



The National Woman's Party Bulletin

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY, 144 CONSTITUTION AVE., N.E., WASHINGTON, D. C.
DUES: ASSOCIATE \$5; ACTIVE \$10; MAINTENANCE \$25; SUPPORTING \$100; LIFE \$1,000

Vol. 1

September - October, 1966

No. 6

Text of the Equal Rights Amendment:

"Equality of Rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Officers of the National Woman's Party:

Founder and Honorary Chairman, Alice Paul, Conn.

Honorary Chairmen: Elsie Hill, Conn., Anita Pollitzer, S.C., Ernestine Breisch Powell, Ohio, and Amelia Himes Walker, Fla.

National President:

Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.

National Chairman:

Mary A. Birckhead, Md.

National Vice Chairmen:

Pearl Sayre, Okla., Mary J.

Brandon, Ohio, Butler Franlin, Va.,

Marjorie Longwell, Calif., Louise

Gore, Md.

Treasurer:

Elizabeth C. Forbes, Md.

Recording Secretary:

Mary Burnett, Va.

Corresponding Secretary:

Esther Cloward, N. Y.

Assistant Treasurer and

Bulletin Chairman:

Mary Glenn Newell, D.C.

COMMENTS BY THE BULLETIN CHAIRMAN:

This will be the last Bulletin you will receive before adjournment of the 89th Congress, unless they decide to "recess" and return after the November elections. As this goes to press, Sept. 30, we cannot predict what action will be taken on the Equal Rights for Women Amendment before final adjournment.

As we look back over the four years of the 88th and 89th Congresses we recall days of encouragement and days of disappointment. Our greatest disappointment was the lack of support from President Johnson. He had been a supporter of the Amendment in the Senate and in a letter dated Oct. 19, 1960, to our National President, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, regarding the Equal Rights for Women Amendment, he said:

"As I am sure you know, I have consistently supported this resolution and I intend to continue with this support."

This was during the 1960 election campaign, just before his election as Vice President. When he became President upon the death of President Kennedy we looked forward to this support, but in this we were disappointed. In the National Democratic Platforms for many years we had strong planks for the Equal Rights for Women Amendment but in the 1964 National Platform we had less than a weak plank, one which did not even mention the Equal Rights Amendment. This plank was drawn up under the close supervision of the President. In reply to a letter from Mrs. Miller protesting against the omission of support for the Amendment in the Platform, after pleasantries, he wrote:

"I am sorry you were disappointed in the platform. Platforms can never satisfy everyone, try though we may."

In another letter to Mrs. Miller, dated Dec. 3, 1964, again relative to the Equal Rights Amendment, he said:

"You know I will give it every consideration in the days ahead and will look forward to your continued support."

President Johnson has given no support to the Equal Rights for Women Amendment, although he has worked wholeheartedly for the Civil Rights Bills prohibiting the denial of civil rights because of race, color, religion and national origin. In one instance - when largely through our efforts Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was amended to include "sex" in the provisions prohibiting discrimination in employment - the Administration spokesmen opposed the inclusion of the word "sex." However, in the 1964 Platform it was claimed as one of the great achievements of the Administration. (See article in this Bulletin entitled "History of the Struggle to Amend Title VII to Include 'Sex.'")

Largely due to lack of support from the Administration, the Equal Rights for Women Amendment has not, as of Sept. 30, 1966, been reported out of the Senate Judiciary, although of the nine members of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, seven are present Sponsors and one other has indicated his support, and in the full Judiciary Committee, of sixteen members, eleven are Sponsors and two others have indicated their support.

There is a chance that the 89th Congress may not adjourn in mid October, as planned, and that the Amendment may still be favorably reported out and passed by the Senate, before adjournment. Then, of course, the Amendment will have to be sent to the House for action. We will not give up hope so long as there is a possibility.

Should we fail in the 89th Congress, the National Woman's Party, still undaunted, will start over again in the 90th Congress when it convenes in January 1967, just as it has in every Congress since 1923 when the Amendment was first introduced.

Beginning in 1948, when the first meeting for equality for women ever held in this country met at Seneca Falls, N. Y., until 1920, when women were enfranchised, 72 years later, women worked for the right to vote. At first they worked through the States - an amendment to the Constitution was never thought of as there had been no such amendment since 1803.

