

A convention opposed to equal suffrage was elected, and framed a constitution excluding women. A friend of the present writer talked with many of the members while the convention was in session. He says that almost every lawyer in that body acknowledged, in private conversation, that the decision by which women had been disfranchised was illegal.

Roosevelt a Suffragist.

I believe in women's rights as much as in men's, and, indeed, a little more. The mother must be more than a head nurse and housekeeper. She must have an interest in outside things to keep up her self respect; and if she loses that self respect, she loses that of her children. No family can become all it ought to be if the mother does not keep in touch sufficiently with outside interests, and with what is going on in the world, to be an intellectual stimulus to her children. * * * I have noticed in women's colleges the fine type—cultivation of the body not neglected in cultivation of the brain, and both not developed at the expense of character.—Theodore Roosevelt.

Abraham Lincoln.

I go for all sharing the privileges of government who assist in bearing its burdens, by no means excluding women.—Abraham Lincoln.

Charles Kingsley.

One principal cause of the failure of so many magnificent schemes, social, political, religious, which have followed each other age after age, has been this: that in almost every case they have ignored the rights and powers of one-half the human race, viz., women. I believe that politics will not go right, that society will not go right, that religion will not go right, that nothing human will ever go right, except in so far as woman goes right; and to make woman go right she must be put in her place and she must have her rights.—Charles Kingsley.

Harriet Beecher Stowe.

If the principle on which we founded our government is true, that taxation must not be without representation, and if women hold property and are taxed, it follows that women should be represented in the state by their votes. I think the state can no more afford to dispense with the votes of women in its affairs than the family.—Harriet Beecher Stowe.

Benjamin F. Wade.

Every argument that can be adduced to prove that males should have the right to vote, applies with equal force to prove that females should possess the same right.—Benjamin F. Wade

EXTRA LEAFLETS OF THE CASE OF WASHINGTON

Extra Leaflets may be had on application to DR. FANNIE LEAKE-CUMMINGS, President of the Washington Equal Suffrage Association, 2925 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.

Price 30 Cents Per 100, Postpaid

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL

A weekly paper, founded 1870, by Lucy Stone. Editors, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—Clara Barton.
Subscription Price, \$1.50 Per Year.

Woman Suffrage Tracts.—Sample set of Woman Suffrage Leaflets (40 different kinds), postpaid, 10 cents. Address: Leaflet Department, Massachusetts Woman's Suffrage Association, 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

The Case of Washington

BY ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Women voted in Washington for the first time in 1884, and were disfranchised by the Supreme Court in 1887.

Equal suffrage was granted to women by the Legislature of Washington Territory in October, 1883. The women at once began to distinguish themselves there, as they have done in Wyoming and elsewhere, by voting for the best man, irrespective of party. The old files of the Washington newspapers bear ample evidence to this fact.

The first chance that women had to vote was at the municipal elections of July, 1884.

The Seattle Mirror said:

The city election of last Monday was for more reasons than one the most important ever held in Seattle. The presence of women at the voting places had the effect of preventing the disgraceful proceedings usually seen. It was the first election in the city where women could vote, and the first where the gambling and liquor fraternity, which had so long controlled the municipal government to an enormous extent, suffered defeat.

The Post Intelligencer said:

After the experience of the late election it will not do for any one here to say the women do not want to vote. They displayed as much interest as the men, and, if anything, more. . . . The result insures Seattle a first class municipal administration. It is a warning to that undesirable class of the community who subsist upon the weaknesses and vices of society that disregard of law and the decencies of civilization will not be tolerated.

Quotations might be multiplied from the papers of other towns, testifying to the independent voting of the women, the large size of their vote, the courtesy with which they were treated, and the

greater quiet and order produced by their presence at the polls.

Next came the general election of November, 1884. Again the newspapers were practically unanimous as to the result. The Olympia Transcript, which was opposed to equal suffrage, said:

The result shows that all parties must put up good men if they expect to elect them. They cannot do as they have in the past—nominate any candidates, and elect them by the force of the party lash.

The Democratic State Journal said:

Anyone could not fail to see that hereafter more attention must be given at the primaries to select the purest of material, by both parties, if they would gain the female vote.

Charles J. Woodbury visited Washington about this time. In a letter to the N. Y. Evening Post, he said:

Whatever may be the vicissitudes of woman suffrage in Washington Territory in the future, it should now be put on record that at the election, Nov. 4, 1884, nine tenths of its adult female population availed themselves of the right to vote with a hearty enthusiasm. What is the result so far?

He goes on to say that he arrived in Seattle on Sunday, and was surprised at the quiet and order he found prevailing, and at the general Sunday closing of the places of business:

Even the bars of the hotels were closed; and this was the worst town in the Territory (except Ainsworth) when I first saw it. Now its uproarous theatres, dancing houses, squaw-brothels, and Sunday fights are a thing of the past. Not a gambling house exists.

Women served on the jury, and meted out the full penalty of the law to gamblers and keepers of disorderly houses.

The Chief Justice of the Territory at that time was Hon. Roger S. Greene, a cousin of United States Senator Hoar, a man of high character and integrity, and a magistrate celebrated throughout the Northwest for his resolute and courageous resistance to lynch law. In his charge to the grand jury at Port Townsend, August, 1884, Chief Justice Greene said:

The opponents of woman suffrage in this Territory are found allied with a solid phalanx of gamblers, prostitutes, pimps and drunkard-makers—a phalanx composed of all in each of those classes who know the interest of the class and vote according to it.

In his charge to another grand jury later, Chief Justice Greene said:

Twelve terms of court, ladies and gentlemen, I have now held, in which women have served as grand and petit jurors, and it is certainly a fact beyond dispute that no other twelve terms so salutary for restraint of crime have ever been held in this Territory. For fifteen years I have been trying to do what a judge ought, but have never till the last six months felt underneath and around me, in the degree that every judge has a right to feel it, the upbushing might of the people in the line of the full and resolute enforcement of the law.

Gamblers and other bad characters, finding Washington too hot for them, crossed the border into British Columbia in such numbers as caused prominent men there to declare that British Columbia would have to adopt woman suffrage too, in self defense. Hon. John D. Robson, in introducing a woman suffrage bill in the Parliament of British Columbia, said: "The women of Washington are voting all the gamblers and blacklegs out of the Territory, and they are coming over here."

Naturally the vicious element disliked "the full and resolute enforcement of law." The baser sort of politicians also disliked the independent voting of the women. The Republicans had a normal majority in the Territory. But they nominated for a high office a man

who was a hard drinker. The Republican women would not vote for him, and he was defeated. Next they nominated a man who had for years been openly living with an Indian woman and had a family of half breed children. Again the Republican women refused to vote for him, and he was defeated. This brought the enmity of the Republican "machine" upon woman suffrage. The Democratic women showed equal independence, and incurred the hostility of the Democratic machine.

Not long after, a change of administration at Washington led to a change in the Territorial Supreme Court. The newly appointed Chief Justice and a majority of the new Judges of the Supreme Court were opposed to equal suffrage, and were amenable, it is said, to the strong pressure brought to bear upon them by all the vicious elements to secure its repeal. A gambler who had been convicted by a jury composed in part of women contested the sentence on the ground that women were not legal voters, and the Supreme Court decided that the woman suffrage bill was unconstitutional, because it had been headed "An Act to Amend Section So and So, Article So and So of the Code," instead of "An Act to Enfranchise Women." The Organic Act of the Territory, which stood to it in the place of a constitution, provided that every bill must be fully described in its title. Nineteen other bills passed by the same Legislature had been headed in the same way as the suffrage bill, without being therefore declared unconstitutional, including the bill that authorized the sitting of the court which pronounced this decision. But no account was taken of that fact. The object was to get rid of woman suffrage; and the vicious elements rejoiced greatly.

But this decision was rendered a good while after the members of the next biennial Legislature had been elected

by men and women together; and it did not invalidate the election, because, according to law, no member's election could be contested after a certain time had elapsed. When the Legislature met, in 1888, it re-enacted the suffrage bill, giving it a full heading, and strengthening it in every way possible.

Washington was about to be admitted as a state, and was preparing to hold a constitutional convention to frame a state constitution. There was no doubt that the majority of the women wanted to vote. Chief Justice Greene estimated that five-sixths of them had voted at the last election before they were deprived of the right. Two successive Legislatures elected by men and women jointly had re-enacted woman suffrage (for its continuance had been made a test question in the choice of the first Legislature for which the women voted, and that Legislature had been careful to insert the words 'he or she' in all bills relating to the election laws.) It was admitted on all hands that if the women were allowed to vote for members of the constitutional convention, it would be impossible to elect a convention that would wipe out woman suffrage.

It was therefore imperative to deprive the women of their votes before the members of the convention were chosen. A scheme was arranged for the purpose. On the ground that she was a woman, the election officers at a local election refused the vote of Mrs. Nevada Boomer, who was opposed to suffrage. They accepted the votes of all the other women. She made a test case by bringing suit against them. In the ordinary course of things, the case would not have come up till after the election of the constitutional convention. But cases for the restoration of personal rights may be advanced on the docket, and Mrs. Boomer's ostensible object was the restoration of her personal rights,

though her real object was to deprive all women of theirs. Her case was put forward on the docket and hurried to a decision.

The Supreme Court this time pronounced the woman suffrage law unconstitutional on the ground that it was beyond the power of a Territorial Legislature to enfranchise women. The Organic Act of the Territory said that at the first Territorial election persons with certain qualifications should vote, and at subsequent elections such persons as the Territorial Legislature might enfranchise. But the court took the ground that in giving the Legislature the right to regulate suffrage, Congress did not at the time have it specifically in mind that they might enfranchise women, and that therefore they could not do so. The suffragists wanted to have the case appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. If that court has sustained the decision of the Washington Supreme Court, it would have been a "ten-strike" for the opponents of equal rights, since it would have wiped out woman suffrage not only in Washington, but in Wyoming, and in all the Territories that had granted full or partial suffrage to women. But Mrs. Boomer refused to let the case be appealed; her friends knew perfectly well that legally the decision had not a leg to stand on; and none of the women who favored suffrage could make a genuine test case and take it up to the United States Supreme Court, because none of them had had their votes refused. It was an adroitly combined conspiracy to keep the women from being allowed to vote as to whether they should retain the suffrage.

The women themselves being prevented from voting, their friends were not able to overcome the combined "machines" of both political parties, and the intense opposition of all the vicious and disorderly elements, at that time pretty large on the Pacific Coast.

also vote it will destroy the family organization? If so, I would ask the senator how it happens that the family is an institution coeval with the commencement of society, and that, probably, taking the human race together from the beginning down, not one man in five hundred has ever exercised the right of suffrage, and not one in five thousand for that matter?

MR. REAGAN.—I am well aware, and I say it with no disrespect to the senator from New Hampshire, that he has great respect for short-haired women and long-haired men. I cannot say that I have that respect for them at all. I am trying to argue the question upon philosophical grounds.

MR. SANDEES, of Montana.—I should like to ask the senator from Texas a question. Ought not the law to be the expression of the intellectual and moral sense of the people? Question number one.

Question number two.—Is the statement that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" true or false?

MR. REAGAN.—Mr. President, if I were to answer the abstract questions presented by the senator from Montana as abstractly as they are asked, the Senate would not be much wiser or much better satisfied than it is now.

Senators Morgan, of Alabama, Gray, of Delaware, and others spoke against the bill; Senators Platt, of Connecticut, Spooner, of Wisconsin, and others in its favor. Senator Platt summed up the situation as follows:

Woman suffrage has existed in Wyoming for twenty years. It has not been repealed, and has proved satisfactory to the people of that Territory, so much so that they have incorporated it in their constitution. If the constitution had been silent upon the subject, there is no reason to suppose that it would not, at the very next session of the Legislature, continue it as one of the institutions of the State after it should have been admitted.

After a prolonged debate, the U. S. Senate voted, 29 to 18, to admit Wyoming, with the equal rights clause in its constitution.

On July 10, the President signed the bill, and Wyoming became a State—the first State in the Union to carry out to its logical conclusions the Republican principle that "taxation without representation is tyr-

ny," and that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

In Wyoming, the news was received with great rejoicings. On July 23, the celebration of statehood took place, with imposing ceremonies and unbounded enthusiasm. A fine address was made by Mrs. Therese A. Jenkins. At the capitol, in the presence of six thousand people, Mrs. Esther Morris, on behalf of the women of Wyoming, presented to Gov. Warren a magnificent State flag, "in grateful recognition of the high privilege of citizenship that has been conferred upon us."

Gov. Warren, receiving the flag, said, in an eloquent address:

"Wyoming, in her progress, has not forgotten the hands and hearts that have helped advance her to her high position; and in the adoption of her constitution, equal suffrage is entrenched so securely that, it is believed, it will stand forever. Women of Wyoming, you have builded well in your past efforts and conduct; and the men of Wyoming extend heartiest greetings to you at this time. They ask you to join them in the future, as in the past, in securing good government for our commonwealth."

Judge Melville C. Brown, who had presided over the convention that framed the constitution of the new State, presented a copy of it to Mrs. Amelia B. Post, vice-president for Wyoming of the National-American Woman Suffrage Association, and closed an able speech with the words:

"Far out across the Great American Desert, and beneath the shade of the grand old Rockies, there springs into existence a new State, and the watchwords of its people are 'Justice, Equality.' Here it was ordained by the people of Wyoming that each citizen of the State should enjoy the same rights guaranteed to every other citizen, whether high or low, black or white, male or female.

"With these new privileges come new duties and responsibilities. 'Act well your part, there all the honor lies.' Your past furnishes the highest guarantee for the future. If you live up to the full measure of your high privileges, you will not only bring happiness to the new State, but joy to the hearts of the noble women of other States who are struggling for the repeal of unequal and unjust laws."

A full set of Woman Suffrage Tracts (42 different kinds) sent postpaid for 10 cents.

Address C. WILDE, 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Monthly at 3 Park St., Boston, Mass., by the National-American Woman Suffrage Association.

Vol. III. Entered at the Boston Post-office as second-class matter. No. 9.

Subscription, 25 cts. per annum. OCTOBER 1, 1890. Extra copies, 50 cts. per 100, postpaid.

THE FIRST FREE STATE.

Full suffrage was extended to the women of Wyoming by the Legislature of that Territory in 1869. The results proved so satisfactory that the law was continued upon the statute book for twenty years.

In 1889, the constitutional convention elected to frame a constitution for the new State of Wyoming embodied a woman suffrage clause in the constitution by a five-sixths vote. The constitution containing this woman suffrage clause was submitted to the people (the people in this case meaning both men and women), and was ratified by a very large majority on the popular vote.

On March 26, 1890, the bill for the admission of Wyoming was read in the U. S. House of Representatives. Representative BAKER, of New York, advocated the passage of the bill. He said:

Wyoming will, if admitted under the pending bill, be the forty-third State to come into the Union, and the thirtieth to enter since the original federation. Within her own borders, both the great political parties and all interests, public and private, seem to have united in the memorial which has been presented to Congress. Wyoming is here asking for her constitutional right of admission to the Union, and for representation upon this floor on an equality with her sister States.

The suffrage article (of her constitution) provides that "the rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex," and that "both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges."

These constitutional provisions are novel, and yet not new. As a Territory, woman suffrage has obtained and existed for twenty years in their government. The people of the new State, men, women, and children, all, irrespective of political affiliations or religious prejudices, so far as we are informed, want the same principle ingrafted into fundamental law. I honor them for it. He may not be a "bold, bad man" who will deny them statehood or argue against their capacity for self-government because they want to continue in statehood the principles under which, as a Territory, they have prospered, but he does assume to battle against a sentiment which steadily through four decades or more has grown in our land until it has become a mighty power. Will any man dare to stand up here before the people of this country, talking as we do to sixty mil-

lions or more of our equals, and assert that a constitution containing such a principle is un-republican in form? If you, let him so declare, and then go hence and be no more forever, but politically of doubtful sanity.

Representative WASHINGTON, of Tennessee, opposed the admission of Wyoming with a clause in its constitution granting equal rights to women, and predicted, as a blood-curdling possibility, that some day a lady in a poke-bonnet might occupy a seat in Congress.

Representative KERR, of Iowa, said:

Mr. Speaker, the best argument the gentleman from Tennessee has been able to produce against the suffrage feature of the Wyoming constitution is his apprehension that some lady might occupy a seat on this floor dressed in a particular fashion. It seems to me that a case must be devoid of argument when this point is the only reason assigned against such a proposition. Who shall prescribe who shall be voters in Wyoming if not the citizens themselves? That they have admitted the women to vote is to me a guaranty that a very greatly needed element to secure purity, humanity, and justice in government, as well as true republicanism, has been introduced and secured in the fundamental law.

Representative KELLEY, of Kansas, said:

From the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, who recently occupied the floor on that side of the House, he seems overawed with astonishment and even horror at the idea that some day—a far-distant day, perhaps—a lady or two or three might occupy seats upon this floor as members of this House, having the same rights as other members. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see ladies almost every day in this House. Ladies are in the galleries. And I sometimes notice that gentlemen on the other side cast sly glances in that direction; and while I don't see any of them with poke-bonnets on,—that bonnet which seems so much to disturb the gentleman from Tennessee,—I have observed gentlemen from both sides of this House on several occasions "poking" out of the side door, soon to appear smiling in the gallery, seated between two ladies. I wish to assure my Democratic friends that ladies are no more dangerous on the floor of this House than they are in the galleries.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in illustrating the evil results that may follow from the admission of women on this floor as members, he seems to have lost sight entirely of the fact that the greatest nation on the face of the earth, save and except the

United States, is presided over by a woman, and has been for the last fifty years.

In the State of Kansas this is no new question, and I am free to say that I have been astounded at some of the remarks made here to-day in reference to this matter. Women are occupying to-day and have for years occupied public offices, and have been eligible to office in that State. Many of them are county officers to-day, county court clerks, registers of deeds, county superintendents of public instruction; and they make the best officers we have.

MR. PROKLER.—Has it unsexed them?

MR. KELLEY.—No, sir. It does not hurt their looks; if such a thing were possible, I think it makes them better looking. The assistant attorney-general of the State of Kansas to-day is a woman, and she has entire control of the legal department of the State of Kansas, because the attorney-general of the State of Kansas, who, if present, would have that control, is absent from the State, and has been for some time; and in his absence the assistant attorney-general takes charge. Nobody ever complained that she, as a lawyer, did not conduct the legal part of that State properly. And I have no doubt that, if this proposition should become more popular, and should extend from some of those progressive States of the West and Northwest even as far as the State of Tennessee, and if it should become necessary for the women of that State to vote in making a selection of Representatives in Congress, they would be just as wise in their selection as were the women in Wyoming, and I have no doubt that the State of Tennessee would be represented upon this floor by gentlemen or ladies just as fit to represent it as the State of Wyoming will be when she is represented by our worthy friend, Judge Carey.

MR. SPEAKER, I am reminded that just opposite me are three or four good-looking gentlemen from Georgia; and if the State of Georgia should ever determine to send two or three good-looking women here to occupy those seats, sitting as I do right opposite to them, I should not be at all frightened. [Laughter.] I should be perfectly willing to stand it, and I have no doubt the Speaker could stand it, and I have no doubt the gentlemen themselves could stand it.

MR. CLEMENTS.—The question is whether the ladies could stand it.

MR. KELLEY.—Well, there is no law in Georgia, I hope, which would compel people, men or women, to come to Congress unless they desired to. We do not have any such laws in Kansas, at any rate.

Representative MOREY, of Ohio, said:

Our friends on the other side seem to get into a panic when anything is said about the enlargement of the right of suffrage. And one distinguished member, my friend from Tennessee, seems to be stampeded by the idea that some Representative from the State of Wyoming may take a seat beside him clothed in a poke bonnet. [Laughter.] That is the kind of argument advanced in support of the

propositions of the Democratic minority of this committee.

A fear is expressed that women, if permitted to vote, will seek the enactment of laws "in their own interest and against that of man." It is assumed that the exercise of the right of suffrage by woman will change the relations of the sexes. There never was a greater mistake. The race is homogeneous, and will never be divided in its aims and desires. It is assumed that woman desires the ballot to legislate for woman. This, too, is a grievous mistake. She desires the ballot that she may legislate for the race, for her sons and her daughters, for her husband and herself.

A simple answer to the question of the minority, "Why has the male sex alone made the laws?" is that the female sex has forever been denied the right to help make the laws by which they are governed.

