

Hearing before the United States Senate committee on woman suffrage ... 13th day of February 1900

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 1800 Class JK 1888 Book 1900a OFFICIAL DONATION.

HEARING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE, HELD IN THE MARBLE ROOM OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE ON THE 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1900, AT 10 O'CLOCK A. M.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

201

The members of the committee present were Senators Daniel (chairman), Berry, Wetmore, and Foster.

The Chairman. I beg leave to state that this meeting of the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the Senate has been called at the instance of the ladies who favor that movement. The committee has been requested by ladies who are opposed to the movement to give them a hearing, which will be done at such time and place as may be convenient to them and to the committee, but to-day has been accorded to the ladies who favor the movement for woman suffrage, and the committee is now in session to hear those ladies. The chair recognizes Miss Anthony.

Miss Susan B. Anthony. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that we are here to-day. This is the first time we ever assembled in the Marble Room of the Senate.

A voice. Two years ago we were here.

Miss Anthony. I have been coming here for the last thirty-two years, and this is the first time I was ever in the Marble Room. We consider it a great honor that we are able to get even a committee of five of the honorable members of the Senate to listen to our arguments. We have from year to year during the last thirty years made earnest applications for an opportunity to get our appeal before the entire Congress—members of the House and Senate—and we are always very thankful for even the opportunity to speak before a committee, however large or small, of either House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are here to begin this morning with an historical statement. This hearing is to present the historical department of our movement, and the first speaker in order will discuss the

work which Congress has done for the women during the last thirty years. Just think of it, Senators. Suppose any of you men had to plead for any of your rights for thirty years and not get them.

I will introduce Mrs. Clara B. Colby, the editor of the Woman's Tribune, formerly of Nebraska, but now a nonvoting citizen, as good as a man, in the District of Columbia.

OUR WORK WITH CONGRESS.

Mrs. Clara B. Colby. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when it was sought to settle the political status of the negro by the fourteenth amendment the word "male" was for the first time introduced in the Federal Constitution. The combined wisdom of Congress could not open the door wide enough to let the black man into the political fold without putting up a bar to keep women out. Charles Sumner, who had come most in contact with the petition work, said he spent sleepless nights over it, and wrote 19 pages of foolscap to try to get around it, but it could not be done.

JK 1888 1900a

The woman suffragists at once remonstrated against this proposition, and sent out forms for a petition that the resolution might be amended by striking out the word "male." Before the session was over they had secured and presented 10,000 names. The Republican leaders could not controvert claims based on the same line of argument by which they sought to confer suffrage upon the negro, but they said: "You are right, but you must wait. This is the negro's hour."

The first vote on the question of woman suffrage took place the following session, in December, 1866. A bill being before the Senate to amend the franchise law of the District of Columbia so as to allow colored men to vote, Senator Cowan, of Pennsylvania, moved to amend by striking out the word "male." The debate lasted three days, and is of great historic importance as being the first time this question was discussed in so grave a body. Mr. Cowan said he was not afraid of negro suffrage if female suffrage went hand in hand with it.

In the arguments of the opposition he found, he said, only "the same ancient footprints, the same things that satisfied men thousands of years ago and which never did satisfy any woman that I know of." Mr. Wilson, of Massachusetts, afterwards Vice-President of the United States, opposed the amendment, as did a number of others favorable to woman suffrage but who wished to keep the questions of negro and woman suffrage entirely separate. He, however, made an eloquent speech for the principle involved, saying that every year had confirmed his conviction that our legislation would be more humane, more for liberty, more for a higher civilization, if women permitted to vote.

Mr. Gratz Brown, of Missouri, in taking issue with the claim that suffrage is a concession and not a principle, used this sublime language: "Whenever you establish that doctrine; whenever you crystallize that idea in the public mind of this country, you ring the death knell of American liberties."

Senator Buckalew, of Pennsylvania, was a true prophet in saying: "This is not the last we shall hear of this subject. It will come to us again, and I am persuaded that one reason why it will come again is that the arguments against the proposed extension of suffrage have been inadequate; they have been based upon grounds which will not endure debate."

After three days' discussion 9 Senators voted for the bill and 37 against it. Among the latter were some who wanted woman suffrage, but wanted negro suffrage more and therefore would not jeopardize the bill. Those who wanted woman suffrage just as much as they wanted negro suffrage, and perhaps more, were: Senators Anthony of Rhode Island, Brown of Missouri, Foster of Connecticut, Nesmith of Oregon, Patterson of New Hampshire, Buckalew and Crown of Pennsylvania, Riddle of Delaware, and Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio.

In the House the same question was brought up by Mr. Noell of Missouri and without debate it stood 49 yeas, 74 nays.

3

When it was found that the fourteenth amendment did not sufficiently protect the negro, a fifteenth amendment was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Pomeroy of Kansas, and in the House by Mr. George W. Julian of Indiana, in December, 1868. As framed at first it made citizenship the basis of suffrage, and would have made women legal voters. This failed and the amendment, as it now stands, was passed in 1870.

In December, 1868, a bill to enable women to vote in the District of Columbia was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Wilson and in the House by Mr. Julian.

The next move was by Mr. Julian to try extend the suffrage to women in the Territories, and this was almost simultaneous with the legislative enactment of woman's suffrage in the Territory of Wyoming in 1869.

On March 15, 1869, Mr. Julian submitted a joint resolution for a sixteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, prohibiting the States from disfranchising citizens because of sex. Worded a little differently, this amendment has been introduced in every succeeding Congress.

Addresses on behalf of the rights of women citizen were sent to Congress in 1866 and 1867, and hearings before Congressional committees began with the first Washington convention, thirty-one years ago. In January, 1870, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Paulina Wright Davis, Charlotte B. Wilbour, and Madame Arneke spoke before committees for the bill enfranchising the women of the District of Columbia.