Following the Civil War three Amendments were added to the National Constitution, the 13th, abolishing slavery; the 14th giving civil rights to all citizens, and the 15th, giving the right to vote to the Negro. The 15th Amendment read:

"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."

Women tried to have this Amendment changed to include "sex" as well as "race, color or previous condition of servitude." This was denied them - they were told "This is the Negroes hour." After that the women concluded that the best way to obtain the right to vote was by a Constitutional

Amendment similar to the one enfranchizing the Negro. And so, through the efforts of the Suffrage leaders, a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to give to women the right to vote was introduced in the Congress in 1878. This resolution read:

"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 sex."

Victory did not come until 1920 - forty-two years later, after the resolution was passed by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States, when it became the 19th Amendment to the Constitution.

It was fifty years after the 15th Amendment enfranchizing the Negro, before women were enfranchized by the 19th Amendment in 1920. Even today, legislation to benefit the Negro takes precedence over legislation to benefit women.

The 19th Amendment gave to women the right to vote - no other. This was not the purpose of the women who met at Seneca Falls in 1848. They wanted full equality, both civil and political. To obtain these additional rights, in 1923, following the Suffrage Victory, a resolution was introduced in Congress for full equality of rights under the law, sponsored by the National Woman's Party. The resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator Charles Curtis, Republican, of Kansas, later Vice President, and in the House by Representative Daniel Anthony, also a Republican of Kansas, who was a nephew of Susan B. Anthony.

In spite of the great strength in Congress in support of the Equal Rights for Women Amendment, in the 88th Congress and now in the 89th Congress, priority has been given to the Civil Rights Bills, primarily to benefit the Negro, and these bills have consumed so much of the time of Congress, that action on our Amendment has again been deferred. In this connection we quote from a communication received just a few days ago from a distinguished member, Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney, Civil Engineer and Architect of Greenwich, Conn., granddaughter of the famous Suffragist who convened the historic meeting at Seneca Falls, N. Y. in 1848:

"How completely ignorant most women are of their degraded position.

"When will Women realize that they are only enfranchized, not emancipated?

"When will Women have first-class citizenship?

"When will Women's status be raised to that of the Negro under the Constitution?

"When will Women have the equal protection of the Law which colored citizens have."

Mrs. Barney's family represents three generations of women, dedicated leaders in the movement to raise the Status of Women:

Her grandmother, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, one of the most famous of the pioneer Suffragists.

Her mother, Harriot Stanton Blatch, one of the National leaders in the later days of the Suffrage movement.

Mrs. Barney herself, also an ardent leader in the later days of the Suffrage campaign, and continuing in the Equal Rights Campaign. For many years she was Chairman of the Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party. She has two daughters and a son, all interested in Equality of Rights for Women. Her children and grandchildren have been frequent visitors at Headquarters. Two grandsons, fine young college students, recently visited us.

(This has been written at the request of Members for a brief history of the Woman Movement.)

HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE TO AMEND TITLE VII TO INCLUDE "SEX"

"Title VII" has become almost as well known as the "Declaration of Independence," especially to the working woman. For her it was the most far reaching legislation ever enacted by Congress for the benefit of women. Lest some of our readers are not too well informed on the subject, we will review it briefly.

"Title VII" was that part of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964, H.R. 7152, which related to employment practices and it provided that no employer should discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment on account of "race, color, religion or national origin." As the bill did not bar discrimination against women workers, the National Woman's Party, always alert to the rights of women, initiated a campaign to amend Title VII by adding "sex" in all places where the words "race, color, religion and national origin" appeared. In spite of great opposition the campaign was successful and when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted on July 2, 1964, Title VII included prohibition against discrimination in the field of employment on account of "sex" as well as "race, color, religion and national origin." All other provisions of the Act became effective immediately, but Title VII did not become effective until one year later, July 2, 1965.

On July 26, 1965, a bill, H.R. 10065, was introduced in the House by Representative Augustus Hawkins (D), Calif., to repeal Title VII and replace it by a new Act to be known as the "Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

Apprehensive lest the plan of the opponents of the addition of "sex" was to omit "sex" in the new bill to replace Title VII, the National Woman's Party again initiated a campaign against the repeal of Title VII, unless the new bill to replace it included the same provisions against discrimination because of "sex" as had been added to Title VII.

