressed the same opinion.

In spite of the fervid pleas of the opponents of the amendments, two hundred seventy-four members voted for the measure and secured its passage. One hundred thirty-six⁷ voted against it. Amid a heated debate the House had passed the national suffrage amendment, and the suffragists now

1 Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, p 767.

2 Ibid., p. 772.

3 Ibid., p. 765.

4 Ibid., p. 780.

5 Ibid., p. 794.

6 Ibid., p. 796.

7. Ibid., p. 802.

turned their entire attention to the Senate.

The President had thrown his power behind the House of Representatives and the suffragists waited to see if he would urge the passage of the amendment in the Senate. There were ninety-six senate members and sixty-four votes were necessary to pass the measure. The women believed that fifty-three Senators would vote for the amendment, so it was necessary to get eleven more to change their minds.¹ The President urged all to support the measure, influencing four of the Democratic Senators. Senators Phelan of California, King of Utah, Gerry of Rhode Island, and Culberson of Texas left the opposition groups. Among the Republicans, Senators McCumber of North Dakota, Kellogg of Minnesota, Harding of Ohio, Page of Vermont, and Sutherland of West Virginia were compelled to support the amendment because of the pressure² brought to bear on them by the party leaders. However, when it was voted upon October 1, 1918, two votes were lacking³ and the amendment once more met defeat.

Only the short second session of the 65th Congress from December 1918 to March 1919 remained in which to win those two needed votes. If the amendment was not passed at this session it would automatically die and have to be brought up again in a new Congress, even though it had already successfully passed one branch of Congress. When Congress

¹ Stevens, op. cit., p. 260.

² North Dakota Legislature compelled Mr. McCumber to vote in the affirmative.

³ Stevens, op. cit., p. 269.

reconvened for its final session, President Wilson for the first time included suffrage in his regular message to Congress.¹ Soon after this he sailed away to France. Less than fifty days remained in which to secure the two votes. A Democratic caucus was held and with the aid of a cable from the President, Senator Pollock yielded, thus gaining one more vote for the amendment. This gain of one vote reduced the number lacking to only one. Some of the Democratic leaders began to be alarmed that it would not be secured. William Jennings Bryan consulted with the Democrats who were still opposing the amendment and argued:

"Woman suffrage is coming to the country and to the world. It will be submitted to the states by the next Congress, if it is not submitted by the present Congress. I hope the Democrats of the South will not handicap the Democrats of the North by compelling them to spend the next twenty-five years explaining to the women of the country why their party prevented the submission of the suffrage amendment to the states."

With one vote still lacking the Democratic Congress came to a close and it now looked as if all of the credit for the amendment would go to the Republican Congress which followed.

This Congress which was elected in November, 1918 would not sit until December 1919 unless the President called a special session. Two new Democratic Senators had been elected to sit in the new Congress. Senators Harrison of Mississippi and Mr. Harris of Georgia. Mr. Harris was traveling in Italy and the President wired him to come to

¹ Stevens, op. cit., p. 294.

France. It was here that he pledged the sixty-fourth vote for the amendment, and from that day on the passage by Congress of the original Susan B. Anthony amendment was assured.¹ The Republican Congress convened in Special Session May 19, 1919. The Republican leaders met in caucus and provided for the prompt passage of the amendment. With very little discussion the Republican House passed the measure by a vote of 304 to 89.² This was 42 votes above the required two-thirds.

Immediately after this the Senate received a message from the House asking for concurrence on the amendment. Still the Southern men tried to prevent the colored women from getting the vote. Senator Harrison of Mississippi proposed an amendment giving only the white women the vote.³ Thirteen Southern men and one Northerner voted for it.

Senator Borah of Idaho still objected, as he always had, to the amendment because he believed suffrage would not be enforced for all of the women of the South.⁴ Senator Gay of Louisiana attempted to remedy this by offering an amendment providing for federal legislation in cases where any state failed to enforce the nineteenth amendment. This attempt⁵ did not meet with any success. On June 4, the measure passed the Senate by a vote of 56 to 25; two votes more

¹ Stevens, *op. cit.*, p. 337

² Congressional Record, Vol. LVIII, p. 81

³ Ibid., p. 557.

⁴ Ibid., p. 561.

⁵ Ibid., p. 634.

than were needed. Of the forty-nine Republicans in the Senate, forty voted for the amendment and nine against. Twenty-six of the forty-seven Democrats were in favor of the amendment and twenty-one¹ against it. So the amendment introduced into Congress by the efforts of Susan B. Anthony in 1878, was submitted to the states for ratification on June 4, 1919.

¹ Congressional Record, Vol. LVIII, p.634.

Chapter V

CONCLUSION

The Nineteenth Amendment did not mark the end of the woman's rights movement. The Congressional Union, the active militant suffrage group, organized the National Woman's Party in 1921. This is a national non-partisan organization of women, dedicated to the freedom of their sex. Its object is to advance the interest of women in the law and in the customs of the people. It is now sponsoring equal rights measures in the various State Legislatures and is endeavoring to obtain an amendment to the national Constitution providing:

"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."

This amendment is known as the Lucrettia Mott Amendment and is now before the Judiciary Committee. The organization feels that a national amendment is the most effective, surest, and quickest as well as the least expensive method of securing the equality of men and women before the law. This type of legislation is also more inclusive¹ and permanent than State legislation.