To attribute this to their lack of physical courage is neither just nor manly. I have read in the *Congressional Record* the autobiography of my friend from Illinois [Mr. Springer], and from that I learn that, while the great war for the Union was testing the patriotism and valor of the American people, my friend was taking lessons in statesmanship at home. What were the women of the country doing then? Anna Ella Carroll, moved by the loftiest patriotism, her genius quickened by her love of country, was the friend and counselor of the great Lincoln, and lighted his way in the gloom of that awful period. Who has not read of Dorothea Dix and the army of noble nurses; of Elizabeth Blackwell and the Sanitary Commission?

Who has not read of Clara Barton, whose chosen work was on the field of battle, caring for the wounded, burying the dead? For four years she endured the rigors and was exposed to the dangers of soldier life. Shrinking from no danger, she stood side by side with the surgeons on the field of battle, exposed to shot and shell, her clothing pierced by balls and torn by shot. There was Mother Bickerdyke, who was a strong woman in her prime during the dark hour of the nation. She gave her entire time for four years to the service of the country, laboring in hospitals, going out on the battlefield after the contest was over, and viewing those scenes of carnage that make the heart grow sick, lifting wounded soldiers in her brave arms to bear them to places of safety, at the risk of her life. And there were thousands of other brave and loyal women who, in camp and hospital, at home and at the front, and even on the field of battle, did a noble and heroic part in the prosecution of the great war for union and free government. By what right does my friend Mr. Springer, who prepared this minority report, challenge the right of the women of the country to enjoy the highest and dearest right that can be exercised under the government which they did and sacrificed so much to save?

HON. JOSEPH M. CAREY, the delegate from Wyoming, said:

I do not believe that, under any condi-

tions, the people of Wyoming, not even if granted half a hundred of constitutional conventions, could obtain a better result for themselves than the constitution with which they ask to be incorporated into the Union.

The people selected from their best men to make it. These were selected without much regard to their party affiliations. They had the best guide to govern them, the experience of the people for a period of twenty years. A young people, without the prejudice of old communities to influence them, they incorporated in the constitution the results of the best thought of those who, in this progressive age, have made constitutional law life's study.

The provision most to be commended is that clause that makes no discrimination on account of sex, so far as political rights are concerned. The people of Wyoming, after a practice and experience during their entire territorial life, hesitated not one moment on this subject. They were substantially of one mind. The manner in which woman has exercised her right of elective franchise has left few men indeed who would deprive her of the privilege, if it were in their power to do so.

All criticisms of this constitution by the press and people have been in words of commendation.

The Senate Committee on Territories says of the constitution:

"Your committee find much to praise and nothing to condemn in the constitution which has been adopted, and believe that the highest and best interests of its people, as well as the strength and glory of the Republic, will be subserved by its immediate admission as a State."

Woman suffrage is not a new question. It is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. It is not unrepresentative.

In New Jersey, under the Articles of Confederation, women had the right of suffrage. In England, women votes in municipal matters; in Scotland and Wales and in the Isle of Wight; and in Ontario, on the northern portion of our boundary, a province which is as large as the States of New York and Michigan combined, she votes for everything except member of Parliament. In British Columbia she votes in all matters except for members of Parliament. A law has been passed in Australia giving her suffrage; the same also in New Zealand. Suffrage, in some of these instances, is limited to unmarried women. But it is not new, even in our own country. Women exercise the right to vote in Kansas in municipal affairs, and women to-day have the right in seventeen States to vote on school matters.

An amendment to strike the woman suffrage clause out of the constitution of Wyoming was then voted down, and the bill admitting Wyoming as a State passed the U. S. House of Representatives by a vote of 132 to 119.

The bill for the admission of Wyoming came up in the U. S. Senate, June 25th.

SENATOR VEST, of Missouri, said:

I shall never vote to admit into the Union any State that adopts woman suffrage. In my judgment, woman suffrage

is antagonistic to the spirit, to the institutions of the people of the United States.

SENATOR PLATT, of Connecticut, said:

It is a question which these men and these women in Wyoming have a right to determine for themselves. Why should we, the Congress of the United States, stand here and say to that Territory, where the women have enjoyed the right of voting for twenty years, and no one arises to gainsay it or to say they have not exercised that right wisely, why should we stand here and say, "Keep out of the Union. We will let no community, no Territory, in here that does not deprive its women of the right which they have for twenty years enjoyed while in a territorial condition?"

SENATOR JONES, of Arkansas, opposed the passage of the bill, and asserted that the constitution of Wyoming had been adopted too hastily.

SENATOR STEWART, of Nevada, said:

If it was postponed any length of time, we should have a constitution presented in the same form. So far as the constitution is concerned, it is republican in form and a good constitution, and it cannot be successfully criticised.

SENATOR REAGAN, of Texas, said:

Mr. President, sentimentalism may do for some things, but in the practical affairs of this world, as the Almighty has made it and as mankind has respected it, until the wisdom of these latter years, it has been found that the happiness of all, the welfare of all, was best consulted and best promoted by the women working in their sphere and the men working in their sphere.

SENATOR BLAIR, of New Hampshire, said:

May I ask the Senator a question?

MR. REAGAN.—Certainly.

MR. BLAIR.—How long is it since men began to vote in this world generally, and how long have they been voting in this country—the English-speaking race, or the human race—and how much voting have the most of men done, notwithstanding what God intended them for, according to the Senator?

MR. REAGAN.—I have read some ancient history, Mr. President, perhaps not as much as the Senator from New Hampshire, and I have read how men voted in a sort of way away back in the time of Greece and Rome. There are some places in the world where, perhaps, they do not vote yet, or vote but little, as in monarchies.

But that, I submit to the Senator from New Hampshire, does not meet the question which I am presenting, that the good of society, the happiness of the family, the welfare of the country, depend upon the preservation of the family organization.

MR. BLAIR.—Does the senator hold that the privilege of voting or the exercise of that privilege by men or by women has much to do with the family organization? Does he think that if men vote and women

Woman Suffrage Leaflet.

Published Fortnightly by the American Woman Suffrage Association, at 3 Park Street, Boston.

Vol. I.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second class matter.

No. 3

Subscription, 25 cts. per annum. SEPTEMBER 1, 1888. Extra Copies, 15 cts. per hundred.

Objections to Woman Suffrage Answered.

BY HENRY B. BLACKWELL.

1. *Suffrage is not a right of anybody.*

To say so is to deny the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. "Governments derive their just powers from consent of the governed"—women are governed. "Taxation without representation is tyranny"—women are taxed. "Political power inheres in the people"—women are people. To deny these principles is to justify despotism. "The men who refuse the ballot to women can show no title to their own."

2. *Nobody asks for Woman Suffrage.*

Over 21,000 citizens of Massachusetts have petitioned for it within six months. More than 50,000 others have petitioned for it in previous years. Not a dollar has ever been spent in circulating these petitions. Repeated efforts have been made and money spent to circulate petitions against Woman Suffrage, and they have fewer signers.

3. *What eminent men have favored Woman Suffrage?*

Among others, Abraham Lincoln, Chief Justice Chase, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Samuel G. Howe, John G. Whittier, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Charles Sumner, Henry Wilson, President Hayes, Governors Banks, Boutwell, Claflin, Washburn, Talbot, and Long, Senators Geo. F. Hoar and Henry L. Dawes, John M. Forbes, Robert Collyer, Bishops Haven, Bowman and Simpson, Neal Dow, George William Curtis, the republicans of Massachusetts in successive platforms since 1870. The national republican platforms of 1872 and 1876.

4. *What eminent women have favored Woman Suffrage?*

Among others, Margaret Fuller, Lydia Maria Child, Frances D. Gage, Lucretia Mott, Florence Nightingale, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Julia Ward Howe, Mary A. Livermore, Louisa M. Alcott, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Clara Barton, Frances E. Willard, Abby W. May, Lucy Stone, Mary F. Eastman, Frances Power Cobbe, Harriet Prescott Spofford, Mary Clemmer.

5. *Most women do not want to vote.*

Except in years of presidential election, a majority of men in Massachusetts do not vote. This is shown by statistics. The right to vote for governor, state legislature, municipal, town and county officers, usually calls out less than half the male voters, in spite of public opinion, party machinery, torchlight processions, newspaper articles, expenditure of money, and personal efforts of candidates. 6679 women in Massachusetts registered last year to vote merely for school committee. Yet this is only a small and disjointed part of the system of Municipal Suffrage. It does not include a vote on the management of schools, or a share in the nomination of candidates.

Small as it is, the right is restricted in the case of women by limitations which make it troublesome and costly to exercise. A woman must apply to be taxed and registered. She must give a statement under oath of all her property, and thus incur taxation to an extent which most men escape. Under parallel conditions not 500 men would have voted for school committee. That nearly 7000 women have done so, under such restrictions, is a proof of eminent and unselfish public spirit.

6. *The number of women voting has diminished each year since School Suffrage for women was granted.*

Only when the number of men voting has also diminished each year since School Suffrage for women was granted, but not for several years. In Boston in 1881 the registered male voters numbered 4639 less than in 1880, a falling off of 8 per cent, while the registered female voters fell off 24, a falling off of only 3 per cent. In both cases the falling off was due to a general lack of political interest, which temporarily affected both sexes. In the case of women it is due also to the limitation of the right, and the vexatious restrictions imposed upon the registration of women by the present law.

7. *It is a step that once taken can never be recalled.*

Municipal Suffrage for women, on the contrary, is an experiment which can be repealed at any time by a Legislature of men alone, elected by men alone. If the presence of women at town-meetings and municipal elections proves distasteful to the men, the Legislature will soon repeal the law. Every fair-minded opponent of Woman Suffrage should vote for Municipal Woman Suffrage, in accordance with Governor Long's recommendation, as the shortest way to put an end to the agitation for Woman Suffrage by exposing its evils.

8. *We have too many voters now.*

Where will you draw the line? No one proposes to disfranchise any class of men who now vote. Every extension of suffrage has proved on the whole a benefit to all concerned; first to poor white men; then to ignorant colored men; why not now to intelligent women? Are democrats who have given suffrage to poor men of foreign birth or republicans who have forced negro suffrage on the reluctant South, afraid to share political power with their own intelligent mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters?

9. *Women are represented already.*

Men cannot represent women, because they are unlike women. Women as a class have tastes, interests and occupations which they alone can adequately represent. Men specially represent material interests; women will specially represent the interest of the home.

10. *Only bad and ignorant women would vote.*

Our five years' experience of School Suffrage for women proves the contrary. The 6679 women who have voted are admitted to be good and intelligent. The demand for suffrage comes from the respected leaders and educated representatives of their sex. No woman can vote in Massachusetts unless she can read and write.

11. *It is contrary to experience.*

Not so. In England women have voted for fifteen years in municipal elections. Hon. Jacob Bright has written to the Massachusetts Legislature that in England Woman Suffrage has proved 'good for women, good for Parliament, and good for the country.' It has worked so well there that it has just been extended to the women of Scotland. Are American women alone unfit to be trusted with political responsibilities?

12. *There is no precedent in this country.*

In Wyoming, women have voted for fifteen years on all questions, on the same terms as men. Governor Hoyt has again announced in his annual message that Woman Suffrage is a success. Three successive governors,—Campbell, Thayer, and Hoyt,—the judges of the Supreme Court, the delegates in Congress, the presiding elder of the M. E. Church, the newspapers of both parties, all agree that Woman Suffrage works well and gives satisfaction in Wyoming.

13. *It would put the control of state and nation into the hands of the foreign element*

In every State there are more women who can read and write than all the illiterate men and women combined. In every State there are more American women than all the foreign men and women combined. In every State the votes of women will double the intelligent majority, thus diminishing the influence of the ignorant minority one-half. In the Southern States taken together, there are more white women than all the colored men and women combined. So that the white majority, when women vote, will be larger than the total number of white male voters, if all women and colored men were excluded. There are in Massachusetts 454,852 women over twenty years old who can read and write; 326,731 of these are Americans; 128,121 of foreign birth. (See Carroll D. Wright's statistics for 1875.)

14. *It would put our cities under Roman Catholic control.*

There are in all our large cities, even in New York, more Protestant women than Roman Catholic women; more American women than foreign women. There are in Boston 91,367 women over twenty years old, who can read and write; 52,608 of these are Americans, 38,759 are of foreign birth. (See Carroll D. Wright as above.)

15. *It would diminish respect for women.*

Voting is power. Power always commands respect. To be weak is to be miserable. How many men are tolerated in society only because they are rich and

powerful! Woman armed with the ballot will be stronger and more respected than ever before.

16. *It is contrary to the Bible.*

Not so. In the beginning, we are told, God made man in his own image male and female, and gave *them* dominion; not man dominion over woman. Among the Jews, God's chosen people, Deborah, the wife of Lapidoth, a married woman, was judge, and led their armies to victory. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one. Women as well as men are commanded to "call no man master." Nowhere is it said in the Bible to women, "Thou shalt not vote."

17. *Women have not physical strength to enforce laws; therefore they should not help make them.*

One half our male voters have not physical strength to enforce laws, yet they help make them. Most lawyers, judges, physicians, ministers, merchants, editors, authors, legislators and congressmen, and all men over forty-five years old are exempt from military service on the ground of physical incapacity. (See statistics of the late war.) Voting is the authoritative expression of an opinion. It requires intelligence, conscience, and patriotism, not mere muscle. All the physical force of society is subject to call to enforce law, but cannot create law. Moral force, such as women possess, is as necessary as physical force to national well-being.

18. *If women vote they must fight.*

Women are the mothers of men. Lucy Stone says: "Some woman perils her life for her country every time a soldier is born. Day and night she does picket duty by his cradle. For years she is his quartermaster, and gathers his rations. And then, when he becomes a man and a voter, shall he say to his mother, 'If you want to vote you must first kill somebody'? It is a coward's argument!"

19. *It will make domestic discord when women vote contrary to their husbands.*

In cases where husbands and wives vote together it will be an additional source of sympathy and bond of union. In cases where they vote differently they will agree to differ, as they now do in religious matters. A man will not respect his wife the less because she has an opinion of her own and is free to express it.

20. *It will only double the vote—women will vote as their husbands do.*

Then the family will cast two votes instead of one. But the quality of the voters changes the quality of politics. A political party of men and women will not be the same as a party of men alone. Women are more peaceable, refined, temperate, chaste, economical, humane, and law-abiding than men. These qualities will influence the character of the government. The united votes of men and women will give the fullest, fairest, and most accurate expression of public opinion.

S. H. Sawyer.

Woman Suffrage Leaflet.

Vol. I. Published Fortnightly by the American Woman Suffrage Association, at 3 Park Street, Boston. No. 4.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum. SEPTEMBER 15, 1888. Extra Copies, 15 cents per hundred.

A WOMAN SUFFRAGE CATECHISM.

BY LUCY STONE.

At the woman suffrage hearing before the Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, on the 17th of February, 1885, Lucy Stone presented the following statement, with questions and answers which illustrate some phases of the movement for the equal legal and political rights of women that are not as visible now as they will be hereafter:

Gentlemen of the Committee:—We have come up to this room for many years, vainly asking for equal rights with yourselves. We have quoted the great principles on which our government is based: the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. We have found that those principles are not respected in their application to women. We have answered over and over all objections that have ever been offered against the ballot for woman. We have quoted the successful working of woman suffrage wherever it has been tried, in England, Scotland, Ontario, Nova Scotia, and in our own Western Territories, without avail. I propose now, to show the historic record the Massachusetts Legislature has made for itself, on this question, by the following questions and answers:

Question—Shall the men and women who are to obey the laws have a right to make them?

Answer—No. Only the men shall have that right.

Q.—But there must be laws that especially concern women. Who shall make those laws?

A.—Only men shall make them.

Q.—May not mothers help make the laws that settle their legal relation to their children?

A.—They shall not. The men shall have the sole right to make such laws.

Q.—May not married women help make the laws that decide what share of the property acquired by a husband and wife during marriage shall belong to the wife?

A.—They shall not.

Q.—May not a married woman help make the laws that decide how much of her property acquired before her marriage shall belong to her husband after her death?

A.—No. The men shall decide it.

Q.—Who shall make the laws that decide how much of the property of the husband shall go to the wife?

A.—The men shall make them.

Q.—Who shall make the laws that decide how, and how much, a wife may will of her own property?

A.—The men.

Q.—Who shall make the laws that decide the rights of married partners in case of marriage and divorce and alimony?

A.—The men.

Q.—By the laws the men have made, do the father and mother have an equal legal right to their children?

A.—No. The right of the father is supreme so long as he lives with his wife.

Q.—What share shall a husband have in the real estate of his wife?

A.—He shall have the use of the whole of it as long as he lives, if his wife has ever had a living child.

Q.—What is his right to that property called?

A.—“The estate by the courtesy.”

Q.—What share shall a wife have in the real estate of her husband?

A.—She shall have the use of one-third after her husband's death.

Q.—What is the right to that property called?

A.—It is commonly called “the widow's incumbrance,” “dower,” or “widow's thirds.”

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Q.—If the wife die before her husband, what share of the property earned by herself and by her husband jointly during their marriage may she have to will to her children, or to anybody?

A.—Not a cent's worth.

Q.—Who made the law?

A.—The men.

Q.—Do married women now own their own clothes?

A.—They do.

Q.—How long did it take to secure that right?

A.—Three years.

Q.—May a widow now be buried in the family lot?

A.—She may.

Q.—How long did it take to secure that right?

A.—Ten years.

Q.—Shall the men and women who pay taxes have a right to say how much they shall pay, who shall spend the money, and how it shall be spent?

A.—No. Only the men shall have that right.

Q.—Shall all soldiers and sailors honorably discharged from service have a right to vote, whether they are paupers or not, or whether they have paid a poll-tax or not?

A.—They shall.

Q.—Shall male Indians, and people of color called Indians, have a right to vote for all officers of town, county, State and nation?

A.—They shall.

Q.—Shall female citizens have a right to vote as freely as the male Indians do and on the same questions?

A.—They shall not.

Q.—For what may they vote?

A.—For members of the school committee. Some cannot vote until after they have asked to be taxed.

Q.—May a wife will her personal property as freely as a husband may will his?

A.—She may not.

Q.—How much of it may she be free to will?

A.—One-half.

Q.—What must be done with the other half?

A.—She must do with the other half just what her husband gives her permission to do by his consent written on the will.

Q.—When a husband brutally assaults his wife, who shall have the sole right to make the law that will punish him?

A.—The men.

Q.—If women were milk-cans, would they be promptly protected?

A.—They would.

Q.—How long since Massachusetts women asked for the only power that will protect them, viz.: the ballot?

A.—Thirty-two years.

Q.—When was application first made to protect milk-cans?

A.—Last year.

Q.—What was done about it?

A.—By House Bill No. 184, it was proposed that "Whoever, without the consent of the owner thereof, takes, uses, sells, disposes of, buys, or traffics in, any milk-can or cans, marked or stamped with the name, initial or device of any dealer or dealers in milk, or wilfully mars, erases, or covers over said name, initial or device of any such dealer or dealers in milk, so marked or stamped on said can or cans, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the jail not exceeding one year." The final result is a fine on the misusers of milk-cans.

Q.—Have the Legislature the same right and power to secure municipal suffrage for women that they have to secure protection and safety for milk-cans?

A.—They have.

Q.—What makes the difference in the legislative action about milk-cans and about women?

A.—The owners of milk-cans have votes and can protect their interests. Women have no votes; hence their interests are not protected.

Q.—Do men claim for themselves every right they deny to women?

A.—They do.

Q.—What sort of history of the old Bay State does this treatment of women make?

A.—History itself will tell.

"The Woman's Journal." A weekly paper devoted to woman suffrage. \$2 50 a year.
Specimen copies free. A dozen assorted tracts will be sent by mail, postpaid,
for 10 cents. Address "Woman's Journal," Boston, Mass.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL.

A WEEKLY PAPER, FOUNDED 1870.

Devoted to Women's Interests, and especially to Woman Suffrage.

EDITORS:

LUCY STONE. HENRY B. BLACKWELL. ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Mothers, Sisters, Daughters.