H.R. 10065 was passed by the House on April 27, 1966, and retained the provisions against discrimination because of "sex."

The bill, as passed by the House, was sent to the Senate for action on April 28, 1966. In the Senate another bill, S. 3077, had been introduced, almost identical with H.R. 10065, except that it omitted "sex" in the clause barring discrimination. Again, the National Woman's Party initiated a campaign against S. 3077 in the form in which it had been introduced.

At the time the Conference on the Status of Women Commissions was held in Washington June 28-30, 1966, both H.R. 10065 and S. 3077 to repeal Title VII were before the Senate, and because of the effect of these bills on the status of women, we could not understand why they were not brought to the attention of the Conference delegates. The only reference to Title VII we saw in the Press was one which appeared in the Evening Star of June 30, 1966, in which Mary Dublin Keyserling, Director of the Woman's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, was quoted as saying:

"We are now firmly committed as a country to the elimination from American Life of discrimination in all its terms.

"The inclusion in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, of a ban on discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, was no accident."
(underscoring ours)

This was an amazing statement in view of the fact that the Woman's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor took no part in the struggle to amend Title VII to include "sex", but on the contrary, they opposed it.

The facts as above stated prompted our decision to give to our readers the full story of the struggle to amend Title VII to include "sex" in which we were joined by women of other organizations.

When Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 came before the House of Representatives for action in February 1964, our good friend, Rep. Howard Smith (D) of Virginia, introduced five important amendments adding "sex" in places where "race, color, religion and national origin" appeared. Rep. Emanuel Celler (D), N.Y., Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and Administration Floor Leader in the House for the Civil Rights Bill, led the opposition to the addition of the word "sex." With much levity (usual when the rights of women were concerned) he remarked:

"Women are not in the minority in my house . . . in an argument I always have the last two words - 'Yes, dear.'"

He then went on to say he had that morning received a letter from the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, dated February 7, 1964, which read:

"This is in response to your inquiry about the reaction of the Woman's Bureau to suggestions that the Civil Rights Bill be amended to prohibit job discrimination on the basis of sex as well as race, creed, color or national origin.

"Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson who is in charge of the Woman's Bureau has replied to requests for support of such an amendment as follows:

"WE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT TO ATTEMPT TO AMEND H.R. 7152 (the Civil Rights Bill) WOULD NOT BE TO THE BEST ADVANTAGE OF WOMEN AT THIS TIME.'" (Parenthesis, Caps and underscoring ours.)

Mr. Celler continued:

"So, we have an expression of opinion from the Department of Labor to the effect that it will be ill advised to append to this bill the word 'sex' and provide for discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin and sex as well."

Following is an interesting colloquy between Rep. John Dowdy (D) of Texas, and Mr. Celler, in regard to the letter above quoted:

Mr. Dowdy . . . "if the chairman will permit me to ask a question, this letter he read from the Woman's Bureau, was it signed by a man or a woman?"

Mr. Celler - "It was signed by a man."

Mr. Dowdy - "I had an idea that would be true - the letter from the Woman's Bureau of the Department of Labor, opposing this equal rights for women amendment was signed by a man. I think there is no need for me to say more. Even the Department set up by the U.S. Government for the benefit of women is opposed to equal rights in employment for women."

Mr. Dowdy then urged the adoption of the amendments introduced by Judge Smith adding "sex," saying he would have offered them himself, but "yielded the honor to my beloved colleague from Virginia."

Representative Frances Bolton (R) of Ohio, Dean of Congresswomen in the House, introduced seven additional amendments adding "sex" in places where "race, color, religion and national origin" appeared, making a total of twelve amendments to Title VII introduced in the House of Representatives.

In addition to Rep. Bolton, Rep. Katharine St. George (R), of New York, then Chief Sponsor in the House of the Equal Rights Amendment, Rep. Edna Kelly (D), New York,

Rep. Martha W. Griffith (D), Mich., and Rep. Catherine May (R), Wash., (the latter two now Chief Sponsors in the House of the Equal Rights Amendment, on the Democratic side and the Republican side, respectively,) all took an active part in the debate and voted for the amendments introduced by Representatives Smith and Bolton. We regret we do not have sufficient space to quote from their excellent speeches. The only Congresswoman who opposed and voted against the amendments was Rep. Edith Green (D), Oregon.

