

and for British support of the Monroe doctrine. He furthermore declared that the government had sanctioned a plan to enable Great Britain to secure payment of confederate bonds through some unexplained means of laying the entire burden on the southern states. President Wilson later invited Senator Jones to a conference at the White House. On the following day the Senator confessed in the Senate that his assertions had no other foundation than sensational newspaper gossip, and that the President had assured him that they had no foundation of fact whatever. He accordingly apologized. [See current volume, page 274.]

The lobby investigating committee of the House of Representatives reported on March 17. It recommended administration of a rebuke to Congressman James T. McDermott, the Democratic labor union member from Chicago. It also recommended for rebuke the following officers of the National Association of Manufacturers: J. Philip Bird, general manager; John Kirby, Jr., president from 1909 to 1913, and James A. Emery, general counsel. It further recommended that an anti-lobbying bill be passed containing the following provisions:

The Senate and House shall maintain legislative dockets on which shall be registered the names of lobbyists and their employers and the measures in which they are interested.

Lobbyists shall not give any service except the making of arguments before committees and shall not accept compensation contingent upon the passage or defeat of legislation.

Lobbyists and their employers shall file with each house itemized expense accounts at the close of each session, setting forth all expenditures in connection with their activities.

Lobbyists shall not attempt to influence personally the votes of individual members on pending legislation.

Lobbyists and their employers shall not make any gift, campaign contribution, or loan to any member or candidate for a seat in Congress.

[See current volume, page 275.]

Before the Senate lobbying committee on March 18, former Rear-Admiral F. T. Bowles, president of the Fore River Shipbuilding Company, testified that he had sought to defeat the exclusion of railroad-owned ships from the Panama Canal. He said he had paid a \$1,000 retainer to Clarence DeKnight to fight this legislation and had promised him \$4,000 in event of success. DeKnight had previously testified that he had been retained to work for toll exemption. Admiral Bowles read a letter from DeKnight dated March 29, 1912, in which he referred to Congressman Knowland of California and said he would "co-operate with him to the fullest extent." Congressman Knowland

has been active in opposition to repeal of toll exemption. [See current volume, page 274.]

The holding company bill, one of the administration's anti-trust measures, was made public on March 17. Its principal provisions, as announced, are to the effect "that it shall be unlawful for one corporation engaged in interstate or foreign commerce to acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole, or any part, of the stock or other share of capital of another corporation engaged also in interstate or foreign commerce, where the effect of such acquisition is to eliminate or lessen competition." It will exempt "corporations purchasing such stock solely for investment, and not using the same, by voting or otherwise, to bring about, or in attempting to bring about, the lessening of competition." A further provision is that "nothing contained in this act shall prevent a corporation engaged in interstate or foreign commerce from causing the formation of subsidiary corporations for the actual carrying on of their immediate lawful business, or the natural and legitimate branches thereof, or from owning and holding all or a part of the stock of such subsidiary corporations, when the effect of such formation is not to eliminate or lessen a preëxisting competition." [See current volume, pages 105, 275.]

The Burnett immigration bill with the literacy test retained, was favorably reported on March 19 by the Senate Committee on Immigration. [See current volume, page 153.]

#### Federal Woman Suffrage Amendment.

The Woman Suffrage Amendment to the Constitution, which required a two-thirds majority for passage, was lost in the Senate on March 19 by a vote of 35 yeas to 34 nays, there being 26 absentees. This action was taken after many days' debate and much disagreement among suffragists as to whether they wished the matter to be voted upon as soon as possible or postponed. For the resolution, were 14 Democrats, 20 Republicans, and 1 Progressive; against it, were 22 Democrats and 12 Republicans. Three Southern members, Senators Ransdell of Louisiana, Sheppard of Texas and Lea of Tennessee, voted yea.