In December, 1870, Victoria C. Woodhull sent a memorial to Congress praying for the passage of such laws as might be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States without regard to sex. This was presented in the Senate by Mr. Harris and in the house by Mr. Julian. The memorial was referred to the Judiciary Committees, which appointed a hearing for Mrs. Woodhull on January 11, 1871. An opportunity was also given to Isabella Beecher Hooker ad Hon. A. G. Riddle to address the committee, the latter making a legal argument on the right of women to vote under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Judge Bingham, on behalf of the majority, reported adversely on January 30, and on February 1 a favorable minority report was made by Mr. Loughridge and Benjamin F. Butler. In this report it was maintained that the right of women to vote was embodied by ancient precedents in the common law of England. Decisions of our Supreme Court were cited to show that elective franchise is a right fundamental to citizenship. This right is also recognized by the first clause of the fifteenth amendment, which says: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged," et. Here is stated, first, the existence of a right. What right! The right to vote. Whose right! The right of citizens of the United States. And this right the State are forbidden to deny or abridge. The denial of the power to abridge a right recognizes the existence of that right. The report extended over 34 closely printed pages and covers the whole question of the constitutionality of woman's right to vote as a citizen of the United States.

4

In view of this new phase of the movement and the impetus resulting from the hearing, it was decided to appoint as a committee for Congressional work during the session Isabella Beecher Hooker, Josephine S. Griffing, Mrs. M. B. Bowen, Miss Anthony, Paulina Wright Davis, and Ruth C. Dennison, of Washington. The chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor (Mr. Arnell, of Tennessee) tendered the use of his room as headquarters. Later this was exchanged for the larger room used by the House Committees on Agriculture and Manufacturers, whose chairmen (General Smith and Mr. Wilson) generously proffered the use of it. Here books were opened for signatures, literature was distributed, petitions sent all over the country, and conferences were held. This was indeed a woman suffrage committee room.

On the closing day of Congress Mrs. Hooker, on behalf of the committee, thanked the members who had rendered signal service to the suffrage cause. To Mr. Arnell double thanks were due, not only because he was the first to admit women to the Capitol as citizens having any right there in the use of public buildings, but because he had secured the passage of a bill to give to employees of the Government equal pay for same work without distinction of sex. Mr. Arnell replied that he welcomed the committee as the advance guard of American women.

Judge Loughridge strongly urged the women to continue to appeal to Congress rather than the courts, for, he said, "Courts are generally in the rear rank," which the suffragists found to be true in the suits which they subsequently brought.

Mr. Julian closed his response with this immortal sentiment: "Who will venture to judge the future by any political almanac of bygone times! I can only say with old Thomas Carlyle, "One strong thing I find here below—the just thing, the true thing, and no man or party is strong enough to stay the grand march of events through which the hand of God is visibly guiding the Republic to universal liberty, and through that to enduring prosperity and peace."

During this session Mr. Julian again made an effort to have the word "male" stricken out of the suffrage clause in a bill that had been introduced to provide for the better government of the District of Columbia, Mr. Cook, of Illinois, moved the previous question, thus cutting off debate. But Mr. Julian called for the ayes and noes, thus obtaining a test vote, which stood 55 for and 117 against.

Under date of January 21, 1871, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood and Drs. Caroline B. Winslow and Susan A. Edson had memorialized both Senate and House on behalf of this bill, and on July 14 of the same year Mrs. Lockwood appeared before the House Judiciary Committee, making an able argument in support of the woman suffrage bills and presenting a large petition for their passage.

In January, 1872, an attempt was made to get a hearing before the Senate and House in defense of the suffrage measures. The request was in the Senate referred to the Judiciary Committee, which replied through its chairman, Lyman Trumbull, that this would not be consistent with the rules of the Senate, but that the committee would give the memorialists a hearing on the following Friday. At that time four of the strongest men in the Senate—Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois; Mr. Conkling, of New York; Mr. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, and Matt, Carpenter, of Wisconsin—listened to a masterly constitutional argument by Mrs. Hooker and Mr. Stanton. The latter urged that it should not be taken for granted that the Revolutionary heroes, after a struggle with despotism, studied how to use their new-found freedom for the purpose of robbing women of their inalienable rights. Women were voting at the time that Constitution was written, and if the framers of that document had not wanted

women to vote they would have said so. "It is not safe," Mrs. Stanton said, "to leave the intentions of the Pilgrim fathers or of the Heavenly Father wholly to masculine interpretation."

Miss Anthony reminded the committee that by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the question of suffrage for men had been lifted above State control. Therefore women turned to Congress praying first that the word "male" should not be inserted in the fourteenth amendment, then for the insertion of "sex" in the fifteenth amendment, so that it might read that the States should not abridge the right of suffrage on account of race, color, sex, etc., but they were told to wait until the negro was cared for. Then when they came asking protection under the new guarantees of the Constitution they were told their only plan was to wait until Congress should adopt an amendment to make null and void the word "male" in the fourteenth and supply the want of the word "sex" in the sixteenth amendment.

In the House, on January 24, 1872, General Butler introduced a suffrage petition containing the names of 35,000 women asking for protection in their right to vote.

The next hearing was given by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1874 to Mrs. Sara A. Spencer, Miss Frances Ellen Burr, Miss Phoebe W. Couzins, and Mr. Francis Miller, in connection with 600 women of the District, asking for legislation enabling them to vote.