We sing the praises of the many fine Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, who took part in the debate and voted for the amendments adding "sex" to Title VII. Our loyal friend, Judge Smith, was magnificent in his leadership. Many Congressmen, too numerous to mention individually, took part in the debates and voted for the amendments, and we are grateful to every one of them. Suffice it to say that Title VII with the twelve amendments adding "sex" in all places where "race, color, religion and national origin" appeared, was included in the Civil Rights Bill, H.R. 7152, passed by the House on February 10, 1964. The bill was sent to the Senate, where other amendments were added to Title VII, and in every new place where "race, color, religion and national origin" were used, "sex" was added, making a total of 20 places in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as finally adopted, where the word "sex" appeared.

The addition of the word "sex" was the only major change made by the House and the Senate in the text of the Civil Rights Act as originally sent to Congress by the Administration.

This victory was achieved in spite of the opposition of the Women's Bureau, the U.S. Department of Labor, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and of the Coalition of Democrats and Republicans that, to use the words of Representative Smith, were "controlling the movement" for the adoption of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964, sponsored by the Administration.

It is interesting to note in this connection that in the Democratic Platform of 1964, the Administration lists among its achievements the inclusion of "sex" in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We quote:

"The great Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the strongest and most important law against discrimination in employment in the history of the United States. It states unequivocally that 'It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer ... an employment agency ... or a labor organization' to discriminate against any person because of his or her 'race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.' ... THE INCLUSION OF WOMEN IN THE EMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, MAKES EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT, AT LONG LAST, THE LAW OF THE LAND." (Caps and underscoring ours.)

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY AIDS MANY CAUSES WHICH BENEFIT WOMEN

The National Woman's Party has not only worked unceasingly since 1923, following the Suffrage Victory, for passage of the Equal Rights for Women Amendment to the Constitution, which would give to women full equality under the law, but because of its deep interest in all that affects the dignity and welfare of women it has, when requested, given support to other causes benefiting women. There are many such cases but we have space for only two.

One of the latest cases in which we were able to give assistance, was that of Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired (DACOR), in connection with the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1965, H.R. 4170, to provide annuities for widows of Diplomatic and Consular Officers who retired before 1960 and died before the enactment of this Act. While this Bill, as passed, did not provide for all those for whom relief was sought, it did provide for those in greatest need.

Widows who were receiving no pensions were granted an annuity of \$2,400, per annum, and those who were receiving pensions of \$1,200.00 or less, were given an increase to \$2,400.

We received a warm letter of gratitude from Honorable John Hamlin, Executive Secretary of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired (DACOR), thanking us for our assistance, and Mrs. Ida S. Foster, Member of the Legislative Committee, wrote:

"I feel that we cannot be too thankful for the support and effective help that the National Woman's Party gave to our effort on behalf of women who had given a life-time of able and devoted work with their husbands in the Foreign Service, but who were not included in the existing pension plans. Among these women were widows in great financial need and dependent upon the charity of their families, friends and the public.

"The Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired (DACOR) had struggled for five years to obtain passage of this Bill, without success. I know that the help given by the National Woman's Party, at a critical moment, was a big factor in the final victory."

Mrs. Butler Franklin, another member of the Legislative Committee, the day following the passage of the Bill, said:

"Because of the help of the National Woman's Party in securing passage of H.R. 4170, many women slept more peacefully last night."

Should another bill be introduced for the relief of those not included in H.R. 4170, the National Woman's Party will again stand ready to help in any way possible.

Probably one of the most tragic cases ever encountered by the National Woman's Party, was -

Section 213, Married Persons Clause, Economy Act of 1932.

The purpose of this Act was to reduce existing personnel where a husband and wife were both in the service, to create positions for those unemployed. The Act read:

"In any reduction of personnel in any branch of the service of the United States Government or the District of Columbia, married persons (living with husband or wife), employed in the class to be reduced shall be dismissed before any other person employed in such class is dismissed, if such husband or wife is also in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia."