FOR news concerning Women, their advancement and successes in all countries, read THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL. Among our corps of contributors we not only number eminent women, but bright unknown writers gain an audience, and we gather fresh enthusiasm from the record of their vigorous work.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—*Clara Barton.*

"The best woman's paper in the United States, or in the world."—*Englishwomen's Review.*

"It is so much the best of the woman suffrage papers that no comparison is possible."—*Rev. Anna H. Shaw, National Superintendent of Franchise, W. C. T. U.*

"I would give up my daily paper sooner than THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL."—*Maria Mitchell.*

"It is an exceedingly bright paper, and, what is far better, a just one. I could not do without it."—*Josiah Allen's Wife, (Marietta Holley).*

"It is able, genial and irreproachable—an armory of weapons to all who are battling for the rights of humanity."—*Mary A. Livermore.*

"I never forget to recommend THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL. I deem it the best journal published for our work in this line (the woman question)."—*Mrs. Helen M. Gougar.*

"THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL has long been my outlook upon the great and widening world of woman's work, worth and victory. It has no peer in this noble office and ministry. Its style is pure and its spirit exalted."—*Frances E. Willard.*

"It is the most reliable and extensive source of information regarding what women are doing, what they can do, and what they should do. It is the oldest of the women's papers now in existence, and has built up for itself a solid and unblemished reputation."—*Julia Ward Howe.*

Three weeks on trial, FREE. One year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.50. Regular price per year, \$2.50. To libraries and reading-rooms, half-price. Address,

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL,

3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

THE WOMAN'S COLUMN.

A SMALL WEEKLY PAPER
FOR THE MILLION.

EDITED BY ALICE STONE BLACKWELL, No. 3 PARK STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

It gives every week the news of the movement, together with short articles, arguments, and answers to objections.

PRICE, 25 CENTS A YEAR.

Woman Suffrage Leaflet.

Published fortnightly by the American Woman Suffrage Association at 3 Park Street Boston.

Vol. II.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second class matter.

No. 26.

Subscription, 25 cts. per annum. AUGUST 15, 1889. Extra Copies, 30 cts. per hundred.

Shall Women be Admitted to the General Conference?

The following excellent article was contributed by Rev. J. W. Bashford to the *Northern Christian Advocate*, in reply to an argument on the other side by Dr. Daniel Wise:

The justice of allowing those who share the burdens and responsibilities of the church a voice in determining what these burdens shall be was conceded when the General Conference adopted lay representation. This Scriptural principle that authority springs from service was expounded in the now historic address of laymen to the General Conference in 1868. But women share with men the burdens of our churches. They serve in Sunday schools, prayer-meetings, class meetings, in raising money, and in pastoral labor. Measured by any possible standard of either gifts or services, the principle upon which laymen asked for representation, and upon which it was granted, is violated by the denial of that representation to two-thirds of the laity on the ground of sex. No one has ever written consistently in opposition to admitting women to the General Conference without controverting the principle upon which we admitted laymen. This principle that ministers should confer with the mothers and sisters, as well as with the fathers and brothers, in planning the work of the church, is so just and Christian that every minister applies it in his local work. Its application to the general work of the church would never have been challenged had not good people feared that its application, without respect to sex, was without Scriptural warrant and had no precedent in ecclesiastical history. With this single statement of the principle at issue we shall, therefore, devote our article to these two objections.

The only church council or conference mentioned in the New Testament is the Council of Jerusalem. The account of this is found in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. The conclusion of that conference is stated in the following language: "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church," etc. We do not think Luke would have represented the church as concurring in the decision reached provided no members of the church had been present at the council save apostles and elders only. The statement in Acts that "the whole church" approved the decision reached in this apostolic council is our only direct Scriptural precedent for lay representation. But it is clearly impossible to find any authority, either in the principles or in the language of the New Testament, for admitting that one part of the laity, viz., the male members, attended and approved the acts of the apostolic council,

but that the women were not included in Luke's statement, "the whole church."

Dr. Wise holds that the exclusion of women from the government of the church is "in harmony with the act of God in creating Eve to be the 'helpmeet' of Adam. Equal in nature, in value, and in dignity to the man, Eve was yet officially subordinate to him. He was the principal to whom Eve was the divinely appointed helper." The only Scripture quoted for this affirmation that God originally subordinated woman to man is the phrase, "I will make him a help meet for him." This exegesis is based upon our English application of the word "help" and "hired help" to subordinates. The Hebrew noun here applied to woman is used nineteen times in the Bible. In fourteen cases it is applied to God or used in connection with Him, as "The Lord is our help." A noun which in the Bible is not once used to designate a subordinate, but is applied fourteen times to God and twice to woman, is hardly a sufficient Scriptural basis for the affirmation of the divine subordination of woman. It is true that after the fall and in consequence of sin woman was subjected to man, as narrated in Genesis 3:16. But Christ came to remove from us the consequences of the fall; and we no more fight against God in attempting to alleviate the penalty which fell upon woman than in filling the earth and causing it to bring forth fruits and flowers instead of "thorns and thistles."

The original relation of the sexes is found in the first chapter of Genesis from the twenty-sixth to the twenty-eighth verses: "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion," etc. Here the dominion is committed not to man alone, but to man and woman together,—and let them have dominion." The twenty-eighth verse leaves not the slightest room for doubt that woman is included with man in the command given and the dominion conferred: "And God said unto them, be fruitful and multiply . . . and have dominion," etc.

Dr. Wise cites Paul's name as the New Testament authority for the subjection of woman. He thinks that Paul bases the obedience of the wife to her husband on the ground of sex, while we think that Paul bases the husband's authority, not upon the ground of sex at all, but wholly upon the ground of service. In Phil. 2:5-10

Paul distinctly asserts the principle upon which Christ came to the dominion of the world. "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him," etc.

The Bible here directly declares that Christ's exaltation to the headship of the Church is due to his services to humanity. Christ makes service to be the sole ground of our exaltation before God, without the slightest reference to sex, and speaks of himself as obeying this principle: "But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever shall become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20:25-28.

Paul shows that so far from proclaiming the rulership of the husband over the wife as a divine prerogative, he had in mind this very principle of rulership by service. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself up for it." Eph. 5:25. We heartily accept Paul's own exposition of these difficult passages, and urge husbands to win all the dominion they possibly can by this Christian principle of service to their wives.

We think most Christian homes are now conducted upon Paul's principle, or rather Christ's principle, that authority springs from service; and not upon the old interpretation of Paul that authority inheres in sex. In those departments in which the husband serves the family, he may consult others, but the right of decision rests with him. In those departments in which the wife serves the family, she often advises with the other members of the household, but the decision is conceded to her. While the parents protect and support the children, they justly direct the children's lives. As the parents become aged and dependent the children still revere them for past services, and wisely consult them. But the right of decision is now voluntarily conceded by parents to the children, because the circumstances which gave rise to that right are now reversed, and the responsibility for the support of the family is now shifted from the parents to their children. This seems to us to be the Christian theory of authority as over against the old view that authority inheres in sex.

The fact that God committed to man and woman together the joint dominion of the earth; the fact that Deborah and Huldah were prophetesses in the Old Testament and that God fulfilled their prophecies by special providences; the fact that the words of Mary and Elizabeth are recorded among the choicest portions of the New Testament; the fact that Anna is

mentioned in Luke by her official title "prophetess;" the fact that Christ gave to Mary the first message of the resurrection, and that woman first published the tidings of a risen Saviour as recorded in Luke 24:9; the fact that the Holy Spirit was poured out upon women as well as men on the day of Pentecost; that one of the original deacons had four daughters, "virgins which did prophesy;" the fact that Paul saluted Phoebe as a "deaconess of the church at Cenchreae" and commended her to the church of Rome; the fact that "aged women" or female presbyters and "widows" are recognized as an official class in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus; the fact that Christ sums up the Gospel in the Golden Rule, and Paul applies the Golden Rule in the declaration, "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus"—such passages indicate that new light may yet break out of the Word of God upon this subject. We are sure that the passages of the Bible bearing upon the relation of the sexes will richly repay a fresh study and will possibly demand a broader interpretation upon our part. Let us remember that the same interpretation which makes Paul teach that authority inheres in sex made Paul also teach the divine right of slavery and of kings. In Titus Paul uses the same word to denote the subjection of slaves, of women and of citizens to those in authority over them. He tells Titus to teach the doctrine of women "being in subjection to their own husbands," 2:5; of slaves "being in subjection to their own masters," 2:9; and of citizens "being in subjection to rulers," 3:1. Our fathers were at least consistent in holding, during seventeen hundred years of the church's life, that the Bible taught the divine right of husbands, of slaveholders and of kings. A broader and more spiritual interpretation of Paul has convinced the present generation that he did not teach the divine right of slavery or of kings. But can we consistently abandon the old view of Paul's teaching in regard to the two latter doctrines and then maintain it in regard to the first, when all three doctrines are taught, if taught at all, in consecutive passages and in identical language?

We have thus dwelt upon the Scriptural argument because we have felt that our people are anxious to act only in harmony with God's will. Let us remember, however, that almost every distinctive position the Methodist Church ever took was resisted by the conservative members of other churches, and even of our own, as in violation of the Scriptures. The ordination of our ministers by Mr. Wesley, the establishment of the local ministry, the doctrines of free will, of the new birth, of the witness of the Spirit, of Christian perfection, the permission for women to speak in the prayer and class meetings, the declarations of our conferences against slavery, the admission of partial lay delegation in our General Conference—all these reforms were stoutly resisted both inside

and outside our church as unscriptural. The sanctified common-sense of Methodists has enabled them to grasp the principles of the Bible more fully than the learned conservatism of other churches, as other churches now admit by following where we led the way. May that sanctified common-sense not fail us in this decision!

Again it is objected that the admission of our sisters to seats beside their brothers in the General Conference is unprecedented in church history. Unfortunately this argument proves too much. Had this argument prevailed in the earlier decisions of our church we should have had no lay representation or even pastoral representation in our General Conference. Dr. Van Hefele's "History of Church Councils" shows that after we leave the first council of Jerusalem until the close of the Reformation neither lay nor pastors were represented in the councils of the Catholic Church. The councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, etc., were composed entirely of bishops. Secular princes and noblemen indeed appeared in the fourth Lateran Council. But they appeared not as the representatives of the laity, but of the principalities of this world. Besides, the hierarchical tendency continued to grow until secular princes were excluded from the great church councils, and only bishops and higher ecclesiastics were admitted to them. This tendency culminated in the Vatican Council of 1870, declaring that even bishops, united in a council, have no authority as against the Pope alone, but that his decrees are of themselves final. This is a pure ecclesiastical despotism.

Methodism, upon the other hand, profiting by the example of other Protestant churches, allowed pastors as such to be represented in the General Conference at the beginning of her history. This, however, was only one step toward allowing the persons who bore the burdens and made the sacrifices for the church a voice

in its management. The tendency toward representative government among us led to an agitation for lay representation, along with pastoral representation, in the early years of our history. The refusal upon the part of ministers to grant the laity a voice in the government of our church was one cause of our loss of the Methodist Protestant Church and of the Wesleyan Church. But justice and the influence of our ablest laymen at last prevailed and lay representation was granted in 1872.

Surely it is not to the discredit of Methodism that our course in regard to the representation of our people in our highest ecclesiastical councils should be exactly opposite to that of the Roman Catholic Church! Despite the fact that from the council at Jerusalem to the close of the Reformation we have no precedent in church history for our conduct, yet it is impossible to convince Methodists that they have been advancing in the wrong direction, and to lead them to revoke the principle of lay representation. The historical argument is, indeed, against us until we get back to principles of the New Testament and the practices of the apostles. But it is one of the distinctive features of Methodism that she passes over the history of the Roman Catholic Church and goes back to the Bible for her inspiration and her precedents.

Notice how modest is the proposal now before the church. It is not a declaration that women must be elected to the General Conference. It is simply a proposal that lay electoral conferences be permitted to act as in their godly judgment seems best. Bishop Simpson has wisely said that the government of the Christian church rests not with the ministry alone, or with the laity alone, but with proper representatives of the two. Shall we violate this principle by denying all eligibility to the General Conference to two-thirds of our laity?

Woman Suffrage Leaflet.

Published Fortnightly by the American Woman Suffrage Association at 3 Park Street, Boston.

Vol. II.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second class matter.

No. 29.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

OCTOBER 1, 1889.

Extra copies, 15 cts. per 100, postpaid.

THE BIBLE FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BY REV. J. W. BASHFORD.

[Address delivered at the thirteenth annual meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association.]

The convictions of the great mass of our people are grounded upon God's word. Many reforms have been greatly hindered by false interpretations of this book. Our opponents generally go back as far as Genesis for arguments, but even then they do not go back far enough. They stop with a true account of the false relation into which man and woman were thrown by sin, and quote this account as the original charter for mankind: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." If they will only go back to the creation of Adam and Eve and to their natural and divine relation before the fall, they will fail to find a sentence which hints at the subordination of woman. Woman was not made in man's image, neither was the dominion of the world committed to him alone. On the contrary the record plainly says: "In the image of God created He him, male and female created He them, and God said: Let them have dominion over all the earth." So far as the superiority of either might be inferred from the account of their creation that inference is plainly in favor of woman.

If the order of creation means anything, if we find God gradually advancing in His work from the inorganic earth to the mineral kingdom, then to the vegetable kingdom, and then to the animal kingdom, and last of all making man, the fact that woman is made after man suggests her higher qualities rather than man's superiority. There is no marked difference between the sexes. The Bible does not represent Adam and Eve as separate species. The highest qualities belong to humanity in common. Christ is as much the typical woman as the typical man of the race. But I pit against the spurious claim of man's divine superiority, the Bible account of the creation advancing in a gradually ascending scale, man being formed from the ground and the breath of God, Eve being formed from Adam by the act of God, and Christ, the head of the new humanity, springing from woman by the divine power. It takes an im-

mense amount of ingenuity to make out woman's inferiority from the simple scale of creation presented in God's word. The fact that two thirds of the Christian church are composed of women favors the theory of her higher spiritual nature if the preference is given to either.

Now when Adam and Eve descended from the sphere of spirituality to the animal sphere, when they turned from a life of faith to follow appetite, God said to man that even nature should rebel against his animal life; "The earth shall bring forth thorns and thistles." The history of every drunkard and man of lust proves that nature fights against him, and confirms the prophecy. And God said to woman that in this lower animal life with man she would be constantly worsted; "Thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." Six thousand years of history have proved the terrible truth of this prophecy.

And yet this declaration of woman's subordination—which does not belong at all to the account of her original creation, and which is directly due to sin, and which we see sprang from the very nature of the two and from the sinful contest on which they then entered—is quoted repeatedly as the divine declaration of the ideal state of the sexes, and we are constantly told that any attempt to change it is a violation of the divine constitution. As well might one declare that the thorns and briars which God said the earth should bring forth on account of man's sin are an expression of the ideal attitude of nature toward man, and that we violate the divine constitution in tilling the soil and improving its products.

Again, the whole effort of Christ was to restore to mankind what was lost in Adam. "For as in Adam all die so in Christ shall all be made alive." If Christianity is completely to restore that which was lost in Adam, how can it stop short of completely abolishing the subordination of woman, which the Bible declares to be the direct result of sin, and of leading us back to that

Edenic proclamation: "Let them have dominion over all the earth"?

I fully entered into Paul's position, in a little pamphlet issued by the WOMAN'S JOURNAL, and need not dwell upon it here. Paul wrote the letter to the Corinthians, and all his other letters, not from the platform of rights, but from the higher platform of love. He declares in the ninth chapter that he has, from the standpoint of justice, a clear right to payment for his labor, but refuses it; says he has a plain right to eat any kind of meat, but declares that if meat cause his brother to offend he will eat no meat while the world stands. He asks the Jews and Romans who may be in Corinth, not to confess Christ in Hebrew or Latin unless an interpreter is present, tells the women to keep silence in the meetings and obey their husbands, forbids the slaves to contend for their freedom, but to choose service rather. He even says: "Let no man seek his own but every man his neighbor's good," and the argument fitly culminates in the marvelous exaltation of love in the thirteenth chapter.

After reading Paul's letter as a whole, who would dream of affirming that Paul is writing, not an apotheosis of love, but a magna charta of personal rights? As well might we say that the fact of his taking no compensation is proof that he had no right to compensation for his labor, that his command to Jews and Romans not to confess Christ at Corinth is proof that they had no right to confess Christ in Hebrew or Latin, and that his prohibition of any man to seek his own is proof that a man has no right to his property, as to say that Paul's command to women to keep silence in the churches, and to obey their husbands, is proof that they had no right to speech or liberty. But still more, as if Paul foresaw that his words on the subjection of woman might be tortured into falsehood, in this very letter to the Corinthians, after mentioning the historical fact that man is the head of the woman, he adds, "Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman nor the woman without the man *in the Lord*," and in Galatians he declares unqualifiedly: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond or free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Our children will be as much astonished that we could hold to the divine subordination of women in the face of this last clause, as we are now astonished that

slave-holders and Jews could hold to the divinely ordained subordination of the African and other races in the face of the first two clauses.

Lastly, in a word, what is it that Woman Suffragists contend for? Their fundamental principle is this: Every human being has a right to work out his or her own destiny, subject only to those restraints of society which are applied to all alike. The *Popular Science Monthly* is rehashing the old argument that woman is not fit for the law and medicine and theology. All this is wide of the mark. Thousands of men are not fit for congressmen, or doctors, or ministers. But if men make mistakes, as they constantly do, in their work and in their lives, nature needs no artificial help to punish their temerity.

It may be that not one woman in a hundred cares to enter the law, or medicine, or the ministry, but we insist in her case, as we insisted in the case of the Africans, that every avenue be thrown open on similar conditions to all, and that each human being shall be free to sow, and then reap what he or she has sown. Society has a right to self-preservation, and, for the good of all, may impose restrictions and adopt regulations, under which each individual may practice medicine, or vote, or do any other work. But these regulations must apply to all alike. For society to say that no Jew shall hold office because he is a Jew, that no German shall practice medicine, that no colored man shall preach the gospel, or that no woman shall practice law or cast a vote because she is a woman, is simply an impertinence of tyranny. Our cause rests back upon the fundamental principle of Protestantism, the freedom of the individual to work out his own destiny and take the consequences. Nay, it rests back upon the fundamental principles of the Bible and of the divine government. God himself respects individual freedom so highly that he will not invade the sanctuary of the will unbidden and over-ride our personalty. He reasons with us and invites us. But He will stand by sorrowfully, yet with self-restraint, while we go down to ruin. Society has no right rudely to enter the sanctuary of one half the race and restrict their lives to a particular work, while God himself only stands at the door and knocks until He is bidden to come in.

Woman Suffrage Leaflet.

Published Fortnightly by the American Woman Suffrage Association at 3 Park Street, Boston.

Vol II

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second class matter.

No. 31.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

NOVEMBER 1, 1889.

Extra copies, 15 cts. per 100, postpaid.

MUNICIPAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN.—No. 2.

BY EDNAH D. CHENEY.

The question of woman suffrage has now been so long agitated, its triumphs are so great, and in many minds there is such certainty of its final victory, that the most important question is now, how shall it be introduced into our system of government, and does it need any additional safeguards and checks in its exercise? The general question, Have women a right to suffrage? is hardly an open one. In fact, Massachusetts has settled the abstract principle of the right and propriety of women's voting by the ready assent which she gave to the demand that women should be empowered to vote in the election of school committees. If they are able to aid in choosing the officers with whom rests one of the most important functions of the State, the education of its citizens, it is impossible to say, "Women are by nature unfitted to take any part in the government of city, State, or nation." That we must go on from this first step is evident, and that the next most appropriate step is to confer municipal suffrage upon women, is equally evident to my mind.

It is good fortune when great changes can be gradually introduced; it is great wisdom which sees when it is safe to take the next step and so make the whole ascent easy and safe. The whole body of women in our State are not yet ready and eager for the exercise of their political rights, but a large, intelligent and united body, increasing every year, are fully ready, and determined that they will never cease their demand until they have accomplished their object. Thirty years of steady work show this. This state of things ensures that if municipal suffrage be granted now, its exercise will be gradual, and it will be women of earnest thought and purpose who will enter at once upon its exercise, and give the weight of their influence in municipal affairs.

We hear two opposite objections to the admission of women to municipal suffrage; one, that they will not vote, and the other, that the additional vote will be so large as to bring fresh dangers in the working of our politics. This latter result has not appeared in any instance in Europe or America; unless it be in the exceptional Territory of Utah, where the condition of political life is abnormal and unwholesome.

If few women vote in municipal elections, the introduction of this new element will be gradual, and so bring into our town and city governments the interest and ability of our women without any sudden shock to our institutions. If we wait until the whole body of women are aroused upon this subject, an overwhelming demand may be made in the interest of some particular measure which may cause temporary ill-temper and disturbance.

