

ago, on which we have been requested to make some remarks. The article was well written though it contained nothing new in argument, but was free from that ridicule and those puerile platitudes which are usually to be found in the effusions of opponents of the political enfranchisement of the fair sex. The article is very lengthy, and therefore requires some space to give it anything like a detailed reply.

The writer offers the following objections to woman suffrage. We give them in a condensed form, but so as to convey the gist of them, fully and fairly.

First—Government belongs to man, and for this he is appointed of God and qualified by nature.

Second—The right to vote should be given only to those in circumstances to vote independently. Women are under the dictation of their husbands, and therefore should not have the franchise.

Third—The true unit of government is not the individual but the family.

Fourth—If women enter politics and act independently, the unit in government will be divided against itself. If husbands and wives vote together, then the family will cast two votes instead of one and party results will remain unchanged.

Fifth—Giving women the suffrage would introduce an uncertain element into politics. That is, when an issue was involved that was of particular interest to women they would vote, at other times they would not.

The first objection here urged to woman suffrage is, under our republican form of government, an argument in its favor. If government belongs to man, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, then to deny to women a voice in the choice of those who are to govern them is unrepresentative, undemocratic and a manifest injustice. Observe, this is a question of political government. Let it not be confounded with family government. If men are to govern politically, women should have the suffrage, that they may give their consent to the government by expressing their choice of the men who are to govern them, nationally and locally. The objector's references to the fiat of the Almighty in the beginning, and to Paul's doctrine that "man is the head of the woman as Christ is the head of the Church," are very unfortunate for his argument. For God gives to woman her choice of a husband, a head, to "rule over her" in the family, and therefore she should have a similar choice as to her political rulers in the State. Moreover, in the Church, both men and women vote, on an equality, on all matters and persons relating to the government of the Church, and by parity of reasoning the same rule should prevail in the State.

The second objection would deprive all men of the suffrage who, it might be alleged are "not in circumstances to act independently." Every young man of age to vote who is still under his father's oversight, is subject to the same alleged "dictation" as the mother. But in a government of the people, where the secret ballot protects every voter, this assumed "dictation" would

cut no figure. It does not follow because a man is the head of the family that he is to "dictate" his wife in her religion, or her politics, or her opinions on any subject, any more than in her food or her thoughts. The "dictation" of woman in any of these things is out of place in a free country and in an argument on human rights.

The third objection is a political heresy. The matured individual is the political unit in a popular government. If the family is the unit, then all the sons who are unmarried after they are twenty-one years of age and remain members of the family should be debarred from the franchise. For, it is claimed that the husband and father casts his vote "not for himself alone but for his wife and children." However pretty this notion may be as a matter of poetic sentiment, it is not correct in political practice, for the male voter, as is well known, goes to the polls "for himself and not for another," and he casts but one vote, whether his family numbers but one or a score, while if he voted for a family, justice would give the family man more votes than the single man, and they proportioned to the numbers of his household. If the matured sons may vote, each for himself, why may not their more matured mother exercise the same privilege, for herself? Then there are numbers of women, widows and otherwise, who are themselves each the head of a family. On the rule that the family is the unit of government, every woman in that position ought to exercise the elective franchise. If a woman breaks the law, the husband does not go to prison for her. She is judged as a member of the body politic. If she is to obey the law as an individual, she ought to have an individual voice in the making of the laws by voting for the lawmakers. There is no such thing in the nation as family suffrage, it is individual suffrage, and a woman is an individual as much as is a man.

The fourth objection is based on the third, and goes down with it. All the argument as to the dividing of the family unit or the doubling of the votes, applies equally against giving sons the franchise who remain in the family after becoming of age. "Discord in the family circle" is not a necessary result of individual franchise. Practice in this Territory for fifteen years and in Wyoming up to the present time, proclaims that women may exercise the suffrage in their own right, as they exercise their religious freedom, without any serious results either to the family or to society. Prognostications of evils to come if a woman should be permitted to cast a ballot are not argument, they are only guesswork. And, further, women can be, and many are, enthusiastic Republicans or Democrats without the franchise. Giving them the right to put a piece of paper in a box will not be likely to alter their nature or disrupt the social foundations of the family structure. And there are millions of women who have no husbands to differ with on politics; why should they be denied the suffrage because someone fancies that voting would cause wives to quarrel with their husbands?

Fifth. The "uncertain element in politics" already exists, and it has not been introduced by woman suffrage.

Men do exactly what it is claimed women would do if they had the voting power. When an issue is involved that specially interests men, they flock to the polls in large numbers; when they are not so interested, hosts of them stay away. What of it? If the objection urged is an argument against woman suffrage, it is an argument against man suffrage. "An uncertain element in politics, eh?" What are the certain elements in politics? As to women "shrinking from elements that are uncongenial," how much worse is it for a woman to go the polls, in a civilized country, and deposit her ballot, than to crowd into a theatre, or a circus, or a race-course, or any thronged public assembly? And why should there be an election so conducted that any lady could not with perfect propriety go to the polling place and exercise her sacred right of franchise? What is there about such a proceeding that is unwomanly or repulsive? There are men who seem to think it quite womanly for women to wash their dirty clothes, but very unwomanly to put in a box a piece of clean white paper, stamped with the names of persons she wishes to act in the public service!

As to whether women would "purify politics" or not, it does not matter. We do not exclude any class of men from the suffrage because they do not purify politics. That politics would degrade woman if she had the right to vote is a mere conjecture and made without sufficient ground. For women discuss political matters now, and it does not degrade but elevates them. Some of the noblest women citizens in the land are interested in politics and are yet denied the right to say who shall govern them, while the most ignorant, brutal and degraded male citizen, who has scarcely any right conception of the principles of government, can cast a ballot and at the same time sneer at woman suffrage.

All the homilies about women at the fireside and in the home are a waste of words, because the simple right to a voice in the affairs of government as one of the people, as one of the governed, as a citizen of the country, is not incompatible with the most tender and sacred relations and duties of the wife and mother. And it does not necessarily involve and "rush to the hustings or the forum," or any struggle for place or power, but is simply a right—if the franchise is to any body a right—withheld from at least one half of the people, in a government said to be "of the people and by the people and for the people," who are thus governed without their consent, and when they have property are taxed without representation. This is tyranny and injustice, according to the fundamental principles of republican government, and there is not a single argument raised against the political enfranchisement of woman that is not equally applicable to certain classes of men and does not thereby furnish its own refutation.

— NEW YORK, March 7.—Gold coin to the amount of \$250,000 has been ordered for shipment to Europe tomorrow. The total ordered since February 19th, is \$5,816,000.