Perhaps this would have been a solution of the unemployment problem, except, it should be remembered, these were the Depression Years following the First World War. I, your Bulletin Chairman, was employed in the Government at that time, but being unmarried was not affected. However, "I was there" and a witness to the tragedy which befell some of my friends and I suffered for them. I knew young women who had come to Washington and entered the Government service because it was necessary to help their families who were victims of the Depression. I knew young women receiving \$100 a month who sent from \$25 to \$50 a month to their families and lived on the balance. Some were married when they came to Washington with husbands in the Combat services, others married later, but in so many cases both husbands and wives had to contribute to the support of their families "back home."

The Government Workers Council of the National Woman's Party, headed by Mrs. Edwina Avery, a lawyer and a Government worker, were given an office on the ground floor of our

Headquarters, from which they conducted a long and strenuous campaign to repeal Section 213. A Hearing before the House Committee on Civil Service was held on April 9, 1935, with Hon. Robert Ranspeck presiding. At this Hearing Anita Pollitzer represented the National Woman's Party and her testimony was excellent; Edwina Avery spoke for the Government Workers Council of the National Woman's Party; Rebecca Greathouse represented the National Association of Women Lawyers, and Dr. Helen Gladys Kain, of the Medical Woman's National Association who was unable to be present filed a statement opposing Section 213, which was placed in the records. Before the end of the fight many other women's organizations had joined us in protest against Section 213.

Finally, after a vigorous struggle lasting five years, a Bill to repeal Section 213 was passed by the House on June 5, 1937, by a vote of 206 and 128; was unanimously passed by the Senate on July 23, 1937 and signed by President Franklin Roosevelt on July 26, 1937 - thus removing from the statute books Section 213 - the nightmare of Government employees who lived through the harrowing experience. An amendment to limit the combined salaries of husband and wife, which had been added to the Bill, was discarded.

As I read the account of this struggle in the National Woman's Party Magazine "Equal Rights" I marveled at the courage and persistence of those women of the National Woman's Party who led the fight. Edwina Avery's fine article in the August 1, 1937 issue of the magazine, entitled "And So the Bill Was Passed", paid special tribute to those women.

What a happy day it will be when we can write in our Bulletin, relative to the Equal Rights for Men and Women Amendment "AND SO THE BILL WAS PASSED." Those of us who are "late comers" in the Woman Movement, will join our Veteran workers in a Day of Rejoicing.

BIRTHPLACE OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

We have received a News Release from Representative Silvio O. Conte (R) of Massachusetts, relative to a Bill H.R. 9242, introduced by him in the House of Representatives, on June 21, 1965, proposing to establish the Birthplace of Susan B. Anthony, in Adams, Mass., as a National Historic Site.

The Bill is now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In a letter dated June 14, 1966, to Hon. Wayne Aspinall, Chairman of that committee, Mr. Conte asks that hearings on the bill be held in the near future. Parts of Mr. Conte's letter are quoted as follows:

"I want to reaffirm my great interest in this proposal which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property and home in Adams, Mass.

"There is considerable interest in this proposal, not only among the people of Adams, Mass., but the Nation. There is a natural pride and enthusiasm for the establishment of such a site. However, it represents added economic potential for the region as an additional tourist attraction.

"As I have indicated to you in the past, the site is the present residence of Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Richardson, Jr. The Richardsons have indicated to me their willingness to undertake any fair and equitable negotiations pursuant to relinquishing their title to the Government.

"I therefore respectfully ask that you again request a report from the appropriate executive department with respect to H.R. 9242 and that hearings be convened as soon thereafter as convenient. Needless to say, I am prepared to cooperate with the Committee in whatever way I can."

So far no action has been taken on Mr. Conte's bill. If it is not considered by the 89th Congress, he has said he will again introduce it in the 90th Congress. We are sure Mr. Conte will appreciate any action by the members of the National Woman's Party in support of this most laudable undertaking.

A QUESTION IN REGARD TO ALIMONY

One of the questions we are asked is "would the Equal Rights Amendment change the laws pertaining to Alimony?"