The example of money corporations is instructive. Every bank, railroad, insurance company, or other corporation in which women hold stock, considers them as fully entitled to vote. Ordinarily very few stockholders take pains to attend an annual meeting and vote. Yet they are a strong and powerful influence. When an emergency arises the voters are called in, proxies are asked for, and individual members who take an interest in the question attend and speak.

But the very fact that the stockholders can vote, that the annual report is sent to

them and they read it with a sense of power and responsibility, helps to keep up an intelligent interest in its affairs, favorable to sound management.

It is far wiser to do away an anomaly or an evil before it becomes so intolerable that it must be swept away even by revolution. Had our fathers fully realized this in the case of slavery, we might have been saved thirty years of smouldering, and four of open, civil war.

The other day I listened to the account given by a woman of her efforts to help a mother rescue her son from evil companions and growing habits of intemperance. After trying everything else in her power, the mother at last consented to have the boy arrested, hoping he would be placed in a reformatory institution which might save him. The poor woman, weak and crippled, in a stormy day went from one office to another, roughly hustled on by the policemen, and at last, when she gave her testimony against her boy, she was answered by the judge that she was a hard-hearted woman to testify against her own flesh and blood. I wondered if that woman did not see the need of womanly influence in municipal affairs, and knew well that the lady who accompanied her, and whose modest and quiet work is constantly bringing her into relations with our municipal authorities, would sign the petition that lies before you. They had no power in the government to which alone they could appeal for help and justice. The object of town and city government is, or should be, mainly for the protection of homes. Our cities do not wage foreign wars or conduct diplomatic relations, but they do control almost every detail of our domestic life. Shall we have our houses of wood to invite conflagration? shall our sidewalks be safe and comfortable? shall our schoolhouses be clean and wholesome? and a thousand similar questions are decided by them. A lady on the school committee of a distant city told me she had been months trying in vain to get a school-room floor scoured out, because the wise city fathers leave all matters of the buildings to the City Council, and there are no women in the City Council. What do men know about scouring floors? The town is only an enlarged household, and the same qualities of care and thrift and attention to details which women are constantly called upon to exercise in their households are needed in the town. In the household men and women work well in union; why not in the town?

The added value of the Home which was recognized in its relation to the town would be very great. The child would associate all the piety of family life with the idea of municipal duties, now too widely severed. A little boy of five or six years old last fall hearing the earnest talk all around him in regard to the election, looked up in his mother's face, that face to which he had ever looked for decision and counsel, authority and strength, and asked, "Mother, how are you going to vote?" And her heart was too full to answer as she might have done, "My son! you will some day vote, but I perhaps never! for I am allowed only to give my sons to fight for my country, and my money to pay its expenses, but it does not recognize that I have any part or lot in its affairs."

Yet of that mother you ask that she should instil into her child's heart lessons of honor, justice, and patriotism, and bring him up to be a useful and true citizen, and ready to give his life for his country. Only the undying faith in woman's heart that wrong must be righted at last, has enabled her to fulfil this mission even as well as she has.

In consequence of the movement for the increased influence of women in education, which gave us school suffrage, we have a few thousand women voting in Massachusetts. We have also over a hundred women serving on school committees, and every one of those committee-women knows that there is a constituency in her own town, however small, which is in sympathy with her. This small number of voters and officers has created a strong interest in the schools, which makes them a matter of constant thought and conversation, and is leading to great improvement, as the report of your State Board of Education testifies. The great safeguard of a republic is the intelligent interest of all its citizens in its well-being. Our towns and cities are the very centres of our political life. It is in them that the public mind is educated.

Imagine an intelligent stranger, say from China, studying the condition of Massachusetts. He goes to your schools and finds boys and girls on the same benches; the teachers on the platform are women in seven cases out of eight; he finds them sitting on school committees, on the Board of Education. He goes to Wellesley College, to Boston University, to the Institute of Technology, and finds women welcomed to the highest education; even at Harvard he finds an Annex prepared for them. On your prison and reformatory boards he finds women, and reads the admirable minority report of a woman-member. He reads in your admirable statute of last year "that women physicians *must* be employed in insane asylums for women" and finds your best families and ablest physicians pressing their assistance. He turns to private institutions; he finds women on the list of officers of Associated Charities, sees them on their benevolent rounds, visiting police-stations, looking after drunkards, bringing up questions of law to the notice of the courts, grappling in theory and detail with the most difficult of social problems, and working harmoniously and efficiently in all these relations. He reads Mrs. Lowell's and Mrs. Fields' books on charity, and sees how beautifully tenderness is balanced by judgment. He goes to factories and printing-offices and other mechanical establishments, telegraph offices, etc., etc., and everywhere sees the sexes working together in peace and without injuring themselves or society.

He then lastly turns his attention to politics. He says to his kind friend who has shown him the treasures of the State, "I admire this ancient and honorable Commonwealth, based upon the broadest principles of right and liberty. I understand that you have universal suffrage here and glory in it; that all your people take part in the management of the State."

"Yes, sir!" replies the representative of the good old State, "with one small exception."

"Ah! indeed! Oh! I suppose as this is such a well-ordered community, you do not allow habitual drunkards to vote. Perhaps this might be wise, but"—

"Oh, no, sir! that is not the case!"

"Ah! it is then the vicious and illiterate. This is a good idea if"—

"The Woman's Journal." A weekly paper devoted to woman suffrage. \$2.50 a year. Specimen copies free. A dozen assorted tracts, 10 cents. Address "Woman's Journal," Boston, Mass.

"No, no, sir, we cannot draw the line so strictly; if a man can write his name and read his vote, that is enough. We don't inquire into his intelligence or virtue; it would be embarrassing."

"Indeed! It is then perhaps the foreigner just landed on your shores—helped by some society for encouraging emigration. This may be a natural protection. I don't know that I should approve of it. A ten years' residence should entitle him to vote. I think."

"My dear sir, you are altogether mistaken. Naturalization is very easy here, and we welcome foreigners from all quarters. We take pains to help them,—when we know what ticket they will vote."

"I am quite at a loss, I confess. Ah! I remember, you have not wholly conquered the race prejudice. I did hope that the fifteenth amendment had done away all legal obstructions for the negro."

"Of course it has. It is very strange you do not see the proprieties of things. The negro is fully enfranchised and is welcomed to the judge's bench or the legislative chamber. It is quite a different thing."

"Thank God for that!" says the somewhat dark-hued inquirer; "but I am utterly at a loss. Will you please to tell me who it is that are unable to vote in municipal matters on such subjects as the reformation of criminals, the closing of dram-shops, the cleansing of cities in preparation for cholera, the supply of pure water, the protection from fire, the safety of roads and streets, the efficiency of the police, the building of schoolhouses, etc., etc?"

"Why, it is only the women."

"Only the women! Do I understand you? It is the Miss May, whom I saw on the State Board of Education, and Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Homans, on your Prison Commission, and Dr. Crawford and Dr. Ingraham, who are lecturing to your working women, and Mr. Hale and the Misses Smith and Mrs. Fields, whom I saw at Chardon Street Charity Building, inquiring so carefully into the condition of the poor, and Mrs. Leonard, who gave me so much valuable information upon prisons, and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and your Missionary Boards, and Mrs. Caswell, of the North End Mission, and your school teachers, and Mrs. Howe, who has gone to New Orleans to take charge of the Women's Department, and Mrs. Hemenway, who provides lectures on history to teach the boys patriotism, in the Old South, etc.—are these and such as these the women who are not allowed to vote in municipal affairs?"

"Yes, sir."

"Indeed! indeed!" said the puzzled Chinaman, "but why?"

The logical representative of a free government paused; he hesitated; then with the wisdom of an agnostic, he answered, "I don't know."

Gentlemen, if you will ask yourselves this question seriously: "Why should not our women—in the main as intelligent, thoughtful, well-educated, as the men—vote on these questions affecting the health, happiness, and life of the family and the home? I think you will be forced to the same answer, "I do not know." I believe that the day on which a Massachusetts Legislature seriously takes this question to heart, and scripping it of all fallacies, setting aside all mockery and ridicule, looks at it simply in the light of reason and justice, they will give a unanimous verdict that the injustice shall be swept away and municipal suffrage be opened to women.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Bi-Monthly at the Office of The Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

Vol. VII.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second-class matter.

No. 3.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

MAY, 1895.

Extra copies, 15 cts. per 100, postpaid.

LEGISLATIVE ADVICE.

At the annual meeting of the National-American Woman Suffrage Association, held at Atlanta, Ga., in February, 1895, a committee on legislative advice was appointed. This committee was formed for the purpose of giving information as to the best methods of conducting legislative campaigns, advising how to secure the passage of laws, and suggesting measures which may be pushed for the benefit of women. Each member of the committee has had legislative experience, and, after consultation, they offer the following plan of work:

LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGNS.

Those who have never conducted a legislative campaign are prone to think that the efforts should begin as soon as the Legislature convenes; while, to secure success, the work should be half done by that time. Every woman who is interested in such a campaign should begin her labors months before the election, by ascertaining who will be the probable candidates of both parties, seeing these men, and obtaining from them pledges of support. When a man is willing thus to aid the cause, every effort must be made to secure first his nomination and then his election. At the nominating conventions of all parties, delegations of women should urge the naming of their candidates and the passage of resolutions favoring woman suffrage. When the campaign has really begun, public meetings must be held and documents distributed in the interest of their chosen candidates. Nothing will so speedily bring about women's enfranchisement as the proof that we already possess political influence and will use it for our friends.

TO SECURE THE PASSAGE OF LAWS.

When the Legislature assembles, the strongest man in the party which has a majority in the body must be chosen to present the proposed law. If the Republicans have a majority, the leading Republican must be asked to champion

the cause; if the Democrats are in the majority, the leading Democrat.

While an act is pending it is called a bill. It may originate in either branch of the Legislature, but must pass both branches and receive the Governor's signature before it can become a law. The bill should be carefully drawn by some good lawyer who is familiar with legislative usage. In order to secure success it is essential that there be some one at the capitol in charge of the measure, also a committee of women of judgment and discretion either there continuously, or for some days of each week.

When the proposed law is introduced, it is referred to a committee, and the first step towards success is to secure a favorable report from that body. Of all the bills annually presented in our numerous legislatures, a large proportion are killed in committee. If a favorable report cannot be secured, a report "for consideration" must be striven for. To reach this end, each member of the committee must be seen, and perhaps a public hearing arranged, at which the best speakers may be heard.

The next step after the bill is reported from the committee is to have it ordered to a third reading. This requires only a majority vote of all present; it is usually secured without much difficulty. On the third reading, or final passage of the bill, the roll is called, and it will require a constitutional majority to pass it; that is, one more than half of all the members elected. For instance, the present Senate of New York consists of thirty-two members; seventeen votes are therefore required to pass any measure.

There are some points, such as the proper engrossing of the bill, its place on the calendar, etc., which must be looked after. Neglect of these details sometimes causes vexatious delays, and even affords an excuse for defeat.

After the bill has passed both houses and is before the Governor for signature,

attention must be given to securing his favorable action; influential men must be asked to see him in behalf of the measure, and every means used to secure this final success.

MEASURES TO BE URGED.

In a State where here is hope of support from the political parties, where there has been long agitation and everything points to a favorable result, it is wise to urge a constitutional amendment striking out the word "male" as a qualification for voters. This must pass both houses in the form of a concurrent resolution and does not require the Governor's signature. In some States it must pass two successive Legislatures; and in most States, it must be ratified at the polls by a majority of voters.

When the conditions are not yet ripe for a constitutional amendment, there are many measures which are valuable in arousing public interest and preparing the way for the final triumph, as well as important in ameliorating the condition of women. Among these are laws to secure:

1. School suffrage for women.
2. Women on Boards of Education and as school trustees.
3. Equality of property rights for men and women, whether married or single.
4. The joint guardianship of children; equal rights for mother and father.
5. Women as factory inspectors.
6. Women as physicians in hospitals and insane asylums.
7. Women trustees in all State institutions.
8. Police matrons.

9. Seats for saleswomen.
10. The raising of the "age of consent."

PETITIONS AND PROTESTS.

While the campaign is in progress, petitions praying for the passage of the pending measures should be circulated in each legislative district, and sent to the member representing it in Senate or Assembly for presentation to those bodies. Special petitions signed by the most influential people in the district are of great effect, when sent directly to a man who is known to be wavering, urging him personally to vote for the bill. Letters should also be written to the members by friends or strangers.

For general agitation, all women who desire their political freedom should send individual petitions to the Legislature asking for their own political liberty.

Strict watch should be kept on all legislative action, and protests should be sent in, when any laws are proposed inimical to the rights of women. Especially bills proposing to change the statutes regulating marriage and divorce should be looked after, and the demand made that they be referred to a commission composed of persons of both sexes.

Further advice on points not touched upon in this leaflet, and general information, may be obtained by writing to any member of the committee.

LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE,
149 East 44th St., New York City.

JOSEPHINE K. HENRY,
Versailles, Ky.

ANNA L. DIGGS,
Topeka, Kansas.

The Woman's Journal.

A weekly paper, founded 1870, by Lucy Stone. Editors, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—*Clara Barton.*

"The best woman's paper in the United States, or in the world."—*Englishwoman's Review.*

"It is able, genial and irreproachable—an armory of weapons to all who are battling for the rights of humanity."—*Mary A. Livermore.*

"The WOMAN'S JOURNAL has long been my outlook upon the great and widening world of woman's work, worth and victory. It has no peer in this noble office and ministry."—*Frances E. Willard.*

"It is the most reliable and extensive source of information regarding what women are doing, what they can do, and what they should do."—*Julia Ward Howe.*

"It is an exceedingly bright paper, and, what is far better, a just one. I could not do without it."—*Marietta Holley (Josiah Allen's Wife).*

First year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.50. Regular price per year, \$2.50. To libraries and reading-rooms, \$1.25. Address *Woman's Journal*, 3 Park St., Boston, Mass.

The Woman's Column.

Edited at 3 Park St., Boston, by Alice Stone Blackwell. Published weekly. 50c. a year.

"The best condensation of the argument for woman's enfranchisement, the method by which this argument is enforced, and the news of the movement, that we have anywhere."—*Frances E. Willard.*

Sample set of *Woman Suffrage Leaflets* (40 different kinds), postpaid for 10 cents.

ampled victories, in the cities of New York, Chicago and Denver.

It must be remembered, too, by the sceptical people in the East, who shall read of women voting in Colorado, and who may dismiss it all as being the action merely of women on the frontiers, that the people of this State are largely from the Eastern States themselves, and that the women here are as refined and accomplished and well educated as in any city or State in the East. Indeed, the choicest families of the Nation have contributed to this State, and also to Wyoming, their best of blood and culture—their younger people coming here looking for a chance in the world, and many and many thousands others sending their invalid members here to find in the sunshine and golden air of this altitude restoration to health. Thus the test of woman suffrage in Denver and Colorado and Wyoming is as complete and intelligent a test as it would be in Boston or Brooklyn, and as complete a test of the question of intelligence as voters, and of refinement as women.

Good women are in the majority. Contrary to the popular theory of those who have always sneered at what they have called pettiest politics, the good women have voted in much larger proportion than the bad. Practically all the good women have voted, while less than ten per cent. of the others voted, or even desired to do so. In one precinct 150 women of the red, as the local phrase designates them here, were registered, and only twelve of them voted. The more refined circles of the great city of Denver have given effectual denial to the stock argument of the antis, that good women would not vote if they had the chance, and that they would be afraid to vote or incur the publicity of voting, even if they were enfranchised and personally desirous of voting. They and the other women of Colorado have also completely disposed of the other stock argument that women, if they should vote at all, would vote headlong and impulsively. For they were as deliberate here as the men, and as well posted on all the issues. They were not only fully informed on all public questions, but they furnished able speakers from their own ranks for the discussion of all issues. The people, and especially the women of Iowa, will be interested in knowing that Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, the splendid Republican and the splendid woman, came into the Colorado contest in March last, and has spent nearly all the time since in making public speeches, in exposing the fallacies and dangers of Populism, and in rallying and uniting the women of the State in favor of Republicanism and the cause of law and order.

Indeed, Colorado in this election has left very little of good argument for its sincere opponents to urge against suffrage. So nearly all of everything hav-

ing any good sense in it at all has been disproved here, that the opposition is left with very few weapons in their armory, and all of them weak. Of course, thousands, and even millions, of sincere people will move slowly from the conservatism of the ages, and will only come to it inch by inch, under the compulsion of State by State adopting woman suffrage. Those who are far away from these intelligent States which are giving the departure a fair and candid trial, and which are doing so fully conscious that the other States look upon it with distrust, will not be convinced of the truth as rapidly as those who have seen it in actual operation, and who have seen women becoming voters without losing any of their charm or loveliness as women. But it is coming everywhere. Of course there is left the old weather-beaten and anchor argument of all, that as governments are based on war power, and as women cannot be soldiers, therefore a woman cannot possibly be a voter. It is the old cry that she who cannot be a soldier cannot be a voter. I fear for these opponents of the coming woman the reply, that she who passes through the Gethsemane of maternity to provide the world its soldiers, and who alone can provide them, atones fully for her own physical liability to be a soldier herself. She who bears soldiers need not bear arms. For my part, I believe that woman suffrage is inevitable in every American State; and that, as it comes, it will bring good to every State, to every city especially, and to the Nation. There is no wrong in government and no vice in city or town or society that is not afraid of good women, and that would not be in danger of its life if good women were voters. The profoundest problem in government is municipal government, and it will never be solved successfully until woman and her moral conscience and quick intelligence are brought to the help of its solution.

I might add that the day here was filled with constant incidents of exceeding interest, too many to tell. The most striking thing of all, to me, was the act of the women in providing *creches*, or comfortable places equipped with competent nurses and suitable foods, for the care during the day of the babies and small children of such mothers as could not go to the polls unless some one took care of these little ones while doing it. These *creches* were provided by the Republican women, but were open to all, and they cared for the children of Democrat and Populist mothers as willingly and kindly as for those of Republican mothers. To blessed women, all babies are alike, and all mothers are sacred. Here is the mother instinct in politics softening into humanity. It will do the American Nation no harm to have this broader spirit and kinder heart in all its elections and among all its people. JAMES S. CLARKSON.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Bi-Monthly at the Office of The Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

Vol. VI.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second-class matter.

No. 6.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

DECEMBER, 1894.

Extra copies, 15 cts. per 100, postpaid.

How Women Voted in Colorado.

HON. JAMES S. CLARKSON, Assistant Postmaster-General under President Harrison, first president of the National Republican League of the United States, and editor for many years of the *Iowa State Register*, gives in that influential paper his personal observations of the working of woman suffrage at the recent election in Colorado, as follows:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

A STUDY OF THE SCENES AND ACTS ON ELECTION DAY.

DENVER, COL., Nov 16 1894.

The many good women who read *The Register* and believe in woman suffrage, will be interested in knowing something of the details of the first election in Colorado in which women have had equal privileges of suffrage in all respects with the men. I was so much interested in it myself that I came to Denver purposely to spend election day and to visit the polls and see for myself the bearing of women as voters, the effect of their presence at the polls, their effect on the crowd, the effect of the crowd on them, the part they would take in the contest, and how they would appear and act while doing it. Some six weeks before, I had visited Denver and Colorado with the object of seeing the women in the activities of the campaign, their feeling of interest or indifference, their comprehension of public affairs and their duties as voters, the work they would attempt, the work they could properly do in the campaign, the stability and courage of their devotion to party and principle, and the comparative intelligence of them, rank and file, intelligent and ignorant, good and bad, as compared with men. I had never known any reason why women, in the sense of abstract right or duty, should not vote as well as men. I had felt, in my judgment, passive resistance to woman suffrage, only from fear that participation in public affairs might in some degree be hurtful to the delicacy and tenderness of refined womanhood; that it might make woman more assertive, more masculine, less feminine and therefore less lovable.