On March 2, in accordance with a motion by Senator Ashurst, the Suffrage resolution had been made the unfinished business on the calendar and therefore remained before the Senate until action was taken. When it became clear that a Senate majority for the Amendment was all that could be hoped for by its proponents, the leaders of the two most prominent suffrage organizations work-

ing for the Amendment, the Congressional Union and the National Woman's Suffrage Association, disagreed about the best course to pursue. The Congressional Union, viewing failure in the Senate as a set-back to the cause, urged postponement of the vote until after the Suffrage demonstration in May, in the hope, as reported, that possibly the great suffrage strength thereby shown would win Senate votes. But the Woman's National Suffrage Association advocated an immediate Senate vote. In the Senate before the original measure was acted upon, two amendments were offered and both were overwhelmingly defeated: One, offered by Senator Vardaman of Mississippi, proposed in effect to repeal the 15th Amendment, which says that, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude." Senator Vardaman announced himself as in favor of Woman Suffrage if the Negro question could be thus removed. The second amendment, moved by Senator John Sharp Williams, proposed to give the vote to white women only. The course of the debate, as well as these amendments, demonstrated without doubt that in the minds of the Southerners and of at least one Westerner the enfranchisement of women was complicated with the race question. [See current volume, page 177.]



On the 20th, Senator Shafroth of Colorado offered in the Senate a joint resolution for a Federal Constitutional Amendment that, upon ratification by three-fourths of the State Legislatures, would compel each State, whenever 5 per cent of its voters so demanded, to submit the question of woman suffrage to a mandatory referendum vote. The resolution was referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee. Senator Bristow of Kansas, on the same day, re-introduced the Resolution for a Woman Suffrage Amendment in the same form as voted upon the day previous.



The House Judiciary Committee held its appointed hearing on Woman Suffrage on March 3. The Congressional Union, which had requested the hearing, under the leadership of Mrs. Glendower Evans, argued mainly to demonstrate the political expediency of the Democratic Party's declaring for a Woman Suffrage Constitutional Amendment, the Mondell resolution for which was in the hands of the Committee. In case this Amendment should not be reported out by the Committee, the representatives of the National Woman's Suffrage Association, including Mrs. Medill McCormick and Mrs. William Kent, asked the favorable reporting by the Committee of a Federal Constitutional Amendment for a mandatory referendum on Woman Suffrage in every State in

which 5 per cent of the voters petitioned for it. Anti-Suffragists, led by Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge of New York, laid before the Committee States' rights as one plea and the desire of the 90 per cent of the American women "whom we represent" as another, against the Federal Amendment. Between the Congressional Union and the National Woman's Suffrage Association there was noticeable in the discussion a marked disagreement on two points: First, the Congressional Union was apparently speaking to a political party, while the National Woman's Suffrage Association was addressing Congressmen as individuals. Second, the Congressional Union stood out uncompromisingly for what has up to this time been the measure demanded by the suffragists from Congress—an Amendment to the Federal Constitution which, upon its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, would immediately grant suffrage to the women in all the States. The National Woman's Suffrage Association seemed willing to accept, in default of this measure, an Amendment which, when ratified, would merely require each State to hold and abide by a referendum on woman suffrage whenever 5 per cent of its voters so requested. [See current volume, page 177.]



#### More New Voters in Illinois.

In Chicago, on March 17, over 60,000 women registered as voters in addition to the 159,000 who registered February 3. In the Democratic wards, where foreign nationalities predominate, especial effort had been made to get the women to register and these showed great gains on the polling lists. One of the Catholic Bishops had written a public letter strongly urging all good Catholic women to register and vote, and the women's clubs had done much work among the foreign women. On the 15th the women's organizations held four "registration rallies" in the business district, each presided over by a suffrage leader and each addressed by prominent citizens and Aldermanic candidates. [See current volume, pages 178, 228.]



Other Illinois cities also showed heavy registration of women; among these being Springfield, with 10,000, Rockford with 7,000, and Danville with 6,200 women's names added to the polling lists. [See current volume, page 178.]



#### Mayor Gill Surprises Seattle.

At the outset of his administration on March 16 Mayor Gill of Seattle caused surprise by appointing as Chief of Police Austin E. Griffiths, who had been numbered among his bitterest opponents. Another surprise was a speech delivered by him on the same day at a banquet of business