

peace, and immediately appointed a commission to confer with General Carranza on the transfer of the government to the Constitutionalists. His demands of General Carranza were a general amnesty, and a recognition of the acts of the Huerta government. These were met by the demand for unconditional surrender. Large bodies of Constitutionalist troops are within striking distance of the City of Mexico, and as nearly all the Federal troops have withdrawn, there is little doubt that General Carranza will have his way. Hostilities have practically ceased upon all hands, and an armistice is in process of negotiation.



The policy of the Washington administration, unofficially outlined, embraces a recognition of the Constitutionalist government as soon as set up in Mexico City; assistance in raising funds; insistence that the new government create a commission to arbitrate all foreign claims; requirement that the new government protect foreign life and property; refusal on the part of the United States to recognize the validity of the concessions granted by the Huerta government; waiving of claims of indemnity for cost or army and naval operations by United States; withdrawal from Vera Cruz when the permanency of the new government is established; and restoration to the agents of the new government of the customs house at Vera Cruz.



Woman Suffrage Declarations.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, issued on July 16 a formal statement declaring himself for woman suffrage. The statement began as follows:

The voters of Nebraska will at the election next November adopt or reject a proposed amendment extending suffrage to women on equal terms with men. As a citizen of that State it will be my duty to participate in the decision to be rendered at the polls. I have delayed expressing an opinion on this subject, partly because I have been seeking information and partly because my time has been occupied with national questions upon which the entire country was acting; but now that the issue is presented in my State I take my position. I shall support the amendment. I shall ask no political rights for myself that I am not willing to grant to my wife. As man and woman are co-tenants of the earth and must work out their destiny together, the presumption is on the side of equality of treatment in all that pertains to their joint life and its opportunities. The burden of proof is on those who claim for one an advantage over the other in determining the conditions under which both shall live. This claim has not been established in the matter of suffrage. On the contrary, the objections raised to woman suffrage appear to me to be invalid, while the arguments advanced in support of the proposition are, in my judgment, convincing.

Several objections to equal suffrage were analyzed and answered by Mr. Bryan, and the right of the

mother to the vote in the care of her children was emphasized:

The mother can justly claim the right to employ every weapon which can be made effective for the protection of those whose interests she guards, and the ballot will put within her reach all the instrumentalities of government, including the police power. If she is a widow there is no one who is in a position to speak for her in this matter of supreme importance; if her husband is living she can supplement this influence if they agree as to what is best for those under their joint care; if they do not agree, who will say that only the father should be consulted?

For a time I was impressed by the suggestion that the question should be left to the women to decide—a majority to determine whether the franchise should be extended to women; but I find myself less and less disposed to indorse this test. Samuel Johnson coined an epigram which is in point here, namely, that “No man’s conscience can tell him the right of another man.” Responsibility for the child’s welfare rests primarily upon the parent; the parent receives in largest measure the blessings that flow from the child’s life, if that life is nobly employed, and upon the parent falls the blow with severest force if the child’s life is misspent. Why should any mother, therefore, be denied the use of the franchise to safeguard the welfare of her child merely because another mother may not view her duty in the same light?

[See current volume, pages 327, 658, 682.]



One June 27, the day when in his home State of Missouri petitions for submission at the November election of a woman suffrage amendment to the State constitution were filed, Mr. Champ Clark, Speaker of the House, declared himself in favor of the enfranchisement of women to a delegation from the National Woman Suffrage Association and the Washington Suffrage Council which waited upon him, according to press reports, “to urge his support for Federal legislation insuring to women equal political rights with men” and for the “most feasible and practical” action by Congress. “The only question for you to consider,” Mr. Clark is reported to have said, “is how you can expeditiously get what you want, because I think you are going to get it. My own judgment is that you can get it quicker through the States than through Congress. At the rate you are going now, it looks to me as if you might get in three or four or five years. My own position, and I might as well make that clear now, because I have got to do it some time, is that I think women should vote. Whenever it is submitted in Missouri I am going to vote for it.”

[See current volume, page 613.]



Doings in Congress.

The Senate judiciary committee finally agreed on July 20 on all changes in the Clayton anti-trust