The women are also working hard to remove certain discriminations which some State constitutions contain

¹ National Woman's Party, Equal Rights by National Amendment,
p. 3.

against women. For example the constitution of Oklahoma provides that the governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary of state, state auditor, attorney-general, and superintendent of public instruction shall be "male" citizens. The National Woman's Party is now aiding the women of Oklahoma to remove the barrier which prevents a woman from holding any of the major state offices. Colorado, Georgia, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia have constitutions which limit jury service to men. It is such discriminations as these that the women are attempting to remove.^I

Numerous equal rights measures which the Woman's Party has sponsored have been secured in twenty-four states since 1921. A few of these are:

1. In California married women have been given equal rights with their husband to will away half of the community property, and mothers have been given equal rights with fathers in appointing a guardian for their children by will.

2. In Delaware women have been given the right by constitutional amendment to hold all public offices, and wives have been given equal rights with husbands to reserve a limited amount of property which cannot be taken to satisfy debts.

3. In Florida married women have been made competent to be incorporators, stockholders and officers of corporations.

4. In Georgia women have been given the same right as men to be appointed guardians for their collateral relatives.

¹ Ibid., p. 7.

² National Woman's Party, Legislation Won in Equal Rights Campaign, p. 2.

5. In Louisiana women have been given the right to be appointed as notaries public, and widows have been given the right to retain the guardianship of their children after remarriage.

6. In Maryland women teachers have been given equal rights with men teachers.

7. In New Jersey women have been given the same rights as men to be executors and trustees.

8. So far Wisconsin is the only state which has passed a law purporting to give women the "same rights" as men except with regard to industrial laws¹.

At the present time the Woman's Party has joined with seven other international organizations and is insisting that the United States refuse to ratify a treaty which includes a codification of international law to be administered by the World Court, which they claim will discriminate² against women.

The suffrage movement was merely one phase of the woman's rights movement. Women were first interested in economic and industrial rights, legal freedom, and property rights but soon realized suffrage was the only means of gaining these advantages. The first definite and organized demand for equal suffrage in the United States was in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848, at the first woman's rights convention. This demand continued along through the nineteenth century. The women had become conscious of their unequal position

¹ National Woman's Party, Legislation Won in Equal Rights Campaign, p. 5.

² Equal Rights, September 10, 1932.

as they entered the industrial world and felt that it was necessary to change these conditions by some means.

In 1848 and 1849 Europe was the scene of many revolutions which came as a result of a new movement for the freedom of man and the spreading of democracy. The woman suffrage movement was probably coincident with these other liberal movements which were sweeping the world in the middle of the nineteenth century and was at first more or less doctrinaire. In America the equal suffrage movement was part of the larger liberal movement which was spreading across the country at that time. Both the abolition and temperance movements were receiving attention and the woman's movement developed along with them. In fact it was in the abolition societies that many of the women appeared before the public for the first time. As the idea of woman suffrage became older and the women did all they could to aid their movement, the public gradually began to change its opinions, and the criticism the movement met with at first died down leaving only the organized opposition of certain powerful forces which feared they would be affected by any change in the voters' qualifications.

The women were kept waiting many years and suffrage

¹ Cutler, H. G., "Why Do Women Want the Ballot," The Forum, Vol. LIII, p. 715 (July, 1915).

was finally granted to them during a war period when there was high enthusiasm in the country for any democratic principle. By this time both of the main political parties were advocating it for each felt that it was only a matter of time until it would come and each wished to be responsible for the amendment's passage.¹

¹ Miss Elsie Hill of the National Woman's Party says that "the organized machinery of the Republican Party was set in motion at the end to secure ratification in order that the anticipated election of a Republican President in 1920 might not be invalidated." (No doubt Miss Hill means held up.) "The very men who had opposed suffrage for years in Connecticut, as a matter of policy, switched so that Connecticut became the thirty-seventh state" to ratify. Letter from Miss Hill to the writer, May 19, 1933.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Material

- Congressional Globe, 1865.
- Congressional Record, 1869.
- Congressional Record, 1871.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XIII, 1882.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XIV, 1883.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XV, 1884.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XVIII, 1886.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XXI, 1890.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XXII, 1891.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XXIII, 1893.
- Congressional Record, Vol. XLV, 1910.
- Congressional Record, Vol. L, 1913.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LI, 1914.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LII, 1915.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LII, Appendix, 1915.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, 1916.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LIV, 1916.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LV, 1917.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LVI, 1918.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LVII, 1919.
- Congressional Record, Vol. LVIII, 1919.
- Fourth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1888.

Brewer and Liquor Interests, Senate Investigation,
Vol. I, 1918.

Letters

Elsie Hill to Harriet G. Webster, May 19, 1933.

Familiar Letters of John and Wife, Houghton Mifflin &
Co., Boston, 1898.

Pamphlets

Equal Rights, September 10, 1932.

Equal Rights by National Amendment, National Woman's
Party Pamphlet.

Legislation Won in Equal Rights Campaign, National
Woman's Party Pamphlet.

Secondary Material

Catt, C., Shuler, N., Woman Suffrage and Politics,
Scribners Sons, New York, 1926.

Dorr, R. C., What Eight Million Women Want,
Small, Maynard & Co., Cambridge, 1910.

Harper, I. H., The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony,
Vols. I, II, III, Hollenbeck Press, Indianapolis, 1908.

Stanton, E., Anthony, S., Gage, H., History of Woman
Suffrage, Vols. V, VI, J. J. Little & Ives Co., New York,
1922.

Hecker, E., Short History of Woman's Rights, G. C.
Putman's Sons, New York, 1911.

Stevens D., Jailed for Freedom, Boni & Liverlight,
New York, 1920.

Crother, H. B., Hudnut, R. A., Problems of Citizenship,
Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1924.

Calhoun, L., History of Family in U. S., Arthur Clark &
Co., New York, 1917.

"Why Do Women Want the Ballot," The Forum, Vol. LIII,
p. 715 (July, 1915).

Shaw, A., Story of a Pioneer, Harper & Bros., New York, 1915.