Having seen them in September in the activities of a very exciting political campaign, one in which at least 90 per cent of all good and intelligent and refined women of this city and State were taking a part, not merely passively, but actively, and having spent the whole day Tuesday visiting the polls in this city, where probably thirty thousand women voted, and not

only voted but bore their part in the party and public duties of the day, I am left to the frank and manly duty of saying that even this last feeling of fear as to woman suffrage on my part is gone; and that the highest minded man, however jealous and sheltering he may be of his wife, mother, or daughter, as against contact with any rude touch of the world, could not have found cause for objection at any of these polls Tuesday—nor, so far as has been reported, at any polls in Colorado. It must be that women cast a majority of the votes polled in Denver Tuesday, for in four-fifths of the many voting places I visited, the women voters were clearly in the majority. In the country districts it is reported that the women voted their maximum strength even more nearly than the women in the city. Instead of rough or vicious men, or even drunken men, treating women with disrespect, the presence of a single good woman at the polls seemed to make the whole crowd of men as respectful and quiet as at the theatre or church. For the credit of American men be it said that the presence of one woman or girl at the polls, the wife or daughter of the humblest mechanic, has as good an effect on the crowd as the presence of the grandest dame or the most fashionable belle. The difference in American and European deference to woman I have never seen so strikingly illustrated and proved as in these throngs of people at the polls of this excited and most serious election of Tuesday. The American woman is clearly as much of a queen at the polls, in her own bearing and the deference paid her, as in the drawing-room or at the opera. I feel more pride than ever in American manhood and American womanhood, since seeing these gatherings on Tuesday, where American men and women of all classes and conditions met in their own neighborhood to perform with duty and dignity the selection of their own rulers, and to give their approval to the principles to guide such officials when chosen. No woman was less in dignity or sweetness of womanhood after such participation in public duties, and I do not believe there is a man of sensibility in Colorado to-day who does not love his wife, daughter, sis-

ter or mother the more for the womanly and gracious manner in which she helped so loyally and so intelligently Tuesday in redeeming Colorado State and Denver city from misrule and the serious dangers of communism and disorder. Indeed, the redemption of Colorado is the victory of good women. They gave the early enthusiasm to the work. They gave the activity and the ardor and the resolute spirit to win to the Republican campaign. Still more, they largely made the efficient detail organization extending to every neighborhood and to every household and every voter; and it was their patient persistence and tireless effort that finally brought all people of conscience to the polls on election day. They perfected the registry lists, subdivided the list of voters, and enlisted the most effective workers, and brought the power of the tea party and the sewing bee and all the minor social functions to supersede and far outdo the always clumsy work of the traditional caucus. What woman puts her hand to do in a good cause, is sure to be done. Colorado and Denver proved this Tuesday. It was not only largely the women who had perfected the lists of voters by districts and precincts, but it was women who made up the neighborhood lists, and women who watched the voting lines and checked the voters present, and women who sent their own or their neighbor woman's carriage to bring in the lag-gard voters.

I was up early in the morning to see the entrance of women into State and National politics—an entrance in a critical State in a feverish time, and in a State already greatly injured by public officials with extreme ideas and not hesitating to enforce them in public affairs by extreme means. In National circles there was a fear that these emotional and hysterical issues, coming up in the prevailing hard times to offer false relief to people suffering under heavy burdens, would appeal to the sympathetic side of women and lead them, in their untrained zeal as voters, to carry their State still further in the wrong direction. It was feared that they would not carefully enough investigate the truth or falsity of the new ideas; that they would decide too hastily and act too impulsively, and thus get on the wrong side, more from the force of sympathy than intention. The gravest statesmen in the Nation, made sincerely anxious by the appearance of communism in an American State, with an incumbent governor espousing its dangerous theories, and boldly seeking re-election in their name to engraft them upon the policy of the State, feared that the new women voters might be captured through their sympathetic natures to this false doctrine of quick philanthropy. Other sober-sided statesmen feared that free trade and its sophistries might capture the women because some one had once characterized all women as born smugglers. But the women of Colorado, like all the women of America, have conscience and intelligence, and like

all women everywhere, had, beside that, instinct, always so superior to man's reason. Instead of following the marsh-light either of communism or free trade, they quickly saw the evil of both, and led the men in having Colorado nobly and completely repudiate both. Indeed, in the early summer, when the men were wavering in the fight and growing nearly helpless, and when R-publican leaders were flinching in the conflict, and some of them going over to the mob and the false prophets, the women rallied the line, gave new energy and greater courage to the party, and so toned up the wavering columns of Republicanism and good government in Colorado that new life and new courage were imparted, not only to this, but to all the States adjoining, all of which were infected also by the new heresies and threatened by the new dangers to government and society.

Election morning, the women, instead of having no interest in politics, as had always been said, were first at the polls. From my window in the home of a friend I was visiting, I could see one voting place. The polls opened at 7 o'clock. By 6:30 twenty women and fourteen men were in the line waiting for the first chance to vote. All the time other voters kept rapidly coming, nearly every man coming with his wife, and the most of the men with two or more women, often the wife and daughter, frequently wife, daughter and mother. It was rare at this poll, or any other, that women came together or without men, and during all the day I saw no woman approaching the polls alone. Instead, families seemed to come together, and the men seemed proud of bringing all their family of voting age to act with them in performing the most important duty of American citizenship. On Capitol Hill, the home of the thrifter classes of people, the families went in groups precisely as they go to church or theatre, and the women seemed as much at ease in this as in other places—although I did not see a woman's face going to or coming from the polls that did not bear in it the new light of a new and smiling dignity. There was in every woman's face a token of new strength and larger self-reliance. I had the pleasure of going with a kinswoman to the polls, a woman of as much refinement and delicacy as any woman in civilization could possess, and there was nothing in it at all to jar her in the least, or to make me wish she was not a voter. There is more chance of a lady seeing or hearing something unpleasant in passing through a crowd to the average theatre or opera than there was in this lady or in any lady going to these voting places yesterday. Young women, who looked too young to vote, and who demurely protested, to the gallant challenge of some judge or clerk that they were not old enough for voters, that they were in fact more than old enough, young looking and beautiful matrons voting with their daughters beside them, silver-haired grand-

mothers, with the light in their faces of a new joy coming in old age to them, all mingled together agreeably, and made it an occasion of pleasure. All of them were as much ladies in this sovereign act of citizenship as in dispensing gracious hospitality in their own homes. One notable thing to a man experienced in politics was the fact that through the vigilance of the women the polls were crowded at the start and kept crowded until all the votes had been cast, with the result that eighty, and in some cases ninety-five per cent. of the votes were polled before noon.

Perhaps the most significant and reassuring thing in women's part in the campaign and election was the fact that all the controlling leaders on the women's side were not the old woman suffrage war horses who have been talking for woman suffrage for long years, but the society women, or the more refined and popular women in the highest society of Denver, women who until recently never dreamed of entering politics. These women, led thereto by the disorder and lawlessness and danger engendered under the rule of G. W. Waite and Populism, began agitation and organization last winter and spring, and organized numerous social-political clubs, and held the meetings in their own homes for the non-partisan discussion and investigation of all the serious questions of government. The power and popularity of society were thus brought to the help of the Republican cause of law and order, and safety of life and property. Society women led. As the campaign proper came on, these society women, having gained experience and training from the series of these political or domestic lyceums held earlier in their own homes, naturally succeeded to the places assigned to women on the party's official campaign committees. In such places they had full play for the exercise of their personal influence and social power, and their influence quickly became the mightiest of all elements in the contest. The old-time agitators were superseded, and yet were borne along the resistless current under the momentum of the power of the leaders of the social, Christian and literary life of the city of Denver.

Now, as the campaigns of the future are being organized, and the personnel of party committees determined upon, some of the old agitators are protesting against these belles and society leaders, or "the butterflies and flirts of fashionable Denver," as I heard one of the old timers characterize them yesterday, taking the places of honor and power, and retiring autumnal matrons and spinsters of the early conflict from leadership. But it will undoubtedly be as true for the future as it has in this instance here, that woman suffrage, to be effective and popular, must be led by the women of the best homes in every community, or by women whose influence controls the fashions or forms the proprieties of society, and whose

active kindness and systematic charity reaches out constantly to the elevation of all other homes and to the faithful care of the helpless and the poor. It was these women of the best homes that made the power of women dominant in Colorado on Tuesday, and that led to the redemption and vindication of the State from any appearance of communism or dishonor. For, undoubtedly, sixty per cent. of the vote cast in this State was made up of the votes of women.

Opponents of equal suffrage will probably claim that it was the novelty of women's first chance to vote and the peculiar and alarming condition of unrest and danger existing here that led women to vote so generally at this election. If this be true, then is it all the more important that the women of society who control in the social life of the State and are themselves the life of its art, literature, humanity and good purposes, should lead and control hereafter as they have done here. In my judgment, woman suffrage, if it is to vindicate its wisdom and benefit the cause of good government without taking anything from the tenderness or charm of women, must find its strength and constant salvation under the impetus and shelter of the best and most refined of women in all the noble and sweeter senses of womanhood. A conversation I heard incidentally to-day between Mrs. Foster, who has been the prophet and the leader prominent in this contest, and Mrs. Rhoads, the chairman of the women's county central committee, illustrated to me, as it will to everybody, the spirit that has guided the women in all political committee and election work. Mrs. Rhoads said:

"I am just on my way to attend the meeting of all the party committees which is to arrange for the jubilee on Monday over the great victory. The men are proposing that the Republican women shall walk in the street procession. I shall protest against that. Such things are not for women. Ladies will keep within the bounds for ladies, in politics as in all other things. Therefore we shall not do any such thing as this. We will take part in the jubilee and attend it, going with our husbands, fathers and brothers, as we went to the polls, or as all ladies go to theatre, church, public fair, foot-ball games, or any public gathering. But we shall certainly do nothing in politics to make us subjects of ridicule, any more than we would in social life."

These were words of wisdom and self-respecting womanhood, and of the new woman suffrage. It means that in public affairs the good women of this land will apply their power as they apply it in church and charity work, or in a manner which will make them still better and more admirable as women and ladies, rather than less. It was this sort of woman's power, made active in politics and coming forward to the help of good government last Tuesday, that gained the three greatest victories in a year of unex-

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Bi-Monthly at the Office of The Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

Vol. V.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second-class matter.

No. 1.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

JANUARY, 1892.

Extra copies, 15 cts. per 100, postpaid.

PREPARE FOR SUFFRAGE.

A Circular Letter by a Virginia Woman.

Dear Sisters of the Southland:—Women now have the right of suffrage in twenty-one States of the Union. In one State, they have no more restrictions on the franchise than the men of the State have on the right to express their wishes by the ballot. In other States, the suffrage is limited to municipal or educational affairs.

It is evident, from the signs of the times, that ere long the question of woman's right to vote will come before the Southern people. It remains to be seen whether the franchise will be bestowed by the various State legislatures or by enactment of the general government. Already in some of the Southern States the subject is agitated. In some it is proposed to have an educational qualification to the franchise, which shall be the only restriction upon the voters. Under this provision, all educated people of proper age, if duly naturalized, would have a voice in the government. All ignorant people would be excluded from making the laws and electing the officers who administer them.

Having studied the question of woman suffrage with deep interest for more than twenty-five years, with all the light I can bring to bear upon it, I am fully convinced that it is greatly to the interest of all concerned that women should participate in the government of the country in which they live. I am a Southern woman born and bred. My ancestors were among the early settlers of Virginia. My forefathers shed their blood to establish the Union under which we live. My heart and hopes are with the Southland. I believe that a new era is dawning upon us, in which the women as well as the men are to be called upon to speak for "God and Home and Native Land." I feel that I am called upon to urge upon Southern women to prepare for the exercise of this great trust and privilege. In our day, we have seen great and terrible evils brought upon

our country by the right of suffrage having been bestowed upon a race all unprepared to use it. Let not another calamity like this be brought upon us, by our unfitness for the task we are called upon to perform.

I know that there now exists much prejudice on the subject. Having grown up with the same prejudice, and having outgrown it in maturer years, I can confidently assure you that, if you will carefully and dispassionately examine the subject, prejudice will pass from your minds.

The bitterness resulting from the anguish of Civil War invested the question of woman suffrage with sectional hatred with which it had nothing to do. In England the most advanced views are held on this subject. Throughout Great Britain, single women and widows have for many years voted in all municipal and school elections, subject only to the same restrictions imposed upon men. Mr. Gladstone, who does not favor full suffrage for women, acknowledges that they have exercised municipal suffrage "without detriment, and with great advantage."

Southern women have been so accustomed to the idea of exclusion from all public functions, that it is difficult to disabuse their minds of the sentiment that all such exercise of their faculties is wrong. Much of this feeling is mere theory. In the churches, which are chiefly maintained by women, much excellent work is done by women in teaching, cultivating music, and in various forms of benevolence, extending Christian influences. With the great increase of educational facilities, the God-given powers of women are being developed to a degree that necessarily brings them into prominence. The lady whose mental training enables her to instruct a Bible class of 150 other women; the travelled woman whose fine observation enables her to interest a large audience as she tells of what she has seen; the singer whose bird-

like notes enthrall all who hear her in church or concert hall; the elocutionist or public reader who delights and refines the taste of those who assemble at her recitations; the woman editor who, in her daily paper, tells "the history of the world for a day," and is ready to point a moral or adorn a tale, as each page unfolds; the woman who builds up and presides over a large school; the woman planter who successfully manages her estate and raises a fine crop of cotton, corn or cattle,—each and all of these depart from the old Southern ideas of ante-bellum days.

The part taken by Southern women during the war, when the men were in the field, and the means of existence, the preservation of society, depended upon women, is among the noble chapters of human story. What women in the South have done and suffered in the shipwreck of fortune and the change of the labor system that followed the war can never be fully told. And now a new duty confronts you, a new task lies before you.

I beg you, by the love you cherish for your own families, by the compassion you feel for the poor, the unfortunate, the erring, to prepare worthily to perform this task. If you ask me what steps to take, I would say, look at the subject seriously, prayerfully, intelligently. Find out what are the laws in regard to women and children, in your own States, and, if they need improvement, what changes should be made. Visit the schools, the almshouses, the insane asylums within

your reach. Shameful neglect and cruelty often occur in such institutions, where there is "no eye to pity, no hand to save." Read the newspapers, and inform yourselves as to current events, so that you can discuss them intelligently with others. Consider whether the societies to which you belong, whether for religious objects, temperance work, or general interests, would not be more efficacious if women had a voice in the laws that regulate them. Read the history of the suffrage movement. Be diligent in the discharge of domestic duties, you who are so happy as to have homes. Let no husband or child complain that his interests are neglected, because the wife and mother is absorbed in public affairs. Let those who are alone in the world, and have no sheltering roof, remember that "He setteth the solitary in families." For each and all the claims of human brotherhood are strong. The sick, the sad, the sinful, the insane, the pauper, the orphan, all of these are waiting for you to minister to them.

It was said of old, "It is not good for man to be alone." "At the polls or anywhere else that human interests call for human aid," is the modern interpretation thereof. The question is not whether you want to vote, but whether you ought to vote. Upon the answer you make to this question depends the weal or woe of the land we love, in the years that are to come.

ORRA LANGHORNE.

Culpeper, Va.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE TRACTS.

A full set of Woman Suffrage Tracts (40 different kinds) post-paid for 10 cents. Address C. WILDE, Woman's Journal Office, Boston, Mass.

The Woman's Column.

Edited at 3 Park St., Boston, Mass., by Alice Stone Blackwell. Published weekly. 25c. a year.

"This admirable little paper gives in small compass the news of the movement all over the world, together with many valuable articles and arguments. It contains poems and dialogues suitable for recitation at entertainments given by Political Equality Clubs, and will be found a valuable help in keeping up the interest of the meetings."—*Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace.*

The Woman's Journal.

A weekly paper, founded 1870. Editors, Lucy Stone, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—*Clara Barton.*

"The best woman's paper in the United States, or in the world."—*Englishwoman's Review.*

"It is so much the best of the woman suffrage papers that no comparison is possible."—*Rev. Anna H. Shaw.*

"It is the very best paper for women."—*Clara C. Hoffman, President Missouri W. C. T. U.*

"It is the most reliable and extensive source of information regarding what women are doing, what they can do and what they should do."—*Julia Ward Howe.*

"The *Woman's Journal* has long been my outlook upon the great and widening world of woman's work, worth and victory. It has no peer in this noble office and ministry."—*Frances E. Willard.*

First year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.50. Regular price per year, \$2.50. To libraries and reading-rooms, \$1.25. Address *Woman's Journal*, Boston, Mass.

neither men nor women will hazard being hurt in going to the polls.

You know we South Carolina people, for all our history of revolutionary strife, have a great regard for our English cousins—a liking for their high breeding, and a positive warmth of sentiment for the Queen and nobility. Well, now, how do the English regard woman's position in relation to politics? Did you notice that paragraph going the rounds of the papers the other day? That Henry M. Stanley in his electioneering campaign (he was running for Parliament, you recollect,) carried his young wife along, and after his own rather awkward attempt at stump-speaking, she took the stand, and so won her way with the rough electors that they one and all declared: "We will vote for him, mum." Now, do you think the gentle Dorothy was more "out of her sphere" stump-speaking than she would be on Stanley's arm, dropping her ballot in the box? Sir Wilfred Lawson says they will confer Parliamentary suffrage on English women before many years, and if good English wives and mothers, models to all the world, are not "unsexed" by this "mixing in politics," why should we be? Indeed, full suffrage has already been tried in the Isle of Man, and partial or municipal woman suffrage exists throughout England and Scotland. Birmingham is said to be "the best governed city in Europe." The city of Glasgow, the most orderly of all we visited on the other side, has municipal woman suffrage.

Iceland has a population of 73,000 in which men and women are political equals. Men and women vote together. These voting mothers have produced a nation in which there are no prisons, no police, no thieves, no army, no very rich nor very poor, but plain, temperate, educated, intelligent people. The future citizens are taught by their mothers, and in the whole island not a single illiterate person is to be found, every child being able to read, write and cipher by the time it is seven years old. Since such is the practical working of full woman suffrage in Iceland, why should men fear it in our country? Then there is, of course, the familiar example of Wyoming, which will have women presidential electors this year. In the Woman's Calendar for 1891 appeared a suggestive picture: A peasant of the middle ages, with the primitive plow of that dawning civilization, drawn by a woman and a milk cow; above appeared the face of Miss Fawcett, who surpassed the senior wrangler.

The Woman's Journal.

A weekly paper, founded 1870. Editors, Lucy Stone, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell. "The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—Clara Barton. First year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.00. Regular price per year, \$3.50. To libraries and reading-rooms, \$1.25. Address Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

The Woman's Column.

Edited at 3 Park St., Boston, by Alice Stone Blackwell. Published weekly. 25c. a year. "The best condensation of the argument for woman's enfranchisement, the method by which that argument is enforced, and the news of the movement, that we have anywhere."—Frances E. Willard. A full set of equal suffrage leaflets, 40 different kinds, post paid, for 10 cents. Address Woman's Journal, Boston.

"Think of it well, you men of might,
Who sit and watch by day and night
The signs of coming change, and see
Through that which is, what is to be."

It thrilled my heart when I saw the color of this beautiful delegates' badge of the Press Association—yellow. That is the symbol of equal rights to women; and my belief is that the men of South Carolina, than whom braver never breathed, are ready to arise and follow the star in the West of woman's advancement, and accept from their heart the Almighty's fiat, "It is not good for man to be alone," neither in the exercise of his affections, nor in the performance of his duty. Love your wives and your sisters and your mothers, my brothers, and you will find your souls taking on fitness for heaven. Give them a share in all your pursuits—law, medicine, journalism, the ministry; and from the finer quality of your partner, woman, these shall take a higher tone. You heard the heart-felt remarks of Anderson's worthy mayor last night, welcoming women to the press of the country. You heard our brother, Col. Hoyt, giving you his experience of the gentleness and womanliness of those 300 ladies who formed part of the editorial excursion to the Pacific coast. Those gentlemen have seen the star in the West, and are journeying towards the goal of woman's ballot, which shall redeem South Carolina from the curse of the hip-pocket pistol and the serpent that besmirches the flower of our youth. Here in America, land of the free, it is meet that the star of woman's liberty should seek conjunction with Mars, for this is woman's land, which Columbus might never have discovered but for woman's help, given him by Queen Isabella, who sold her jewels to defray his expenses. You remember those lines you learned as a boy:

"Star of the East, the horizon adorning,
Dawn on our darkness, and lend us thine aid."

You recall the words of the wise men, who said, "We have seen his star—the star in the East and are come to worship him." So to-day is there a star in the West—the star of woman's advancement, the portent of a new force; coming for the redemption of the nation. That new force is woman's vote, the ballot of her who hath "clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted up her soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully." She shall receive the blessing of the Lord and righteousness from the God of our salvation."

THE STAR IN THE WEST.