On May 28, 1874, when the bill to establish the Territory of Pembina was pending in the senate, Mr. A. A. Sargent, of California, moved to amend it so that women could not be disfranchised. He supported his motion with an earnest speech, in which he reminded the Senate that women voting and holding office in Wyoming had rescued that Territory from a state of comparative lawlessness and made it one of the most orderly in the Union. Those speaking for the measure were Senators Sargent, Stewart, Morton, Carpenter, Ferry, and Anthony; those against were Senators Boreman, Merriman, Morrill of Maine, Edmunds, and Bayard. The vote stood 19 to 27; this was a gain of 10 votes over that of eight years previous.

The arguments for the measure were long and able. Matt Carpenter, of Wisconsin, said: "I believe it is not one of woman's rights, but one of man's rights that the franchise should be extended to woman."

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Anthony, Chandler, Carpenter, Conover, Ferry, of Michigan, Flannagan, Gilbert, Harvey, Mitchell, Morton, Patterson Pratt, Sargent, Sprague, Stewart, Tipton, Washburn, West, and Windom—19.

Nay—Messrs. Allison, Bayard, Boreman, Boutwell, Buckingham, Clayton, Conkling, Cooper, Davis, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Hager, Hamilton, of Maryland, Hitchcock, Jones, Kelly, McCreery, Merrimon, Morrill, of Vermont, Norwood, Ramsey, Ransom, Saulsbury, Scott, Sherman, Wadleigh, and Wright—27.

The centennial year was ushered in with a memorial to Congress from this association asking to have women made voters in the District. 6 This was presented in the Senate by Hon. A. A Sargent and in the House by Hon. S. S. Cox, of New York. Mr. Banks in supporting it recalled the fact that it was one hundred years ago that day that Abigail Adams had written to her husband at that time in the Continental Convention, asking him to give women the power to protect their own rights and predicting a general revolution if justice was denied them.

A hearing was granted in this connection to Matilda Joslyn Gage, Sara A. Spencer, Rev. Olympia Brown, Belva A. Lockwood, and Phoebe W. Couzens:

The Supreme Court having, by its final decision in the case of Virginia L. Minor, in 1875, made hopeless all attempts to secure the protection of women in their citizen's rights under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, the policy of asking for a sixteenth amendment was vigorously resumed in 1877. Mrs. Sara A. Spencer, chairman of work with Congress, received the petitions, and in one day placed 10,000 from 23 States in the hands of the respective members from those States. At the special request of the chairman, Senator Morton, of Indiana, the petitions were sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections although heretofore they had been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

In 1878 another effort was made to get a hearing before Congress itself. Mr. Sargent in the Senate and Mr. Kelley in the House offered the request that the motion be granted. It was voted down in the Senate by 31 nays to 13 yeas. The champions of the resolution were Senators Sargent, Anthony, Burnside, and Davis; those speaking against it were Senators Edmunds, Thurman, and Conkling. Those voting for it were Senators Anthony, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Wisconsin, Davis, Ferry, Hoar, Matthews, Mitchell, Rollins, Sargent, Saunders, and Teller. In the House Mr. Kelly's request to offer the resolution could not be entertained because Mr. Crittenden of Missouri objected. This refusal to grant women an opportunity to plead for their own freedom was more noticeable from the fact that the floor of the House was shortly after to Charles Stuart Parnell, that he might plead the cause of oppressed Ireland.

A hearing before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections was, however, given to 12 women, representing States from Maine to Oregon, in favor of the amendment. Two hearings were

given by the House committee in January, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections gave another hearing to Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker on February 22.

In 1878 a bill to enable women lawyers to practice before the Supreme Court passed the House by a vote of 169 to 87, under the championship of Hon. John M. Glover, of Missouri, but was defeated in the Senate because reported adversely by Senator Edmunds. This was, however, passed in February of the following year, and a week later, March 3, 1879, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood admitted to practice before the Supreme Court.

In 1878 Senator Wadleigh made an adverse report for the Committee on Privileges and Elections, basing his action upon the small number of woman who had asked for the franchise, although at that very session petitions had been received signed by 70,000 and individual letters from 500 women asking to be relieved from political disabilities.

The minority of the committee gave the first favorable report the question received in the Senate. It was dated February 1, 1879, and bore the distinguished names George F. Hoar of Massachusetts; John H. Mitchell, of Oregon, and Angus Cameron, of Wisconsin.

Two other points were gained in 1878. The memorial of Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, and Mrs. Gage, asking for a sixteenth amendment, was read in open Senate.

Mrs. Emeline B. Wells and Mrs. Zena D. Young, of Utah, presented a memorial to Congress setting forth the injury done to Mormon women and children by the law of 1862, which had made 50,000 women outcasts and their children homeless. The result was a law legitimatizing the offspring of plural marriages prior to a certain date.

Miss Anthony, after her famous trial for voting in Rochester, appealed to Congress for remission of the fine which had been imposed on her. Her petition was presented by Senator Sargent January 12, 1874. Senator Edmunds, for the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an adverse report, and Senator Matt. Carpenter made a comprehensive legal argument for the minority. The same was done in the House by Benjamin F. Butler when Mr. Tremaine, of the judiciary, reported unfavorably. Miss Anthony's fine was never remitted and never paid, and thus it stands to this day. The fine imposed upon the inspectors of elections for receiving her vote was remitted by President Grant.

They who claim that women have only to express their desire for the ballot to receive it at the hands of willing men should take note of the petitions which have been thus far referred to. One more great effort was to be made in this line. By an early date in January, 1880, so many petitions had been received that in one week 47 Senators presented petitions signed by over 12,000 women. In

the House unanimous consent could not be obtained, therefore 65 Representatives presented their petitions at the clerk's desk.