Our answer is: The adoption of the Equal Rights for Men and Women Amendment would require equal treatment for husband and wife with regard to Alimony. This is the law now in eleven states where the court may award alimony to husband or wife according to the justice and needs of the particular case. These eleven States, according to the latest information furnished by the Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, are: Alaska, California, Illinois, Iowa, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah and West Virginia. The results in these States seem to be satisfactory and there would seem to be no reason why they would not be satisfactory if equality in this field were extended to all States through the Equal Rights for Men and Women Amendment.

In addition there are seven other States having equal rights in the treatment of husband and wife with regard to alimony in the case of divorce because of mental illness. These States are Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, Nebraska and Wyoming. In one other State, Pennsylvania, the Court is empowered to decree alimony for an insane wife or an insane husband.

Senator James O. Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in his favorable report dated Sept. 28, 1962, on the Equal Rights Amendment, had this to say concerning alimony:

"The proposed Amendment would confirm equal rights under the law for both men and women. In instances where laws are burdensome to men solely because of their sex, they would benefit from the Amendment. For instance, alimony would not favor women solely because of their sex."

Representative Theodore R. Kupferman (R) of New York, expressed this same opinion in a speech made by him before the House of Representatives on April 19, 1966, on the Equal Rights Amendment and quoted in our May-June Bulletins, pages 5-6. He said "Alimony laws would be changed so that men would not bear the full burden". He also cited other instances in which men would benefit and closed his speech by saying:

"From the examples I have cited I think we can see how calling this amendment equal rights for women tells only half the story of its effect upon American life. A clear pronouncement of equality of rights for both sexes is long overdue in this country, notwithstanding the support it has received from both major political parties. I hope Congress will remedy this situation by passage of this Constitutional Amendment."

A TRIBUTE TO LUCY BRANHAM
by the
National Woman's Party

It is with sorrow that we announce the death of Lucy Branham on July 18, 1966. A letter from her brother's wife, (Mrs. John Branham, 318 N.E. 102nd St., Miami Shores, Florida, 33138) dated July 20, 1966, stated that they had visited her on June 30th; that they were concerned about her apparent poor physical condition, but she seemed to be happy; On July 17, Lucy's cousin, Mrs. Hayden Metcalf phoned them that Lucy was in the hospital with bronchial pneumonia but her condition was not considered serious; on Monday morning, July 18, the hospital called them and said Lucy had died suddenly that morning at 5:45 A.M. They had arranged to have her remains sent to Brunswick, Ga., and that she would be buried in the family plot in Palmetto Cemetery with her parents.

Lucy and her mother, Mrs. John Branham, were dedicated members of the National Woman's Party. Lucy, a beautiful young woman, took an active part in the campaign and was one of those sent to prison. It was she who before the Lafayette Monument in Lafayette Park, burned a message from the President, saying "We want action, not words." As the flames consumed the papers she continued: "The torch which I hold symbolizes the burning indignation of women who for a hundred years have been given words without action." Her speech was impressive and she closed with the following words: "We therefore take this empty words spoken by the President this afternoon and consign them to the flames." A large crowd had gathered and they applauded her speech enthusiastically. One gentlemen handed her a twenty dollar bill for the campaign fund. He was followed by others who made contributions. Lucy traveled all over the country making speeches in behalf of Suffrage for Women.

As a young girl Lucy Branham saved two persons from drowning near Rehobeth Beach, where she lived, for which she received a Carnegie Award for Courage. She attended Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, from which she received her Master's Degree. She worked with the World Woman's Party in Geneva for equality of rights for women under the League of Nations.

In her last years Lucy Branham worked as a part time librarian. Her devotion to the cause of Equality of Rights for women never wavered. She loved to paint and just a few weeks before her death sent us a gift of two charming little paintings of scenes on the Delaware coast.

In the spring of this year Alice Paul, Mabel Vernon and Edith Goode spent a day with Lucy. It was a happy reunion of four veterans of the Woman Suffrage Campaign. To know Lucy was to love her. We will miss her but will always remember her with love and gratitude for her great contribution to the cause of Equality for Women.

LOUISE GORE A CANDIDATE FOR THE MARYLAND STATE SENATE

Miss Louise Gore, Vice Chairman National Woman's Party, presently a Member of the Maryland House of Delegates, has announced that she will be a candidate for the Maryland State Senate, on the Republican ticket, in the November elections. We congratulate her and extend to her our fervent good wishes for success.