The following address was given by Mrs. Virginia D. Young, of Fairfax, S. C., the only lady member of the South Carolina Press Association, before the gentlemen of that Association, at its last annual meeting:

It required considerable effort on my part to meet you here. First, I had to get my own consent to leave husband and home, and travel to Anderson without escort. Nothing nerved me to the effort but the hope of being permitted to speak to you on a subject very near my heart. Of course I knew I was not down on the programme for a speech, and I am not given to speech-making, in private or public, being of a silent turn; but there are times when I want to talk, and this is one of them.

I confess, however, to a curiosity about the editors of my State. Being by instinct and habit a writer from childhood, I have always been deeply interested in others who wield the pen. They are invested to my mind with a halo or atmosphere which does not environ ordinary mortals.

Probably my desire to meet and talk to you might have been relinquished in its inception, if I had been discouraged by my husband; but he heartily approved. Through a mistake, for which I was not to blame, I arrived twenty-four hours ahead of you. I cannot tell you how eagerly I looked for editors on the train, fancying I discovered one in each man with a large head and very penetrating eye. But I suffered from a sense of loneliness and fruitless effort, on finding the Press Association unrepresented, save by me; and I only became reconciled to the situation because of the chance it gave me to put together the arguments I am about to present you. But for this, like Ahimaz, I might have had "no tidings ready."

Let me premise that I am very fond of my home; each tree and flower and vine my husband and I have planted, seems a part of my life's happy whole. I am, in deed and in truth, one of the women who have no wrongs to right. Yet I joined your Association, my brothers, for the sake of those who are wronged; and I have prepared this paper, hoping thus to be instrumental in calling your thoughts to certain injustices which I fully believe you would wipe out if you would give your minds to them.

Oh, that the star in the West of woman's advancement might rise on the political night of South Carolina, and, with its bright rays concentrated here at Anderson in the form of the "Girls' In-

dustrial College," hasten the advent of woman's emancipation!

It is proposed, you know, that both press and pulpit unite to inaugurate a reform in the laws, so lax that our papers assert "Murder can be done in South Carolina with impunity." Why not bring in the great moral reserve force of the universe, woman, to aid you in this?

You say politics are "too corrupt for woman to mix in;" but, my brothers, may not her coming cleanse away the corruption? You all know woman's power of putting things to rights, of bringing order out of chaos. You have seen and rejoiced in your wife's, mother's or sister's talent for making home beautiful, have you not? You have seen her skill in evolving good appetizing food from the raw materials of your providing? You have seen her power to quiet noisy children that you could not manage? She that is faithful in small things, proves capacity for greater ones; larger trust, larger responsibility. That woman is worthy of such trust, we have the proof of the past. Look at the history of Rome—the mightiest nation of civilization's youth. "Rome's vestal virgins stood at the very head of the functionaries of the State. They guarded the sacred things on which Rome's safety was held to depend. The wills of Emperors, the secret documents of State, were intrusted to their hands." The vestals were Rome's embassadresses, as well as umpires between nations. They had to do with departments of State, even that of war. So inviolate were their pledges kept that the holy mysteries of their order passed out of the world with the burial of the last vestal. These women received the highest honors from the people. When they drove, other equipages turned aside to make way for them; criminals who came into their benign presence were pardoned; the highest seats were reserved for them on great public occasions; and the Emperor himself sat down among them. All great reforms have brought forth women who showed, equally with men, the capacity for activity and endeavor.

You will not gainsay me, I hope, when I bring the authority of the Declaration of Independence to prove women's right to the ballot. It says: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent

of the governed." Women are governed! You cannot dispute that, my brethren. It occurs to me that they are a little more governed in our State than any other,—for do you men not carry the common (!) pocket-book? Do not your preferences and prejudices rule in your households? Well, then, admitting that they are "governed," should not they give consent to the power governing, in the shape of a vote, on a "hand primary," or something signifying acquiescence?

The Declaration goes on to say, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." Are we women not taxed on our lands, our bank stock, our pianos, our watches, our house furniture? You know we are, and not a bit of representation have we. You would not consider yourself represented by your wife's vote; why should she consider herself represented by yours? Then think how many unmarried women and widows there are in the State—some with no male relations, who have not even the remotest shadow of a voice in the disposition of the taxes, whose burden falls on them just as it does on men, except the poll tax. And isn't it a covert insult to insinuate we have no heads to pay a tax upon? So you must see that, if our forefathers were justified in warring with the mother country, your wife, mother and sister suffer under the same grievance at your hands. Suppose, then, you invested us with this right, as due tax-payers on land, etc.; do you think no woman would vote in South Carolina? Brothers, you are mistaken. I am certain many women want to be recognized as men's equals, who hesitate to say so, lest it make them unpopular. I cannot believe that men like a woman less for having the courage to speak the truth. You believe, as I do,

"Truth, shined in thy heart,
Thy soul shall save."

And as for courage, do not men love it? Think of the women who have proved their possession of it—as Joan of Arc or Charlotte Corday. "Freedom is the indispensable condition of the whole moral life, and its preservation is one of our first duties." We women betake ourselves to prayer for the salvation of our country, but if we could only vote as we pray, how would the day of deliverance from unjust laws and cruel wars be hastened! If, by equal educational opportunities, we fortify the minds of women with facts concerning the great questions which occupy men, we would discover the most effectual cure for gossip, scandal, twaddle. And now may I ask some questions, the answers to which embody in brief women's relations to the laws of the State?

1. Shall men and women, who obey the laws, have a right to make them?

Ans.—No, only men.

Who shall make the laws that concern women only?

Men.

May not mothers help make the laws that settle their legal relations to their children?

No, only men shall make them.

May not married women have a voice in making the laws that determine what share of the property acquired by labor of both wife and husband during marriage they shall have?

They may not.

May not a married woman help make the laws that decide how much of the property owned by her before her marriage shall belong to her after her husband's death?

No—men shall decide it.

Who shall make the laws that decide how much a wife may will of her own property?

Men.

Who shall make the laws that decide the rights of husbands and wives in case of separation?

The answer is, men.

By the laws men have made, have the father and mother an equal right to their children?

No. The right of the father is paramount.

What share shall a wife have of her husband's real estate on his death?

She shall have the "widow's third."

Shall the men and women who pay the taxes say what shall be done with the money?

No, only the men.

Shall Indians and negroes have a right to vote for all officers of town, county, State and nation?

They shall.

Shall white women citizens have a right to vote as well as Indians and negroes?

They shall not.

When a husband brutally assaults his wife, who shall make the laws to punish him?

Men only.

Now, friends, think of these injustices as suffered by the women who are dearest to you, your wife, your daughter, when you shall be no longer by to interpose your strong arm in defence of those you love; and, for their sakes, seek to make better laws for the women of South Carolina.

If you tell me voting unsexes women, I point you to the women of Wyoming, who have been voting for twenty years, and are just as loving mothers, faithful wives and devoted sisters as the women who shrink from the "publicity of the ballot-box." Besides, there are twenty States having school or municipal suffrage, whose women are not in the least "unsexed."

If you quote the Bible as against woman suffrage, I will also quote it as giving women a hand and head in the administration of affairs political. You remember Deborah, who ruled Israel forty years, and without whom Barak, the general of the armies, would not go out to battle? "In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, male or female, but all are one." Women as well as men are commanded to "Call no man master." Nowhere is it said in the Bible, "Thou shalt not vote."

I am sure you are too just to refuse us

the right of suffrage on the plea that we have not the strength to enforce the laws, or because we cannot fight, inasmuch as you let disabled soldiers vote, and also men too feeble in body ever to have borne arms. I have known some very small, weak men, but I never knew one of them deprived of his vote because he was little and not strong. I am sure you will agree with me that it is conscience, intelligence, love of country you want in a voter, not muscle. Have we women not these? The physical forces do not create laws, but only enforce them. What we as women would do is to help create better, juster, more equal laws for the people, of whom we constitute fully one-half, don't we?

Somebody has said, "A woman perils her life for her country, for every soldier that is born. For the man doing picket duty, she has done sentry duty by his cradle." Each of you can remember when your mother was your quartermaster, and supplied your rations of bread and butter. Can words tell what she is to you in sickness or sorrow? How then can you deny her the living right of the ballot?

But you say to me, "Oh! what's the use, women will vote as their husbands do." Well, suppose they do, that will be two votes cast for a good man instead of one, and you will have introduced into politics the pure, economical, unbrilliant, law-abiding quality of woman. And this quality, like the odor of a rose in your handkerchief drawer, will permeate the body politic, and give you the fairest, fullest, most accurate expression of public opinion.

But there is another qualm you have in regard to giving this crowning liberty to your sister, which shall raise her at once from the level of the idiot, the lunatic and the criminal. For think, my brothers, these are the unfortunates by whom you place us, in withholding from us the right of expression at the ballot-box. "Negro women will be rushing to the polls," you fear. How easy to tide over that danger! Give us suffrage with an educational qualification, or, if you will, a property qualification. With the former, you would at once add 76,000 educated white women to your 96,000 educated white men voters and settle the vexed question of white supremacy by a majority of 34,000 over the 118,000 colored voters of South Carolina.

I would like to tell you what I know of some of the leading women suffragists of other Southern States. The leading Alabama woman suffragist is Miss Fanny Griffin, of Montgomery. She won my heart the first time I ever saw her, at the National W. C. T. U. Convention in Chicago, in 1889. She was quite unused to the platform, but nothing could exceed her ease and grace; keen, kind, intellectual, with a voice full and deep, everybody perceived that here was a new force. She set forth the spirit of the South in words of such wit and wisdom that a Grand

Army of the Republic man rose and called for three cheers and a hip, hip, hurrah for the Southland. When the war left her father penniless, a soldier friend said to him, "What a pity, Col. Griffin, you have no son to help you!" Whereupon he answered pluckily, "I wouldn't swap my daughter Fanny for all the boys in Bullock County." Nor did she disappoint her father, but proved the strong staff of his declining years, while educating her younger brothers and sisters. Yet this woman, in her girlhood, never so much as tied her own shoes. Of course the Alabama women are proud of their magnificent leader.

Kentucky has two women leaders in this great reform—Miss Laura Clay, a perfect Henry Clay as a speaker, and dear little Mrs. Josephine K. Henry. She is addicted to literary pursuits, edits a paper and is a most winning speaker. She has created so much suffrage sentiment in Kentucky that two years ago she was nominated for clerk of court, and made a very successful run.

In Mississippi, Mrs. Hatlie B. Kells worked up the women, and men also, to a sense of this new era. They came very near putting woman suffrage in their constitution. I grieved when this was defeated, but I consoled myself with the hope that my own beloved State might get ahead of Mississippi in doing this justice to her daughters, or in being nobly generous, shall I say? How can brothers, husbands, fathers, hesitate to throw this ægis of protection around the women they love, for whom they would so freely give their lives? Remember, if by some unexpected stroke your daughter, wife or sister loses the strong arm of your love and care, the ballot in her own hands may be her best defence against the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune."

When Hatlie Kells, a low-voiced, gentle little woman, yet "with a heart for any fate," told me she had been elected a member of the Mississippi Press Association, I said, "Then why can't I be in South Carolina? Nobody need tell me that Mississippians are ahead of the men of my own State in that generous chivalry which not only uncovers the head, but is ready with hand and heart to befriend woman, even against the laws which so often cruelly ignore her personality." So this is how I came to be here.

Mrs. Judge Merrick, of New Orleans, is the mother of woman suffrage in Louisiana. She is the daughter of one of Andrew Jackson's chief stand-bys in the battles of the past. Her father was a Bon-heart, a man of great breadth of thought and liberality of opinion; and these he imparted to his gifted daughter. Indeed, statistics of heredity show that, as great men are apt to be "their mothers' own sons," so great women are their fathers' own daughters. Under Mrs. Merrick's leadership, the women of Louisiana will, before very long, be voting. Of course it will be after the Australian ballot method, so hedged about that

from the narrow, strong lips. They regarded her with a kind of awe for a moment, the boldest among them forgetting to sneer.

It was at this moment that Ike, who had been in the rear of the house filling a quart bottle with kerosene for a customer, came forward, the bottle in his hand. He glanced a moment at the silent, gaping crowd, with their gaze fixed upon the woman who had lifted her voice in prophecy. His swarthy face grew livid; without a second's hesitation he lifted his arm and hurled the bottle with all his strength at her head. It crashed past her and went to pieces in a thousand fragments upon the wall behind her. The woman never flinched.

"What air ye din' here?" demanded the angry husband. "Didda't I tell yer ter stay at home whar ye b'longed, ye dast-burned hell-out? Comin' here to make a fool o' yersel' befo' a passel o' fools as ain't got no more sense than to laugh at ye! Lemme git at ye; I'll see o' it."

The group separated to make way for him as the half-drunken man strode past them; he carried a rawhide whip that he jerked from the hand of one of the men who had driven a yoke of oxen to the store. The woman moved aside, not to dodge the blow, but to shield the child playing with the twine cord upon the counter. One sharp, cutting blow descended upon the still, stooped shoulders; but before he could lift the whip for a

second, the strange man leaning against the counter sprang to his feet and seized his arm.

"Don't you do that again!" he commanded. "Don't you dare to strike that woman again, you damned brute, you! I mean what I say; no man shall strike a woman where I am, not if I have to hang for it. Drop that lash, you coward, and get back to your oil tubs. A pretty thing, you, to call yourself a man! Men!"—he turned to the wonder-stricken crowd about the door—"you see for yourselves how the laws of the State need mending. If I go to the Legislature from this county, the very first bill I shall introduce will be one to make wife-beating a felony in the State of Tennessee. Now you may elect me on that ticket or not, just as you choose."

A few minutes later he stood outside, watching for Josephine to come down the rude steps, preparatory to going home. "Why did you come here? See what you have brought upon yourself!"

He pointed to a blood stain upon her shoulder where the rawhide had cut through to the skin. She glanced at the stain and then at him. Something in his voice appealed to her; this was her opportunity to say a word, to help along the women of Knoxville. "I air not keerin' fur that," said she; "what I air keerin' fur air my liberty; I

want my liberty. 'Pears like the woman air the only created critters as hev not got the'r freedom in this world."

Instinctively there recoiled to him a sense he had witnessed in his youth; a slave was being beaten for running away; he was bound with thongs, and another slave was made to ply the lash; it was of rawhide also, and there was blood upon the slave's shoulders. He received his punishment without a groan; but the next day he ran away again, and was found dead along the roadside, en route to liberty. And this woman of Tennessee, with her bruised and burdened back, demanded hers.

"Aye, God, and she shall have it," he told himself as he galloped home through the midnight; "she shall have it, if word of mine can avail to help along the cause. Liberty? Why, men have died for liberty; they have died to give the gracious boon to other men. Yet for woman—who has thought of her?"

The words of the mountain woman throbbed in his thoughts; "Pears like women air the only created critters as ain't got the'r freedom."

He saw again the gaping crowd, the sneering faces, the upflung lash. Again in his ears was sounding the one word of defiance offered: "Some o' you-uns'll live ter see the woman o' the land cast in' o' the'r votes yet." Prophetic words, and big with meaning!

The Woman's Journal.
A weekly paper, founded 1870, by Lucy Stone. Editors, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell.
"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—*Clara Barton.*
"The best woman's paper in the United States, or in the world."—*Englishwoman's Review.*
"It is able, genial and irreproachable—an armory of weapons to all who are battling for the rights of humanity."—*Mary A. Livermore.*
"The Woman's Journal has long been my outlook upon the great and widening world of woman's work, worth and victory. It has no peer in this noble office and ministry."—*Frances E. Willard.*
"It is the most reliable and extensive source of information regarding what women are doing, what they can do and what they should do."—*Julia Ward Howe.*
"It is an exceedingly bright paper, and, what is far better, a just one. I could not do without it."—*Maryetta Haring (London Alliance) W.P.*
First year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.50. Regular price per year, \$2.00. To libraries and reading-rooms, 45c. Address: Woman's Journal, 3 Park St., Boston, Mass.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE TRACTS.
A full set of Woman Suffrage Tracts, forty different kinds, postpaid, for 10 cts.
Address, Leaflet Department, Woman's Journal Office, Boston, Mass.

The Yellow Ribbon Speaker
Equal Rights Readings and Recitations, in Prose and Verse, compiled by REV. ANNA H. SARG, ALICE STONE BLACKWELL, and LUCY E. ANTHONY. For sale at WOMAN'S JOURNAL OFFICE, 3 PARK ST., BOSTON, MASS.—PRICE, POSTPAID, 20 CENTS.

The Woman's Column.
The best consideration of the argument for woman's enfranchisement; the method by which this argument is introduced, and the views of the movement, that we have anywhere.—*Frances E. Willard.*

Vol. VII. Entered at the Boston Post Office as second-class matter. No. 6. Subscription, 45 cents per annum. NOVEMBER, 1895. Extra copies, 30 cts. per 100, postpaid.

A HUMBLE ADVOCATE.

BY WILL ALLEN DROMGOOLE.
(From the *Arms*.)

Sunrise in Jones' Cove. The great encompassing mountains stood solemn and weird and silent, capped with cloud and carpeted with everlasting green about their feet, where the winter leaves flung an entrance into the well-screened Cove slumbering among their ragged bases. Winding in and out among the gaps and crevices of the mountains, Big Pigeon River might be seen fighting its way to the beautiful French Broad.

The sun was peering over the mountains, a great round red eye of fire. The Cove still lay in shadow and in silence. It might have been a dead world, indeed, for all sign there was of life, save for the one lone figure leaning upon the low palings of the rude gate in front of a little weather-beaten cabin standing at the Cove's head, just at the point where the road begins the ascent of the mountain.

As for the woman, she, too, might have been a part of the deadness, as she stood there, with one small, knotted, labor-marked hand clasping the palling, the elbow of the other arm resting upon it, her chin in her hand, and her bright brown eyes fixed in melancholy musing upon the distant peaks of mountain rising above the valley. Only, looking well into the face, one could not fail to see the fire that still hid in the dark eyes, like a slumbering coal-bed that waited only the revivifying breath of excitement to fling it into a living glow.

Within the cabin a man lay sleeping, upon a bed over which was thrown a quilt of many-colored stripes. Two burly, calfskin-covered feet depended floorward beneath the coverlet, and the arm, thrown with the careless abandon of the weary sleeper over the man's head, wore a sleeve of heavy gray jeans. Evidently he had thrown himself down to sleep without undressing. Upon a low trundle-bed at his side a boy of six years and a baby of one were sleeping. The woman at the gate was waiting for the man to awaken and eat his breakfast. It was already cooked, and was only waiting the pleasure of the liquor-soaked sleeper before the woman would bring it out from the skillets and pots ranged about the hearth, where she had set it to prevent the food getting "stone cold" before he should sober up sufficiently to call for it.

It was a dreary life, a cat-and-dog existence for her, the silent young watcher at the gate.

"If I could only get my own consent ter hold my tongue, I reckon it would be better," she mused. "But 'pears like I'd be obliged ter die sometimes if I didn't try ter hold Ike Cary off in some o' his doin's. 'Specially when he begins to hender the chillen; the pore little chillen as can't help the'r own ways. I just can't be still then; I be obliged ter fight fur my chillen. Even the ole hen out there'll do that much fur her young; or the w'il' varmints in the woods. I can't git my own consent ter be less keeral o' my young than the hens an' the 'bars an' sech."

It wasn't an unpleasant face that was lifted for a moment to the sunlight stealthily creeping over the mountains; it showed resolve, spirit, and a courage that death itself could not put to shame. "I hev saved that thar man in thar ten year, good an' faithful. I didn't come ter him empty handed, nuther. He had a hundred head o' cattle an' a half a hundred acres o' valley lan' an' I were not accounted a bad lookin' gal nuther, then days. But the law allowed as Ike Cary could keep my lan' an' truck more better nor me, an' so I ware his'n after I ware married ter him. Whose it air now I can't tell. The still house got it o' Ike, I know that much. They-uns ueter say, too, over yander in Emiry whar I ware raised, that I ware right sprightly. Some allowed I'd make my mark ef I lived an' got my growth. I made it, yes; a mighty crosky kind o' mark it ware, when I married Ike. I ain't lacked in my sarvise none nuther, as I can see; an' what I hev got in exchange fur hit air blows and hard names. Lord, ef it ware not fur the chillen, the chillen that he air ruinin' o', I'd hit my heels an' take that thar road up the mount'n, an' travel away from here quoke'n' yer could say 'Jack Robertson.' If it ware not fur the chillen I'd do it."