In 1880 and 1881 the subject of a special committee in the Senate to look after matters pertaining to woman suffrage had been broached. In 1882 the committee, after the morning hour for eight days had been spent in the discussion of the question, was established in the Senate by a vote of 35 to 23.

A Select Committee on Woman Suffrage was established in the House the same year by a vote of 115 to 84. A lively debate on woman suffrage occurred the following year in connection with the motion by Mr. Warren Keifer, of Ohio, to reestablish it, which was supported by Mr. Belford, of Colorado. Later Mr. John D. White, of Kentucky, moved that the House have a standing committee on the subject. In an able speech supporting his motion he illustrated the disadvantage under which disfranchised woman rests by the case of Anna Ella Carroll, who, with political influence, he said, "would long ago have received every dollar advanced by her to save the nation, and her name would have been honored as Sherman's and Grant's." The motion was lost, and matters relating to woman suffrage in the House have since, as before, gone to the Judiciary Committee.

At every Congress for the last thirty-two years hearings have been had before these committees, and the remarks have been printed and franked by the thousands and sent over the country. The value of this direct work with Congress lies chiefly in its reflex influence over the States. Every favorable report and speech being thus sent broad-cast over the nation is made impressive by the fact that this subject has thus received dignified and courteous attention at the seat of government.

Reports by committees of Congress have been as follows:

IN THE SENATE.

1879. Committee on Privileges and Elections. Majority unfavorable; minority favorable.

1882. Woman Suffrage Committee. Majority favorable. Signed by Senators Lapham, Ferry, Blair, and Anthony.

1884. Woman Suffrage Committee. Signed by Palmer, Blair, Lapham, and Anthony.

1886. Woman Suffrage Committee. Signed by Senators Blair, Palmer, Chace, and Bowen.

1888-1890. Woman Suffrage Committee. Signed by Senators Blair for the committee.

1893. Woman Suffrage Committee. Signed by Senators Warren, Hoar, Allen, and Quay.
1884. Woman Suffrage Committee. Unfavorable. Minority by Senator Brown.
1888. Woman Suffrage Committee. Unfavorable. Minority by Senator Cockrell.
1896. Woman Suffrage Committee. Unfavorable. Minority only by Senators Call and George.

IN THE HOUSE

1883. House Select Committee Favorable report by Mr. White.
1884. House Judiciary Committee. Favorable, minority. Signed by Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine.
1886. House Judiciary Committee. Signed by Ezra B. Taylor, of Ohio; W. P. Hepburn, of Iowa; L. B. Caswell, of Wisconsin, and A. A. Ranney, of Massachusetts.
1890. House Judiciary Committee. Favorable. Majority report. Ezra B. Taylor, chairman.
1994. House Judiciary Committee. Unfavorable. Signed by Mr. Goodnight.

In the reports of 1890, favorable alike from both committees, the sixteenth amendment was for the first time in good standing in both Houses of Congress.

On February 6, 1885, the bill for the sixteenth amendment was taken from the calendar to allow Senator Palmer to speak on it. The masterly argument made on this occasion has been distributed by the tens of thousands all over the country, and is still one of our best documents. In that Congress Senators Palmer, of Michigan; Bowen, of Colorado; Manderson, of Nebraska, and Pike, of New Hampshire, sat on seats a little raised at the extreme end of the Senate. This corner was dubbed Pike's Peak. These Senators had agreed to vote together on various subjects, but Mr. Pike said they would have to count him out on woman suffrage. However, after Mr. Palmer's speech, Mr. Pike was the first to congratulate him and to acknowledge himself converted. Henceforth Pike's Peak was solid for woman suffrage.

The sixteenth amendment was for the last time the direct subject of debate in the Forty-ninth Congress, on December 8, 1886, and January 25, 1887, being advocated by Senators Blair, Dolph,

and Hoar, and opposed by Senators Brown and Vest. On this occasion Mr. Blair had incorporated in his remarks and printed in the Record the arguments made by representatives of this association at the hearings of 1880 and 1884. The bill was defeated by a two-thirds vote.

But the question has come up at different times in various ways, showing the watchfulness of the woman-suffrage leaders and their determination to attack Congress at every point.

9

When the bill for the admission of Washington was pending, Mr. Hoar secured the signatures of 22 Republican Senators, asking the conference committee to provide that all persons who had enjoyed the right of suffrage under any act of the Territorial legislature should be allowed to vote for delegates to the constitutional convention and on the adoption of the constitution. This was for the benefit of the women citizens of Washington, who, having been voters, had been disfranchised by the courts. Although ably advocated by Mr. Hoar and Mr. Blair, this point could not be gained.

In this same year (1889) General Manderson presented two bills in the Senate. One asked for an act of Congress protecting women in their right to vote for Representatives or Delegates to Congress; the other asked for an amendment of the enforcement act of 1870 by inserting the word "sex" before that of "color."

The most important action on woman suffrage was in connection with the admission of Wyoming in 1890. Its admission was opposed nominally on the ground of its having woman suffrage in its constitution. For a long time the bill hung trembling in the balance. Judge Cary, the Wyoming Delegate, did not flinch in the least on the question, although it threatened to delay their statehood. The men of Wyoming telegraphed him to message that they would wait, if need be; that they would not go in as a State without their women. The final vote stood 139 for to 127 against, and in the Senate, after a two days' similar discussion, by a vote of 29 for to 18 against.

The subject of Federal suffrage, was taken up in earnest in this association in 1892, appointing a special committee, with Mrs. Colby chairman, to push this phase of the question. Bills were introduced for it April, 1892, by Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming, and in February, 1894, by Lafe Pence, of Colorado. Memorials asking for this measure were sent in from 87 organizations, including many thousands of people, and a hearing on this subject was given in February, 1894, to Mrs. Sarah Clay Bennett and Mrs. Colby by the Committee on Election of President and Vice-President. Since 1896 this work has been under the chairmanship of Mrs. Bennett, who continually lays before members of Congress memorials and arguments on this subject.