The election of Miss Gore to the Maryland State Senate would have great weight in the cause of Equality for Women and the passage of the Equal Rights for Women Amendment. So, Maryland Women of the National Woman's Party, give her your support and urge all your friends to vote for her!

STATUS OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1966:

In the Senate (S. J. Res. 85, introduced by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy (D), Minn.

Since our last report of July 31, 1966, included in our July-August 1966 Bulletin, we have added three new Sponsors in the Senate. They are:

Senator W. G. Magnuson - Washington

Senator J. O. Pastore - Rhode Island

Senator Wm. Proxmire - Wisconsin

These increase our Sponsors in the Senate from 48 to 51 - more than half the membership of the Senate. As none of these had previously promised his vote they were not included in our last report of 25 "pledged", so increase our voting strength to 76, 9 more than the two-thirds (67) required for a Constitutional Amendment.

In the House - H.J. Res. 216, introduced by Rep. Martha W. Griffith (D), of Mich., Chief Sponsor on Democratic side, and H.J. Res. 347, by Rep. Catherine May (R) of Washington, Chief Sponsor on Republican side.

Since our report of July 31, resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, have been introduced in the House by the following seven Congressman:

Arnold Olson (D) Mont. H.R. Res. 1265	Don H. Clausen (R) Calif. H.R. Res. 1286
Floyd V. Hicks (D) Wash. " 1270	John R. Schmidhauser (D) Iowa " 1290
George E. Brown (D) Calif. " 1277	Fernand J. St Germain (D) R.I. " 1291
Robt. L. Leggett (D) " " 1278	

These seven new Sponsors increase our Sponsors in the House from 114 to 121. As only one of the seven had been counted in the number pledged to vote, it reduces that number to 103, making our total voting strength in the House 224, or 66 less than the two-thirds, 290, required for a Constitutional Amendment.

PRESENT STATUS OF H.R. 10065 and S. 3077 TO REPEAL TITLE VII:

As of September 30, 1966, H.R. 10065 is still "on the Table" in the Senate. S. 3077 is still in the Senate Labor Committee and no hearings have been scheduled.

JOBS OF WORKING WOMEN SAVED BY TITLE VII:

The repeal of Title VII as proposed by H.R. 10065 and S. 3077, cited above, would be a great disaster, not only to the working woman but to the country as a whole. Since Title VII was amended to prohibit discrimination against women because of "sex", it has proved a great benefit to the working woman. As an illustration we quote from an article in the Wall Street Journal of Sept. 22, 1966:

"As in many industries, female employees at Rath (meat packing plant in Iowa) traditionally were the first to feel the ax when business turned sour. This was generally accepted as a fact of life by both sexes. However, layoffs are now determined by seniority, not sex. As a result, there currently are 450 men on layoff at Rath's Waterloo plant, while the entire female force of 500 continue to work..."

"In sharp contrast, a year ago 42 women and no men were on layoff At John Morrell & Co.'s Ottumwa, Iowa, plant, nearly 80 women have taken advantage of Title VII to return to work in recent months, displacing men with less seniority. Similar painful dislocations have occurred at Swift & Co.'s plants, where women now have double the number of jobs once available to them."

BE SURE TO PUT YOUR ZIP CODE NUMBER ON ALL CORRESPONDENCE. Effective Jan. 1, 1967, the Post Office requires that all Second and Third Class mail, must have the Zip Code of addressee, or it will not be delivered. This applies to our Bulletin and we are having to have new addressograph plates made for those for whom we do not have Zip Code Numbers.

KEEP POSTED THROUGH THE BULLETIN ON THE PROGRESS OF THE WOMAN MOVEMENT
Bulletin is free with a National Membership of \$2.00 or more. Subscriptions of non-members \$2.00 a year. Published Bi-monthly.

Your dues or any contributions would be most acceptable at this time. Amounts of memberships listed in heading on first page.

All checks should be made to the National Woman's Party and mailed to 144 Constitution Avenue, N.E., Washington, D. C. 20002.

THIRD CLASS



WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

144 CONSTITUTION AVENUE N. E.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PERMIT NO. 42773

PAID

U. S. POSTAGE

BULK RATE