For the children. How many weary women have bowed their backs to their burdens, and taken their crosses again for the sake of the children—the children, God-given to keep the soul and body in harness if not in union! "You Josephine! An I got ter wait all day fur a moufful o' ole victuals? Or hev ye gone spank deaf that ye can't hear noways, when call ter ye? If God, ye air gotten too peart and independent ter suit my fancy. Standin' thar sun-gasin' air ye'an' me a-waitin' for my breakfast? God darn ye, ef yer don't come in here an' fish out them victuals I'll fing the shovel at yer; else't this here brat as can't make out ter git his'n' wake like other folks."

She was in the cabin long enough before the man had completed his complaint, and was dishing up the breakfast. She paid no heed to his threats until he strode over to the trundle-bed where the baby was sleeping, the older child having risen when Cary called his wife to get his breakfast up. "Sitan' back from thar," she commanded. "You-uns jest let that thar chillie be, Ike Cary."

Whether it was the glitter in the restless eyes, or whether he was too stupidly indifferent to carry out his threat, she neither knew nor cared; with a low laugh of derision he drew his chair up to the table and began to eat his breakfast. The woman sat near, not eating, but waiting upon her husband, and the little boy who scrambled up into a chair at her side and began calling for a dodger. "I'd wash my face an' hands first ef I ware ye," said the mother. "If air plumb bad manners fer eat without washin'!"

"Let him be," said Cary. "What be the use, anyhow? They-uns'll be dirty ag'in 'gint dinner time. Eat yer breakfasts, son; pappy'll let ye."

"That ain't no way ter raise chillen," said Mrs. Cary. As she had so many times told herself, she couldn't get her own consent to hold her tongue where the children were concerned.

The man made no reply; he was busy with the chicken she had trolled and set before him. When he had finished and pushed back his plate, he seemed in a better humor—disposed to talk, indeed; though the talk always meant either an argument or a season of ridiculing the woman whom he regarded as his weaker half.

"What did you-uns stay las' night?" She put the question timidly, knowing from experience what the reply would be. "Wall, now, Mis' Master, whar do ye reckon?" said he. "I ware somethers, that ought ter satisfy ye. But Lor, these women! they air obliged ter know it all. Was'then, ef ye must know, I ware down ter the Forge; an' some o' the candidates ware thar, an' we had all the liquor we could curry, an' more. An' they-uns ware powerful anxious ter git my vote, too, I can tell ye. Oh-red me—"

and declaring that the tanning of human skins was a recognized industry and the trafficking in human bodies an established trade in Massachusetts, the certificate of Clara Leonard, the highest living authority on the subject, instantly put the foul column at rest. Are these women—and I might multiply the examples by scores all over this country and in England and on the Continent—to be deemed unfit to vote, either in the framing of policies by which these great institutions are to be managed, or in the selection of the agencies to carry them out?

Now, in my judgment, the doing of these things is government. The instrument to accomplish these things is the State. And when these things are accomplished, the function of the State is fully and entirely discharged. The need of these things is to be permanent and perpetual. No State, however perfect, or however nearly it shall realize its ideal in the future, can be without them. Their accomplishment can not come to pass without the help of woman. It is as needful that she should help us do them in the State as it is that she should help educate the children or rule the family in the home. Without her they will be done in an imperfect, clumsy, left-handed fashion. The army, the navy, the jail, the police court, the criminal law, are but excrescences which it is the object of all civilization and all human endeavor to dispense with and to put away.

But it is said that women can not give their time to these things; that the household, the government of the family and the education of the children must fill up woman's life. How much time do men in general give to these things? With the exception of a very few men who are professional politicians, and who, as a rule, are the most useful nor the most respectable class of men who interest themselves in public affairs, men in general do not spare to their political duties more time than women ordinarily would be able to bestow. If there are women so engrossed in the household duties which are their occupation that they can not properly give to the public any time beyond that which it takes to cast their vote, that only is true of them which is also true of quite an equal number of the other sex.

But it is said that our election processes are unfit for her partaking. I suppose that is largely true. I suppose the violence or the cheating which prevail in some parts of this country, and which have their allies and apologists in other parts of the country, are totally inconsistent with the purity and the delicacy of women. They are totally inconsistent also with the honor and honesty of men. We propose, when woman suffrage is established, if not before, to put an end to these things. I should not like to have any lady of my household jostled by the rough crowd in the criminal parts of a great city, or cast her vote through a hole in the shutter of a beer-shop. I do not think that I ought to be asked or compelled to be exposed to the same thing myself. But I can not see why we can not easily change all these things, where they exist, so that a woman can go to the polls as comfortably and agreeably as she goes to church. The Australian ballot, where it has been introduced, has gone far to accomplish all this already.

I believe that the Republic will never reach the lofty ideal of the conception of our fathers; it will never attain the high moral quality which will be alike its strength and its safety, until that quality shall be given to it by the help and co-operation of woman. She who

"Stays all the fair young planet in her hands" will then contribute her full share to whatever of glory or honor shall be found in our story. The moral temperament, which determines permanently the history of any community, is given to it by its women. Whether it be true, as physiologists tell us, that as a rule the mental and moral qualities of children come from the mother and the physical only from the father, it is at least true that children learn to follow what is excellent in the example of their fathers from the teaching of their mothers. If our children are to imitate what has been of heroism in their fathers, they are to love their country as to be brave, free, generous, they must learn the lesson of duty, at their mother's knees. In no city, no household, no place, where the influ-

ence of woman did not inspire it with the heroic temper. But this influence can only be exerted by woman to its fullest extent when she shares the responsibility, and takes her proper and fair part in the conduct of the State which she is to influence. Whenever in the household woman is admitted to the confidence of her husband, she can be depended upon for all household virtues of economy, of self-sacrifice and purity. It is only when she is excluded from that confidence that she sets the example of selfishness or frivolity. Mr. Emerson quotes the saying of a lady who was among his friends, that she had never known but one woman who gave high counsel. De Toqueville says, "I do not hesitate to say that they give to every nation a moral temperament which shows itself in its politics. A hundred times I have seen weak men show real public virtue, because they had at their sides women who supported them, not by advice as to particulars, but by fortifying their feelings of duty, and directing their ambition. More frequently, I must confess, I have observed the domestic influence gradually transforming a man naturally generous, noble and unselfish into a cowardly, place-hunting self-seeker, thinking of public business only as the means of making himself comfortable—and this simply by daily contact with a well-constituted woman, a faithful wife, an excellent mother, but from whose mind the grand notion of public duty was entirely absent." If there be any truth in either of these statements, how comes it that the women who have given high counsel and set high example in the family do not give high counsel in the State? How happens it that the example of all the fidelity and excellence of the wife and the mother drags her husband down in his public life, because from her mind the grand notion of public duty is absent? It is because and only because the grand notion of public duty cannot be present to that mind from which public responsibility is absent.

I am far from accepting the statement of De Toqueville, or the statement quoted by Mr. Emerson, even under our existing social arrangements. All history, and especially American history, is crowded with examples of men sustained in the difficult paths of public duty and sacrifice by the counsel and companionship of brave and noble women. Next, in my judgment, in pathos to that supreme death scene related in the Gospels, to which all humanity turns for comfort, is the story of the last hours of Lord William Russell, as it is told by Bishop Burnet. "Lady Russell," says the Bishop, "returned alone in the evening. At eleven o'clock she left him. He kissed her four or five times, and she kept her sorrow so within herself that she gave him no disturbance by their parting. As soon as she was gone he said to me, 'Now the bitterness of death is past: for he loved and esteemed her beyond expression, for she well deserved it in all respects. He ran out into a long discourse concerning her, how great a blessing she had been to him, and said what a misery it would have been to him if she had not had that magnanimity of spirit, joined to her tenderness, as never to have desired him to do a base thing for the saving of his life.'

I believe the best scholars are now agreed that Shakespeare's sonnets which are supposed to have been addressed to the Earl of Pembroke are not intended as an expression of his own love for his friend, but are dramatic in their character, and that the Earl himself, or some other man in public life, is supposed to be speaking in them in the first person, and to be setting forth the story of no masculine friendship, but the support and stay he has found in his public life in the constancy and affection of a woman. There are many of us who can bear witness to the full truth of that story.

When, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
I all alone beweep my outcast state,
And trouble deaf heaven with my bootless cries,
And look upon myself, and curse my fate,
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
Featur'd like him, like him with friends possess'd,
Desiring this man's art, and that man's scope,
With what I most enjoy contented least,
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising;
Happily I think on thee,—and then my state
(Like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth) sings hymns at heaven's gate;
For thy sweet love remember'd, such wealth
Brings then I come, that I will kiss with kings.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Monthly at the Office of The Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

Vol. IV.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second-class matter.

No. 12.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

DECEMBER, 1891.

Extra copies, 50 cts. per 100, postpaid.

WOMEN AND THE STATE.

At a convention held at Amherst, Mass., Sept. 24, 1891, Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR said:

I came to the belief, long ago, that the welfare of the State is the true interest of the women of America, that justice, which is the great standing policy of all civil society, alike demand that woman shall be admitted to her full and equal share of the government of the Republic. But my life has been busy with other matters. I have been able to contribute to this cause little more than an occasional declaration of faith. I can do little more now.

I suppose that every thoughtful man, especially every man trained in a New England college, likes to form for himself some conception of an ideal State. This ideal does not depend upon the accident of the generation into which he was born. The experience of all history contributes to it. The studies of philosophers, the dreams of poets, the wisdom of law-givers, the experience of common life, throw upon it their blended light. It is not a conception to be made real in a day, or in a century. It is that it may come to pass that

Through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns.

I believe this to be no idle or visionary occupation. On the contrary, I think that no man into whose thought it has not entered ever has been or ever will be of great value to mankind in the practical administration of the Republic. Our fathers were the best builders of States the world ever saw. They were never led by theory or by enthusiasm a single step in advance of what the condition of affairs in their time, or human nature as it existed in their day, made practical and safe. Yet they delighted in these speculations. The men who framed the Constitutions of Virginia and of Massachusetts, the authors of the Connecticut Pledge of 1640, the framers of the Constitution of the United States itself, were familiar with the speculations of Plato and Cicero, with Locke and Milton and Bacon and Harrington and Sir Thomas More, and with the structure of the Hebrew State, whose foundation was laid in the Word of God itself.

Our fathers believed that mankind were placed in this world for the training of the moral and spiritual nature by learning to submit a free will voluntarily to the moral law. They regarded the State as but one instrumentality in this education. The sublimest thing in the universe, except its Creator, is a human will governing itself in obedience to a law higher than its own desire. The sublimest manifestation of that self-control is when a self-governing State regulates its conduct by the moral law.

Obedience to that law, into which the element of free choice enters, is the highest act of which human nature or angelic nature is capable. Obedience into which the element of free choice does not enter is just so far slavish and ignoble. Jeremy Taylor says, "As thou art a man, thou hast nothing to commend thee to thyself but that only by which thou art a man, that is, by what thou chooseth and refuseth."

The State itself is a moral being, whose collective will, conscience, judgment, are amenable to the moral law, like that of every one of the persons who compose it. When England forced opium upon China at the point of the bayonet and at the cannon's mouth, it was not merely a few amiable gentlemen making a mistake, or a few evil-minded persons committing a crime; it was England; it was upon England that the shame rested, and upon every Englishman who did not do his best to prevent it. When the slave was freed, when every freeman was clothed with citizenship and with the right to vote, the glory belonged to America. When the citizen is despoiled of that citizenship, when every freeman is clothed with the right by violence or fraud, if

that holds the shot-gun or forges the return, and it is upon every American that the shame rests, unless he has done his best to prevent it.

Our fathers thought that an equal share in the government of the State belonged to every man not disqualified by nature or by his own misconduct, as a birthright. As this principle of self-government or self-control lay at the foundation of their conception of the State, it followed that the subject of this government could be nothing less than the entire body of the citizens of the State, and that its object could be nothing less than the welfare of the entire body of people. This idea is expressed in the famous sentence of Abraham Lincoln: "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." It is no less clearly affirmed, in other words, in the opening sentences of the Declaration of Independence, and in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Massachusetts. The rights there affirmed are the rights of the whole people:

"The people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign and independent State. No man, nor corporation, nor association of men have any other title to obtain advantages, or particular or exclusive privileges distinct from those of the community, than what arises from the consideration of services rendered to the public."

"Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity and happiness of the people, and not for the profit, honor or interest of any one man, family or class of men."

"All the inhabitants of this Commonwealth, having such qualifications as they shall establish by their frame of government, have an equal right to elect officers and to be elected to public employment."

The mechanism which the people of Massachusetts devised for carrying these principles into effect has been altered and improved, from time to time, as our fathers expected. They provided in the Constitution itself a method of frequent and easy change. But the principles which they asserted in the Bill of Rights they believed to be fundamental, unchangeable and eternal. They declared that a frequent recourse to them was absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty and to maintain free government. Now, unless the word man, where it speaks of the unchangeable principles of political right as affecting the franchise, does not include woman, although it includes woman everywhere else where the term is used; unless the women of the Commonwealth are not inhabitants of the Commonwealth; or unless the difference of sex be something created not by the Maker of the Universe, but only by the Constitution of Massachusetts, it seems to me very clear that the doctrine of woman suffrage rests securely upon the fundamental principles of the Constitution of Massachusetts.

Now, of course, there are four classes of persons who are exceptions to the universality of this statement: infants, who are unable to understand the interests of the State by reason of their immaturity; insane persons and idiots, who are unable to understand those interests by reason of mental incapacity; criminals, who are at war with the public welfare; foreigners, whose allegiance is due elsewhere, or who have not dwelt here long enough to understand our institutions and interests. To use the expressive English phrase, "They have no stake in the country."

Now, undoubtedly, just as the qualities of the individual,—honesty, frugality, industry and courage,—are displayed in the worth of the individual, so the qualities of the State,—wisdom, justice, courage and industry,—are displayed in the worth of the State.

only who shall control it and who shall constitute it, but the ends to the accomplishment of which its mighty forces are to be directed. These are, in general: defence against foreign and domestic violence; prevention and punishment of crime; making and enforcing laws which regulate property and the relation of men to each other; the accomplishment of those things to which individual resources and capacity are unequal, such as the provision of institutions of education; caring for the insane, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the poor; the establishment of libraries and museums; the construction of public roads; the post-office; the regulation and control of great commercial transactions and instrumentalities; and the choice of legislators, judges, executive officers, and all the instruments by which all these things are to be accomplished.

Now, we demand two very simple things. First, that in counting the votes for these instruments in our elections, the vote of women shall be counted. Second, that when the people vote for public officers, or they are otherwise appointed, if a woman seem to be the fittest person for the place, she may be selected. That is all. Now the person who would exclude from the right of suffrage any woman who desires to exercise it is bound either to deny the general principle on which, according to the Bill of Rights of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth is founded, or to show that she labors under some natural disqualification which will render the exercise of suffrage by her either a direct injury to the State, or an injury to herself, and thereby an injury to the State. They must show that woman suffrage is incompatible either with a just conception of the State, or with the nature of womanhood itself.

It is less than forty years since the movement for woman suffrage began to assume serious proportions. The men and women who took up the advocacy of this cause had to encounter prejudices which had existed since the foundation of the earth, so far as we know anything of human history. The relation of woman to man was a relation of inferiority and of incapacity to act for herself in all the important transactions of life. Woman was not permitted to vote; she could hold no office, except that by a strange anomaly she could occupy the throne of some of the most powerful and highly civilized monarchies of the earth. The married woman could hold no property; could make no contract; had no lawful control over her own children or her own person; she could not make a will; the custom of society shut her out from the learned professions and from all profitable occupations. It was deemed unbecoming for her to speak in public, and in many parts of the world to appear in public without an escort. On the continent of Europe and in the mines of Great Britain she was condemned to the most brutal and degrading occupation, and was sometimes harnessed to the plough with bullocks, or on all fours drew loads over the tramways of mines. If those who ask now that the vote of woman shall be counted in the United States have any prejudice to encounter, let those who feel it remember that forty years ago it would have seemed far more monstrous to them to do away with the condition of things that I have described, than it does to-day to count the votes of their wives, or their sisters, or their mothers.

To-day, woman manages her property; she has the control of her own person; she is admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, and to the pulpit; she manages the post-office; she is librarian of the public library; she conducts the school; she practises medicine; she is head of the hospital; she has elevated the calling of the trained nurse to a high rank among liberal professions. If a remnant of the ancient barbarism is sometimes discovered anywhere lurking among the mass of our statutes, men are filled with wonder and disbelief when the fact is made known; the remedy is at once applied. No man is so conservative as to desire a backward step in any of these things.

The State has been making "Universal Suffrage" a law by which every man is admitted to the vote.

is contracting and that domain of the State which is represented by public spirit, by charity, by humanity, is enlarging. When men thought of government a century ago, they thought chiefly of the jail, the criminal court, the police, the army. To-day, they think chiefly of the college, the technical school, the asylum, the road, the library, the post-office, the hospital and the home. The rank of the State among civilized nations is measured by its colleges, its schools of art and science, its institutions for reform, for the cure of the insane, for the education of the blind and the deaf and dumb. The town points with pride to the excellence of its libraries, its schools, its churches and its roads.

Now the debate between the advocates of woman suffrage and its opponents is, to my mind, but a contest between two theories of the function of the State. If the State is to do nothing or to do little but to raise and discipline armies, to build jails, and to establish police courts, the less woman has to do with it the better for her, and the better for the State, except, as I shall show presently, that even here the State must largely depend upon her for the instrumentalities which are to diminish the evil of war and lessen its horrors. If, on the other hand, it is so to use its forces as to put an end to these things; if education, justice, science, art, charity, the promotion of commerce and manufacture, the healing of diseases, the promoting everywhere increased reverence for the individual soul, be a function to which its great forces are to be devoted in the future, then it is indispensable that woman should have in its management her full and equal share.

If to clothe woman with the elective franchise is to take from her a title of her womanhood; if she is to become less gentle, modest, affectionate, pure, sweet, we abandon the field at once. If to impose upon her political duties is to be inconsistent with her supreme duties at home, she must still devote herself to the latter and keep aloof from the former. But I believe that the perfect State, according to my conception of it as the great example and instrument of self-government, needs the element of perfect womanhood, according to the American and the English conception of womanhood. I believe that the accomplishment by this vast force and influence, the concentrated power of the Republic, of results for humanity not otherwise to be attained, can be made easier and surer by the aid of the qualities which the women of the Republic alone can furnish. The most taking argument against woman suffrage that I ever heard was found in a single phrase of Dr. Bushnell, when he called it "the reform against nature." Let us see whether it be against or according to nature to summon woman to our aid in the management of the affairs of the Republic. Take the things which the State has to do to-day. Take, in the first place, that which our opponents like chiefly to insist on when they discuss this question: defence against foreign and domestic violence. Women will not bear arms or lead armies, and that is true of old men and of men physically disabled. Not more, I suppose, than one-sixth part of our population of sixty-five millions are fit to bear arms. But even in the matter of war, the women of America have conceived, organized and rendered successful the great Sanitary Commission, which was the crowning glory of our people in the late war. There had been no substantial improvement in the care of the wounded and sick soldiers in the field for a century, until the women of America took it in hand. France, which had brought military discipline to its highest perfection, threw her sick or wounded soldier aside to die like a weed by the wall. Dr. Bellows, the president of the Sanitary Commission, declared: "The earliest movement for army relief was begun by the women of the nation, and their zeal and devotion no more flagged through the war than did that of the army in the field. The barriers of sex, caste and conventionalism, which had heretofore separated them, were burned away in the fervid heat of their loyalty." President Lincoln, according to Mrs. Livermore, disappointed at first of the cooperative work of women for the relief of the army, and declared that it would prove a dreadful fifth wheel to the coach. But when the war was over, he said, speaking of the women, "I wish that I had said what has been said by orators and poets

since the creation of the world in praise of women were applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during this war.

Take the next great function of the State, the administration of justice. We have had in Washington and in Wyoming, under the most disadvantageous circumstances, an opportunity to test the capacity of women for service on the jury. And I believe both the advocates and opponents of woman suffrage are agreed that the experiment has been completely successful. I can but repeat here what I have once before said in this connection.