Everything that a disfranchised class could do has been done by women, and never in the long ages in which the love of freedom has been evolving in the human heart has there been such an effort by any other class of people as this here outlined. Surely it ought to win the respect and support of every man in this Republic who has a brain to understand the blessings of liberty and a heart to beat in sympathy with a struggle to obtain it.

While we will work in both State and nation to get such legislation as we may, and to educate public opinion as fast as we can, we will never concede that our right is not embodied in the document which says "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Miss Susan B. Anthony: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask leave to have printed in the report of this hearing certain pages which Mrs. Colby left out in her reading, as the historical record of Congressional action upon this subject is of great importance. I remember ten years ago, when we had a hearing, a gentleman from Ohio, a judge, said to me: "Now, Miss Anthony, if you had only begun this kind of talk before our committees ten years ago you would have the suffrage."

10

Now, I want to say that I have been delegated to tell what has been done by the different legislatures of the whole 45 States. It is impossible to detain the committee to listen to that long array of the hardest kind of work, of tramping through slush and mud and snow and rain, and appearing before the different State legislature to submit a proposition for the striking out of that little monstrous word "male" from the suffrage clause. Now, that little word is good everywhere under the sun except in the suffrage clause, but it is very obnoxious there. I want to ask leave to print the speech in full.

We have just one State in the Union where the experiment of woman's suffrage in the States, what is termed municipal suffrage, has been in existence for the past ten or twelve years, and that State is Kansas. The former president of the State association and the vice-president at large of the Kansas association has prepared a report for presentation, but at the last moment she was unable to be present, and our corresponding secretary, Mrs. Rachael Foster Avery, will read that report. We do not wish to bother the committee with these long reports, but we do wish to put them on record in this the last year of the nineteenth century. It is very important that we should make a landmark now at the close of the nineteenth century, to see where we stand and where our young women will have to start in the twentieth century.

Mrs. Rachael Foster Avery read as follows:

MUNICIPAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN KANSAS. LAURA E. JOHNS, SALINA, KANS.

Just thirteen years ago Kansas celebrated Miss Anthony's birthday after a fashion that delighted her soul more than did the regal banquet at the Riggs House, ten years ago, when she was 70 years young; and even more than the splendid demonstration that marks her 80th birthday. It was on the 15th day of February, 1887, that the governor of Kansas signed the bill which conferred upon the women of the cities of Kansas the privilege of voting in municipal elections. This was a jubilee Miss Anthony herself had helped to prepare, for she had spent many months going up and down in the State, stirring suffrage sentiment that had smoldered for seventeen years, and directing the efforts of the then young Equal Suffrage Association toward the end that women might vote for city officials on the same terms as men. This memorable and fruitful achievement was her first work after as retirement of several years, enforced by her labors on the History of Woman Suffrage.

At the time of the municipal enfranchisement of the women of Kansas no other States had advanced so far along this line. Kansas had given all her women school suffrage eight years before that brave young Territory, Wyoming, gave the full ballot to her woman.

These thirteen years of experience of woman's vote in municipal elections has brought to this measure new friends and new enemies. Its old friends love it more and its old enemies, of the baser sort, hate it harder for what women voters have done and have sought to do. Curiously enough women's ballot is not hated most for the reasons so long exploited by our opposers, namely, neglect of homes and children, loss of moral influence, damage to womanliness, incapacity, bad women, to the fore, et. al., but for reasons far different. They are, 11 in the main, these three: (1) The expression at the ballot box of woman's uncompromising enmity to those city institutions built up and maintained by the vices of men; (2) woman's steady opposition to city revenue from institutions that degrade humanity, and (3) the bitterness of defeat at the hands of women. These characteristics of woman suffrage in operation are irritating to many classes of men, and bring-down their anathema upon woman's enfranchisement. The baser sort look upon woman voters as unwarrantably meddling with their personal liberty; many business men are angered when we succeed in cutting off the revenue that we consider "blood money," but which they hold dear in the delusion that it lowers taxes and makes the city prosperous; while another large class of men grow furious and forswear woman suffrage when woman's votes defeat them, or their friends, or their pet schemes.

On the other hand we have made friends for our cause among the advocates of good government, for many of those who never loved us before love us now for the enemies we have made.

So evident is it that women voters seek to elect men of character, and to bar out men of low morality, that when a defeated candidate has a “bar sinister” on his escutcheon, the general comment is: “The women did it!” And the baser element joins in this cry, and thus does our most ancient enemy testify to woman's effort to use the elective franchise for the correction of municipal evils.

In an important city of the State a strong fight was being made to determine whether or not law should be enforced and government clean and honest. The editor of the leading daily was the leader in this struggle for order, sobriety, and decency. He was unloved by the women because he had opposed woman's enfranchisement, but when his paper came out for civic rightness the women voters came to his support, and on election day, when it was clear that the difficult victory was being won by women, and clearly would have been impossible without them and them enfranchised, he said: “I think we must let these women have the full suffrage. I never saw better organization nor better work. It was as quiet as it was effective, and not the least suggestion of unwomanliness, either. They've been practical in their political work, and without trickery or mudthrowing. I have to confess that in every election when I've tried to make things better, I've had better support from the women voters than from the men.”

