

Norwich Bulletin

Population, 29,685

Norwich, Conn.

Thursday, August 26, 1920

10 pages – 74 columns

Price Two Cents

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS FAIL TO GET A RESTRAINING ORDER

Injunction Was Denied by Justice Siddons of the District of Columbia Supreme Court -- No Further Effort Will Be Made to Prevent the Issuance of the Proclamation

Next Move is to Test the Validity of the Tennessee Ratification in the United States Supreme Court.

Washington. Aug. 25. Anti-suffrage forces received another setback today when Justice Siddons of the District of Columbia supreme court refused to issue a "show cause" order against Secretary Colby preliminary to the issuance of an injunction to restrain that official from proclaiming the nineteenth amendment a law of the land. The order would have required

Mr. Colby to show cause why the injunction should not be issued. The action was brought by Charles S. Fairchilds, an official of the American Constitutional league, on behalf of himself and the organization.

No further effort would be made to prevent the issuance of the proclamation, Alfred P. Smith, attorney for Mr. Fairchilds, said.

The official certification of Tennessee's ratification of the amendment was expected to arrive from Nashville some time tonight and Secretary Colby indicated that he would issue the proclamation as soon as he received Governor Roberts' certification.

The anti-suffrage forces will now attempt to obtain early action in the United States supreme court on the question of the validity of the Tennessee ratification, Mr. Smith announced. He said that he would ask a formal order of dismissal from Justice Siddons in order that he might appeal to the District of Columbia court of appeals at once with a request that the case be certified directly to the federal supreme court and set for early trial.

The action of Justice Siddons today paralleled in a measure that of Justice Bailey of the same court last month, except that Justice Bailey granted a "show cause" order against Secretary Colby in a similar bill filed by the same plaintiffs, but after hearing declined to issue the injunction

asked on grounds of lack of Jurisdiction and insufficient showing.

Mr. Smith said that he still hoped to obtain a decision before the November elections. If, however, the appeal should be carried through the District of Columbia court of appeals to the supreme court it could not be argued until after the regular meeting of the court in October, with little likelihood that a decision would be reached before election day, Nov. 2. In that event, it was pointed out, the women of the country would be legally entitled to vote, with the result that should the supreme court later decide against the legality of the Tennessee ratification the validity of the entire nation election would be in question.

The anti-suffrage forces are also challenging the legality of ratification in Missouri, West Virginia and Ohio.