A good deal of wit has been expended upon this subject. "What sort of Chief Justice do you think you would get if you had a woman on the bench?" That is a question which is put as a difficult and an impossible question to answer. A great part of my life has been spent in studying and watching the administration of justice in this Commonwealth and trying to learn, if I could, something of the qualities which fit men to take a part in the administration of justice; and I declare that the longer I live the more thoroughly I am convinced of the superiority in arriving at the truth of what we call the intuitive and instinctive judgment which is the faculty of women, over the logical method which is the quality of the masculine intellect. The training and discipline our lawyers go through, in my judgment, tends, after a time, to unfit a man for an accurate determination upon the facts. The value which you place upon the institution of the jury is not merely or chiefly because the judge is not supposed to be as honest, or as impartial, or as just as the twelve jurymen, but it is because the experience of men has found that the gift of the practical man who looks into the witness' face, though he can never tell you why he believes or disbelieves him, is often better than all the reasoning of a Parsons or a Marshall in getting at the truth. I was surprised some time ago to think how the relation of women to the administration of justice has manifested itself in some of the most important events of history. Shakespeare, the great delineator of human character, when he desired to introduce into that matchless scene which the world knows by heart, the judgment which cut the knot which had puzzled the lawyers and doctors, placed a woman upon the judgment seat. I think when slavery demanded of us that pound of flesh, secured to it in our National Constitution, that some of us would rather have had Fortia than Toney on the bench. D'Aguesseau, the consummate Chancellor of France, to whose tomb pilgrims from afar have travelled, in the one important and turning point of his life, when he was sent to Versailles by Louis XIV., who demanded of him an unjust judgment against his conscience, was about departing from his house trembling and preparing to submit, when his wife laid her hand upon his shoulder, and said to him: "When you appear before the king, forget your wife, forget your children, forget everything but your duty and your God," and the counsel of that woman it was, that saved that matchless judicial reputation among the treasures of mankind.

In the great case between Charles First and John Hampden, Judge Croke gave the opinion of the minority in favor of the liberty of the subject. He was, however, about to determine in favor of the crown. He was reproached for his baseness by his wife. Says Nugent: "This noble lady cast the shield of her feminine virtue before the honor of her husband to guard it from the assaults equally of interest and fear; and with that moral bravery which is so often found the purest and brightest in her sex, she exhorted him to do his duty at any risk to himself, to her, or to their children, and she prevailed."

I think, perhaps, some of all of you will remember in this connection a more famous judgment and a case of a more august defendant even than John Hampden. When Pilate ascended the judgment seat, on that famous morning, you remember the message that his wife sent him: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man; I should like to have our opponents tell us whether they think the judgment of the man or the woman on the whole was the most to be commended in that case. So you see that the history of the world is a story alike couched in recognizing the superiority of the instinct of women, both in recognizing and declaring truth, when I

brought in issue before the judgment seat.

We have had some interesting experiments, especially in Washington, where woman suffrage was lost by a judicial device of which I never can speak with patience, and in Wyoming, where it is established, and in Wyoming, where it is established, to the entire satisfaction of the people of that noble State, so rich in its great hope.

Women, so far, have not been tried to any great extent in the function of law-making. But it is to be observed that constitutional eligibility to office does not involve election or appointment to office unless in the cases where, in the judgment of the appointing or electing power, the individual is the fittest person who can be obtained for the function. Woman suffrage, while it implies the right of women to vote, implies only the election to office of such individual women as shall be deemed fit for the official function. The question of election to office will always, in the well-ordered State, remain a question of individual capacity.

The right to vote is a very different thing. That should be conferred, first, upon persons who have a stake in the country. What stake in the country is like the mother's interest in the welfare of her children? Second, upon persons who are presumed to be inspired by love of country. Will any man venture to claim for himself superiority in this respect? The voter should be a good judge of character, of those who are candidates for his suffrage. Will it be claimed that in this particular woman is inferior to man? The final and only other qualification for voting that I can think of is the capacity to judge of the public interest when the question is between great policies or great measures of administration. Let us take the things which the State is doing to-day, and which civilized nations are more and more to do hereafter, and see whether the judgment of women is not likely to be as valuable in determining the policy by which the State is to be administered.

One of our most important public functions is the post-office. Mr. Raikes, the English Postmaster-General, well known to be a strong opponent of women's rights, has just borne generous testimony in the House of Commons to the successful work which women do in the post-office, and declared that, speaking for the United Kingdom generally, he was glad to say that the post-office which were presided over by women were by no means the least efficiently managed. It is said that from ninety to ninety-five per cent. of our school teachers of Massachusetts are women. Can they not be trusted to make laws or to choose law-givers for the institutions which they so faithfully and ably manage? I suppose a large majority of the work in our public libraries, fast becoming as indispensable an institution in every town as the school itself, is now done by women. The trained nurse, following that new profession which has been added to the liberal professions in modern times, is taking her place in the management of our hospitals. The insane, the deaf and dumb, the blind and the poor are more and more coming under her care. In that most difficult of all problems, the wise management of the Indians, where measure after measure, commissioner after commissioner, and agent after agent has failed, Miss Alice Fletcher is now the first authority in the country. The mismanagement of the hospital service of the Crimea, which caused the downfall of an administration in England, was remedied by Florence Nightingale. The organization and conduct of the Sanitary Commission, the greatest advance that has been made in modern times in the conduct of war, was made largely by Clara Barton. She has since the war devised the Red Cross League, to which the principal nations of Europe and America have given their adhesion, establishing a new and humane military code for the treatment of the sick and wounded. When the yellow fever invaded Florida, year before last, it was her energy and capacity that organized the best means of relief, when those devised by others were generally failures. The improvement in our time in prison discipline, the establishment of a separate system for women, is due to the wisdom of Mary Ware. When the Massachusetts, a few years since, made its terrible indictment against a woman, charging it with a crime which it agreed in the conduct

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEAFLET.

Published Bi-Monthly at the Office of The Woman's Journal, Boston, Mass.

Vol. VI.

Entered at the Boston Post-Office as second-class matter.

No. 2.

Subscription, 25 cents per annum.

MARCH, 1893.

Extra copies, 30 cts. per 100, postpaid.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN.

BY HON. EDWIN C. PIERCE.

The following argument in favor of Presidential Suffrage for women was given before a committee of the Rhode Island Legislature by Hon. Edwin C. Pierce, Attorney at Law, Providence, R. I.:

The constitutional right of women to vote should be recognized and enforced by the electorate, by the Legislature of every State in the Union, and, in the last resort, by the Congress of the United States.

It is the constitutional duty of the Legislature in every State to recognize and protect by statute the right of women to presidential suffrage.

There can be no question as to the power of a State Legislature to enfranchise women in presidential elections. No man derives his right to vote for presidential electors from the constitution of his State. The U. S. Constitution, and an act of the Legislature in execution of the power and duty devolved by the U. S. Constitution, alone give to every citizen who votes for presidential electors that right. The second clause of the first section of the second article of the U. S. Constitution provides for the choice of the presidential electors in these words:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, etc.

In the earlier period of our Constitutional history, there were several instances of the appointment of the presidential electors by State Legislatures themselves. Such an appointment has never been rejected as unconstitutional, but the votes of electors so appointed have been received and counted in the election of the president and vice-president. South Carolina continued from the beginning until and including the presidential election of 1860, to appoint its electors by direct choice by the Legislature, the first popular election for president being had in that State in 1868. The fourth clause of the same section of the U. S. Constitution, however, provides that "the Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors," a phrase usually, though not exclusively, appropriated to a popular election, and implying an election of some sort; and the republican spirit of the Constitution favors a reference of the choice of the electors to the people. At any rate, the strength and the growth of the democratic-republican sentiment among our people led to the firm establishment, at an early day, of the custom of referring the choice of the electors to the people.

The genius of our institutions requires that the manner of appointment shall be by a popular election.

The control which the State Legislature has over the manner of appointment was illustrated by the Legislature of Michigan at its last session, when, departing from the universal custom for generations of choosing the electors upon a general ticket, the State was divided into electoral districts, each district to choose one elector, while the two senatorial electors are to be chosen on a general ticket. Michigan has been districted—and it is charged gerrymandered—in order to give to the party controlling the Legislature an advantage in the presidential election.

Not only is it within the power of the General Assembly, by a mere act, to enable women to vote for presidential electors, but it is the duty of the Legislature of every State to pass such an enabling act. This claim, as a legal proposition, is founded upon Section 4 of Article IV. of the National Constitution, which contains these words:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Now, no one will deny that the duty of the general government to assure a republican form of government to every State necessarily implies a duty on all the States to have such a government. One of the ablest commentators upon the Constitution says:

Every State must have a republican government. . . . The first requisite to the performance of the duty is to understand it,—to know what it is. The Constitution gives no definition of it, and refers to no standard, and there is no standard of adequate authority to bind the government on the subject. With such lights as the principles of moral and political law afford, the government must decide for itself what the Constitution intends by a republican form of government. The principle of republicanism is the equal right of the people, the citizens, all the members of the body politic. In theory, it is the government of public opinion; the public being its own members and subjects, and the opinion being their own intelligent and well-considered judgment in regard to the requirements of their own best good, and permanent interest. The excellence of a particular government consists in its adequacy to obtain the formation and expression of such an opinion. The essence of its republicanism consists in the fitness of its means for understanding and administering that opinion, and the practical

efficiency with which it holds its agents to their responsibility for doing so. It is obvious that no reliance can be placed by any government for the support of such a public opinion as republicanism demands, otherwise than by a strict adherence to the laws of God, and eternal justice, the equal and inalienable rights of man. Hence republicanism is founded on those principles, and fidelity to them is essential to the security of its own existence.

I quote the foregoing definition of the republicanism of the Constitution from the work on the Constitution by Timothy Farrar, published in 1867. Judge Farrar was one of the ablest jurists of the national school of politics who has discussed our great constitutional questions; and he has discussed them with a power seldom equalled. The first clause of Section Two of Article One of the Constitution provides:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

This is the first and principal branch of the National Legislature; and no step can be taken in creating or sustaining any other or further act or agency in the government, without its assistance. The House of Representatives is to be elected by the people, and the Constitution provides that the State Representatives shall be chosen by the same electorate,—the people. The people of the several States are that portion of the United States who are the resident inhabitants of particular States.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside.

Such is the language of the Constitution. Women are by the express terms of the constitution citizens, and they are legally a part of the people. No one will question that. And the Constitution devolves the choice of the National Representatives upon "the people." Judge Farrar upholds the authority of the National government to maintain the republicanism of the States in the following strong language:

When Congress undertakes to prescribe a republican government to the States, and, of course, to determine what is such a government, they will be as likely to decide what kind and what portion of the people shall participate in the suffrage, and under what regulations and restrictions, as they will to decide what part of the governmental officers shall be chosen by popular election (page 152).

It is the duty of Congress to see that no aristocracy, oligarchy, or privileged class is allowed to usurp the rights of the people, or disfranchise any portion, much less one-half, or a majority of their own citizens.

Judge Farrar did not mean to commit himself to the doctrine that female citizens have a constitutional right to vote. He did not write to cover their case. He wrote a book which will be read more, and quoted more, in the next twenty-five years than in the quarter of a century that has elapsed since it was published; and he wrote in vindication of the republican character of our government, and in support of doctrines of constitutional interpretation under which alone the continental republic can, with increasing lus-

tre and renown, endure, prosper, and peacefully progress, illustrating the triumphs of democracy and of civilization. He wrote to cover the case of the then lately emancipated slaves, who acquired their suffrage by the guaranty clause of the Constitution as it then was, rather than by the Fifteenth Amendment. It needs to be recalled to-day that before the Fifteenth Amendment was even submitted to the States by Congress, the reconstruction act of Congress had reorganized government in the seceding States upon the basis of universal manhood suffrage, making impartial suffrage as respects color, race or previous condition of servitude, the condition precedent for recognition as States in full relations with the Union.

I now invite attention to the utterances in the U. S. Senate of a great statesman, Charles Sumner. On Feb. 5 and 6, 1866, Mr. Sumner made the speech which deservedly ranks as his greatest, asserting the equal rights of all, and maintaining the plenary power of Congress, under the clause requiring the United States to guarantee a republican form of government, to confer the elective franchise upon the colored race in all elections throughout the republic, without amendment of the Constitution. In that great speech, which riveted the attention of the country, and which, notwithstanding the subsequent Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, announced the doctrines upon which Congress proceeded to reconstruct the seceding slave States, proceeded unaided by any amendment to the Constitution, Mr. Sumner said:

We must declare that a State which, in the foundation of its government, sets aside "the consent of the governed," which imposes taxation without representation, which discards the principle of equal rights, and lodges power exclusively with an oligarchy, aristocracy, caste or monopoly, cannot be recognized as a "republican form of government" according to the requirement of American institutions. Even if it may satisfy some definition handed down from antiquity or invented in monarchical Europe, it cannot satisfy the solemn injunction of our constitution. For this question I now ask a hearing.

Sumner then proceeded at great length and with exhaustive research to marshal authoritative declarations and public acts of the fathers of our country, and of eminent European republican philosophers and statesmen, all showing that the principle of republicanism is the equal rights of all, equality in political power. He quoted Benjamin Franklin, who said:

Liberty, or freedom, consists in having an actual share in the appointment of those who frame the laws. . . . They who have no voice nor vote in the electing of representatives, do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes.

He quoted Jefferson, who constantly testified to the idea that a republic means a society where all are equal in rights. He quoted from Jefferson also these memorable words:

To consider the will of the society enounced by the majority of a single vote to be as sacred as if unanimous, is the first of all lessons in

importance, yet the last which is thoroughly learnt.

He quoted Madison, who said :

The right of suffrage is certainly one of the fundamental articles of republican government.

He quoted that democratic Frenchman who so well understood America, De Tocqueville, who says :

There is no legislator sufficiently wise and sufficiently powerful to maintain free institutions, if he does not take equality for first principle and symbol.

He quoted that illustrious German, Emanuel Kant, who said that every State should be a republic, which he defines as—

That form of government where every citizen participates, by his representatives, in the exercise of the legislative power.

Sumner proceeded :

To establish the equal rights of all, no further amendment is needed. The actual text is exuberant; instead of adding new words, it will be enough if you give those that exist the natural force belonging to them. Instead of neglecting, use them. An illustrious magistrate once retorted upon an advocate who, dissatisfied with a ruling of the court, threatened to burn his books, "Better read them," and so would I say now to all who think the Constitution needs amendment. Better read it. Yes, sir, read it in the principles proclaimed by the Fathers before the Revolution; read it in the declaration of the Fathers when they took their place as a Republic; read it in the avowed opinions of the Fathers; read it in the noble acts of the Fathers; and in all this beaming, diffusive light, you will discern the true meaning. The victory which overthrew slavery carried away all those glosses and constructions by which this wrong was originally fastened upon it. For generations, the National Constitution has been interpreted for slavery. From this time forward, it must be interpreted in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, so that human rights shall always prevail.

We need to-day the courage and constancy to principle, with the quick and resolute grasp of the political necessities of the time, which distinguished the statesmen of the reconstruction period. The reconstruction act of Congress, proceeding upon the doctrines enunciated by Sumner, gave universal manhood suffrage to the slave States which had seceded. Then, although Sumner and others urged the bolder course of Congressional enfranchisement of the colored race in the loyal States, the Fifteenth Amendment was resorted to, because, aided by the Republicanized States of the South, it was possible to carry its ratification.

It is to be recalled, however, that by the Fifteenth Amendment the negro was made a voter in Ohio and other Northern States which had just refused at popular elections to strike the word "white" from their constitutions, the Legislatures of those same States ratifying the Amendment. The right of suffrage for the negro was treated by his friends as a right, to be wrested by favoring constructions of the Constitution, and by the bold exercise of political power, against the opposition of the existing electorate which withheld it.

Since republican equality is the rule

of our political life,—a commanding rule which admits of no exception,—I do not feel that the burden is upon me to show why the female citizens of a State should be accorded the right of presidential suffrage, which it is within the competency of every State Legislature to grant. Why should the right be denied? Why should the female part of the people be disfranchised? Are not the women citizens subject to the laws? Are they not taxed? However it was in the past, do they not now engage in the productive industries, in commerce, in the arts, in public service, in manifold ways? Have not the women citizens a stake in the country? Are they not interested in the character and opinions of the Chief Magistrate of the Republic? Are not the women of America, the vast body of them, already participants in sympathy in our American political struggles? Do they not have political opinions, and are not the mass of them affiliated already with one or the other of the great political parties?

The distinguished jurist from whom I quoted in the earlier portion of my remarks, carefully leaves the question of female suffrage precisely where he found it, viz.: with the notion prevailing that just as the law recognizes the incompetency, by the law of nature, of children for political and most civil functions, so women may justly be held to be excepted by the laws of nature from the rule of political equality, on the ground of a universal and permanent incapacity for the exercise of the elective franchise. When the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution was adopted, this notion so far prevailed that in the suffrage clause—that incongruous and worthless, and now practically obsolete suffrage clause—the disfranchisement only of male citizens was to be punished by loss of representation. But the use of the word "male" in this clause has no other effect than simply that of omitting to affirm the rights of female citizens; it is neither in form nor in spirit a positive restriction of the suffrage. In fact, the whole clause is the weakest and only immoral one in the Constitution, neither restricting the suffrage, nor assuring it to any citizen, but seeming to sanction disfranchisement of citizens, if only a price was paid in the surrender of political power. The whole clause is repugnant to the republicanism of the Constitution and to the principles of morality, and as a settlement of the Southern question, for which it was devised, was abandoned as soon as adopted, by the addition of the Fifteenth Amendment.

So far as the past assumption that the law of nature justified and rendered inevitable the denial of the elective franchise to women is concerned, in the absence of experimental proof to the contrary, such a notion might be a tolerable one, but to-day this theory is exploded. Women have been voting for some time, and are voting to-day in all parts of the English-speaking world. They vote in the municipal elections in England and in Canada. Women vote at school elections in half the States of the Union; women

vote in municipal elections in the State of Kansas; women vote in all elections in the new State of Wyoming. In the last two presidential elections, the National Committee of the Republican party appealed to the women of the country to support its principles, and successfully organized clubs of Republican women. Natural political leaders have arisen among women, both in England and the United States, and the recognition of their right to vote will be as expedient, politically, as it is in theory constitutional, republican and just.

I submit, in conclusion, that an act should be passed, providing for the registration of women as voters for presidential electors.

The power of the Legislature of a State to direct who shall vote for presidential electors, independent of the State constitution, has been settled affirmatively. This is not a matter of individual opinion merely; it has been settled by the highest legal authorities. The question was settled by the Soldiers' Voting Acts during the war, and by the judicial opinions upon them, and by the National House of Representatives in the analogous case of elections for that body, wherein the constitutionality of the Michigan Soldiers' Voting Act was upheld.

The Maine Legislature, on March 24, 1864, passed an act for the voting of soldiers in the field for presidential electors and congressmen, and the next day, March 25, submitted a constitutional amendment to enable soldiers out of the State to vote for State officers, but not

including the presidential electors or congressmen, which had just been covered by a mere act. It would have been an impertinence to have included electors or congressmen in the amendment.

New Hampshire (see Public Laws of 1864) passed a Soldiers' Voting Act for presidential electors and congressmen, which the justices of the Supreme Court of that State upheld by an opinion expressly declaring that the Constitution of the United States alone governed that matter, that the act was constitutional, although in conflict with the State Constitution, and the court was unanimous. (45 N. H., p. 607.) The language of the opinion was:

The question as to the election of Representatives to Congress and of Electors of President and Vice-President, is governed wholly by the Constitution of the United States as the paramount law, and the Constitution of this State has no concern with the question, except so far as it is referred to and adopted by the Constitution of the United States.

The Vermont Supreme Court gave an opinion to the same effect. (37 Vt., Appendix.)

In Henry M. Field's work on Election Law, the Michigan case is well stated, and the House decided, after majority and minority reports discussing the issue, that the Michigan Constitution could not govern as to the place or manner of voting for congressmen. There is absolutely no authority the other way.

EDWIN C. PIERCE.

Providence, R. I.

The Woman's Journal.

A weekly paper, founded 1870. Editors, Lucy Stone, H. B. Blackwell, Alice Stone Blackwell.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—Clara Barton.

First year on trial to new subscribers, \$1.50. Regular price per year, \$2.50. To libraries and reading-rooms, \$1.25. Address **Woman's Journal**, Boston, Mass.

The Woman's Column.

Edited at 3 Park St., Boston, by Alice Stone Blackwell. Published weekly. 25c. a year.

"The best condensation of the argument for woman's enfranchisement, the method by which that argument is enforced, and the news of the movement, that we have anywhere."—Frances E. Willard.

A full set of equal suffrage leaflets, 40 different kinds, post paid, for 10 cents. Address **Woman's Journal**, Boston.