I should add there was no question as to the effect of woman's vote to change results in the election in question, because, as in all our larger cities, separate ballot boxes were used to receive the women's ballots; and in this case the men's votes had been counted first and found to give the election to the antilaw and order faction, and a bonfire was lighted. But when the votes of the women were counted the result was reversed—and the bonfire went out. Such incidents are common in most towns of the State.

Women rarely nominations. That is, they rarely present a “woman's ticket,” generally preferring to join with men in securing nominees. There are always to be found men with whom they can work, and who are glad to work with them. Women may have as much to do with nominations as men have. They are themselves to blame if they have not equal voice in choice of nominees; and under our laws, amended since women became voters, we may effect nominations and elections without conspicuousness or “rude jostling at the polls.”

12

It must be said, however, and it is the Jeremiad of all women who have endeavored to better municipal conditions, that we have not been able to provide spinal columns for the invertebrates who get into office in spite of and even by the help of women's votes. But it must be remembered that in Kansas municipal offices confer small honor and no legitimate emoluments, except to clerks

and treasurers in the larger cities. Most of those men for whom women would most delight to vote are busy men. They see no recompense for the time and trouble required by the thankless task of running a city government, and no entreaties can prevail upon them to accept nominations for these places. The truth is that our city offices go begging for better grade men to fill them. Therefore, women must choose candidates from a very limited supply of eligible material. This, in the main, is why municipal woman suffrage has not every time put a man of force and high purpose into every city office in Kansas.

Municipal woman suffrage has proven as much of a success as has manhood suffrage; it serves the highest governmental needs as fully. It is no longer an "experiment," but has passed into a matter of course. It has lost its novelty. The press oftenest mentions the vote in the city elections without making any distinctions as to the male or female vote. We no longer tabulate statistics of the woman vote. During the first half dozen years after we came into this fraction of our rightful heritage the State Historical Society and the State Equal Suffrage Association sent to the city clerks to find out what number of women registered and voted. We found several things to be true: (1) That women voted when they got the chance, whether they had ever asked for the privilege or not; (2) that women came nearer voting their full registration than men did; (3) that the woman voters, taking the State by and large, gained steadily in numbers, notwithstanding that the "novelty" wore off in the same ratio; (4) that the most representative women, viz, the church, club, school, society, and home women, were in the lead in the movement to the polls and constituted the major part of the body of woman voters; (5) that not event those most opposed to the principle per se have been able to point to any damage done to the family, to womanliness, or to the city government; (6) that women have not found the duty burdensome and have no mind to relinquish the privilege of exercising their modicum of the suffrage.

The woman vote in several of our larger cities, in the first three regular elections in which women participated, compared with that of the last election, may prove interesting as showing gain, and also that women vote most numerously when the issue is most important. When both tickets are objectionable from their point of view, many women will not vote at all. This accounts for the fact that one year the woman vote in a given city may be 2,000, and the next year in the same city be only 1,000, though the registration be larger than it was the previous year, when the vote was larger. To their other peculiarities as voters, Kansas women add ticket "scratching." They began that at the beginning, and they hereby challenge Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, and Colorado to show that they are not champion "ticket scratchers" of the earth.

In Atchison in 1887 the woman vote was 300; in 1889, 600; in 1891, 217; in 1899, 1,385.

In Fort Scott in 1887 it was 425; in 1889, 1,250; in 1891, 769; in 1899, 553.

13

In Topeka in 1887 it was 1,049; in 1889, 2,400; in 1891, 2,791; in 1899, 1,471.

In Leavenworth in 1887 it was 2,467; in 1889, 3,500; in 1891, 2,177; in 1899, 2,981.

In Wichita in 1887 it was 238; in 1889, 645; in 1891, 1,308; in 1899, 3,379.

In Kansas city in 1887 it was 1,042; in 1889, 154; in 1891, 1,435; in 1889, 3,863.

We are indebted to the Hon. S. S. King, commissioner of elections in Leavenworth, for the following careful analysis of the last municipal vote in that city:

The total male and female registration and vote at the city election April 4, 1899, was as follows:

Male registration 10,419

White male registration 9,077

White male votes 6,586

Colored male registration 1,342

Colored male votes 722

Female registration 4,804

White female registration 3,920

White female votes 2,666

Colored female registration 884

Colored female votes 397

The foregoing table furnished an interesting study of the voting disposition and the voting power of our colored population. I know of no authentic statement of the proportion of white and colored population in the city since the United States census of 1890. At that time it was given as 33,312

white and 5,004 colored. While the city has grown to about 50,000 it is fair to presume that this proportion has been maintained. Then we have a colored population of 13.1 per cent.

Of our total male and female registration of 15,225, the colored registration was 2,226, equal to 14.6 per cent.

Of 10,419 male registration, 1,342 were colored, equal to 12.9 per cent.

Of 4,804 female registration, 884 were colored, equal to 18.4 per cent.

Of our total number of men and women voting of 10,371, the colored vote was 1,119, equal to 10.8 per cent.

Of 7,308 male vote, 397 were colored, equal to 9.9 per cent.

Of 3,063 female vote, 397 were colored, equal to 12.9 per cent.

Thus it will be seen that the colored vote is not nearly as potent a factor in controlling our elections as is generally supposed. The colored people register much more largely than they vote. The vote in proportion to their registration is much less than the white is. Thus the white male vote is 72.6 per cent of the white male registration; colored male vote is 52.8 per cent of colored male registration; white female vote is 67.7 per cent of white female registration; colored female vote is 44.9 per cent of colored female registration. The great falling off from the colored registration to the colored vote may be accounted for in the fact that the Republican party here uses the Crawford County primary election system in nominating candidates for office who use very persuasive arguments to induce colored men and women to register and attend the primaries. After nomination, by reason of party strength, these candidates feel so secure that less effort is made to get voters out at the election. It has been suggested that the great discrepancy between the colored registration and the colored vote this year is owing to their failure to get a colored candidate on the ticket. This explanation would be more satisfactory only for the fact that the discrepancy always appears.

Attention is called to an interesting phase of this question. As shown in the above table, 7,308 men and 3,063 women voted, making a total of 10,371. By reference to the official canvass we find that of those voting 273 men and 269 women refused to vote for either candidate for mayor; 745 men and 692 women; refused to vote for either candidate for city clerk; 857 men and 844 women refused to vote for either candidate for city attorney; 996 men and 776 women refused to vote for either candidate for city treasurer—one of the candidates being woman. As the women who voted were less than half as many as men, yet were almost equal to the men in the number dissatisfied with

party candidates, it follows that they are more particular than men in their choice of officers, or less bound by partisan fealty.

14

What class of women voted? [he says.] The opponents of woman suffrage insist that the lower classes freely exercise the franchise, while the higher classes generally refrain from voting. I will not undertake to designate which are the lower and which are the higher classes, as that must be left for each individual judgment. As women in registering usually give their vocation as "housekeeper" it is impossible to learn from their record which particular ledge of the social strata they stand upon. Therefore, in order to locate women as to trades, business, etc., I give them the positions occupied by their husbands and fathers. I take the seventeenth voting precinct (there are 34 precincts in the city) as a typical one. It is about an average in voting population, in the proportion of white and colored men and women, in the diversified industries. The 149 white women who registered in this precinct, as indicated by the vocations of their husbands, fathers, etc., would be classified thus; the trades (all classes of skilled labor), 32; the professions, 26; merchants (all manner of dealers, 16; laborers (unskilled), 15; clerks, 10; public officers, 8; bankers and brokers, 7; salesmen, 5; contractors, 2; bookkeepers, 2; foremen, 2; paymaster, 1; unclassified, 16. These 16 are largely widows occupying their own homes, and by no rule could be designated as among the lower classes. Thus, if the opponents of woman suffrage, by the term "lower classes," mean to classify accordingly to some ill-defined rule of elite society, the example given above would be a complete refutation. If by "lower classes" they mean the immoral and dissolute, the refutation appears to be still more complete, for the seventeenth precinct is particularly free from these elements, and its female registration considerably above the average.

During thirteen years women have been elected to fill all the offices in some dozen and a half cities. Our women mayors have been remarkably successful and satisfactory. They have nearly always been elected for some specified purposes, and have never yet failed to make good their promises to their constituents. But there seem to be but few aspirants to office among our women. That kind of a bee troubles our bonnets but little. We have now here and there a few women serving on city councils, or as city clerks and treasurers. In the larger cities these offices are salaried, and are much sought after by men. Miss Elliot, daughter of an old soldier who lost his life in the Philippines, is city clerk of Coffeyville; Miss Cora Wales is city clerk of Lincoln—it is said it took a "baker's dozen" of years to elect her. She is the first woman ever elected to any of the offices of that county seat. Many women serve on school boards, and of our 105 county superintendents of public instruction we have had as many as 26 women. Several counties have elected women as registers of deeds. At present Miss Bertha Picket is treasurer of Lane County, and Miss Kate E. Johnson holds the same office in Norton County; and so we have demonstrated (1) that women may and do hold offices for

which no woman can vote, and (2) that enfranchisement of women does not defraud the home nor depopulate the country by thrusting the mothers into office.

One of the delegates to the Woman Suffrage Convention now assembled in Washington is an ex-mayor of one of our cities. She was twice elected, and could have broken the record by serving a third term had she not declined the honor.

The very honorable office of State librarian, is, for the first time in the history of the State, filled by a woman, the distinguished Mrs. Annie L. Diggs, also in attendance at the convention aforementioned.

I dare affirm that women exhibit more independence in voting than men do. This is particularly noticeable whenever unpopular moral issues are at stake, and is due, doubtless, to woman's devotedness to what she deems duty, and to her desire to make the municipality a safe place for the bringing up of her children. There is no great number of women snared by the entanglement of business, or allured by political ambition, or swayed by party power. Women are freer than men as voters and always will be.

15

Our women voters evidence as much as political sagacity, as men do, and often more purpose. It does not appear that women voters are more often deceived as to the integrity or fitness of candidates. They are equally as quick to interest themselves in public improvements. They often make a spirited campaign for better lighting, waterworks, paving, etc. Sanitary measures always rouse the interest of the "housekeeping" voters. Questions of the betterment of public schools and school buildings always sets the woman voter to work. Appropos of this the Topeka State Journal had the following to say:

The proposition to vote \$30,000 to pay a public school deficit was also carried by the vote of the female suffragists. From start to finish it was a glorious victory for the women of Topeka, and today they are quietly celebrating in their homes. They combat the idea that they were in any way influenced by their husband or that political prejudices in any way affected them in their vote for city officials.

Woman's enfranchisement, though only partial in Kansas, has helped to round out and complete her education. Kansas women could not pass through thirteen years' experience of municipal suffrage and remain the "exquisite infants" of tradition. Responsibility has developed them as citizens. Experience has enriched and enlightened them. They have learned much about the springs of political action, and if their respect for lawmakers and executives has not increased, their judgment has ripened; so that they are not now, by any means, "innocents abroad" when they act in the

political arena. Their outlook is widened; the scope of their activities is larger; their world is bigger, and so are they because of their ballots. If there is one thing more noticeable than another to one who has studied Kansas women for seventeen years, it is the fact of their marvelous broadening. I think these realities create an atmosphere distinctly felt by those conservative women who are constantly coming into the State to make their homes here. The studies pursued by our woman's clubs are significant. It would be safe to say that there's scarce a town in the State but has its one to thirty woman's literary or reform clubs. Besides much purely literary work and work for woman's enfranchisement and her enforcement of the prohibitory law, beautifying of schoolrooms and grounds, street cleaning, kindergartens and charities, these clubs study political economy, history, and sociology. They try to get at the principles of government and from them to reason out the solution of municipal problems. Who can measure how much it is to the State to have those who are the heart of the home thinking, learning, and building along these lines? Who can tell what it will be to every interest when this force makes its inevitable mark upon the citizen of to-morrow?

To sum it up in brief: The women of the cities of Kansas have entered the partially opened door of the suffrage to the credit of woman suffrage.

That door will be shut. It only waits the ripeness of time to open wide.

Miss Susan B. Anthony. Allow me to say the committee that the Kansas woman who was expected to be here to read this paper has been twice elected mayor, and she would have been elected the third time but she refused to allow her name to stand for office again. I wanted to show you a woman who had really been the mayor of a city, and I am very much disappointed that she did not come this morning.

Now, we have given you something of the result of partial suffrage, 16 and I am very happy to say that we have with us a woman who possesses the full right to vote, and who at the last Presidential election cast her ballot for or against one or the other of the candidates for the Presidency, or their electors. I present to you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Mrs. Mary C. Bradford, of Denver, who will present to us something that has been done by the women in that Centennial State.

Mrs. Mary C. Bradford. Perhaps no greater compliment has ever been paid by man to woman than that of expecting her to transform imperfection into perfection, and to neutralize the evil effects of centuries of mistakes in the decades that have passed since real civilization has been possible. Perfect conditions presuppose a complete basis. The masculine half of humanity has expressed itself through governmental forms, and the resulting civilization has naturally been a success along the lines in which men are strongest. Equally naturally the defects of their virtues have embodied themselves in the social structure. This half civilization is not a human civilization. Humanity is dual

—man and woman—and the true civilization must express the complete humanity. Feminine self-expression, not masculine, but human, should be the aim.

At last the world has grown to see this. Ever increasing opportunities of feminine expression have been given, until across the sea in South Australia and New Zealand women live on terms of perfect equality with men, and in four States of the Union their nature and their view point is beginning to be incorporated into civil institutions.

The questions are often asked, “What have you done with the ballot? Have you purified politics? Have you bettered public service? Have abuses been abolished?” and a series of inquiries follow that, were each to be answered in the affirmative, the implication would be that a woman's suffrage State was little short of heaven on earth.

No, the enfranchised States do not exhibit paradisaical conditions. Man and woman are still human. Being such they can not equal politically the feat of the Indian magician, who causes a tree to come to full growth while you wait. The tree of life, politically speaking, is of small stature yet. Indeed, only a few healthy shoots show that the seed lately planted has been of a better order than that formerly employed for this kind of forestry.

Metaphors aside, conditions are beginning to improve in the enfranchised States. The story of Wyoming is so familiar that to retell it here is unnecessary, but the results in my own State are not quite so well known, and even when reported by those who know most about them have sometimes been nullified in the public mind by the irresponsible statements of disappointed politicians, men who have realized lost prestige and power through the changed constituency, and that class possessed of atrophied intellects, to whom every new truth or new aspect of affairs comes as painful shock.

What have we done? We have made the polls fit places for decent men as well as decent women to go to, and if all that the men tell us about the conditions of the polls on election day, before women had the ballot, be true, they are fit places for neither men nor women who believed that an election was in essence the sacrament of citizenship; the renewing of the oath of obligation that unifies the people of a community and makes them understand what it is to deserve the name of citizens. Exactly that has happened in Colorado and the other enfranchised 17 States that any student of history would have looked for. Whenever the influence of woman has been extended, whenever she has taken her place side by side with man, wherever, and whenever, in fact, the Turkish idea of seclusion has given way to the American idea of participation, the things that were dreaded for her have been banished by the simple fact of her presence. The same things has happened on election day, at the polls, in the primaries, at the conventions, and in the holding of office, that happens in a

mining camp when women first came in; that happens on the frontier when the wives and children begin to make their appearance and homes are set up. The whole atmosphere changes.

It is a fact in nature that men are at their best in the presence of women, and woman most truly feminine when associate with men, and so I have seen many polling place where, owing to the presence of the women judges and clerks of election who shared such positions and duties with men, the walls have been bright with bunting and the air fragrant with flowers. I have seen a mother standing in line, many of them, holding by the hand a little child, with whom, after the duty of expressing her political convictions has been performed, she would go to school. I have seen gray haired mothers assisted from a carriage by grown sons, and the young husband and wife going to the polls and rejoicing that even here they need not be separated.

I have been in the primaries in the parlors of some of the loveliest homes in Denver, and I have watched proceedings of this sole survival of the Saxon folk-mote and the New England town meeting, the last remnant of purely democratic government that exists, conducted in places not so lovely and where the voters belonged to Lincoln's well-beloved "plain people," and I have heard rough voices softened and have seen burly forms courteously arise when the woman voters at the primary appear. Now, if you even partially purify the primary, you have gone a long way toward leavening the political light of the community, for, as you gentlemen well know, strictly speaking, most matters are settled in the primary, and all that afterwards appears is but the flowering of the purpose there conceived.

With two exceptions the conventions in Denver have been orderly and enjoyable assemblies to visit since 1893, when women first had the right of serving in them. Twice since then, at the last moment, it had been necessary to remove the name of a candidate because the women candidates have heard of his proposed nomination and demanded that his place be filled by someone possessing higher standards of public morality.

There is nothing of the anarchist about the woman voter as I know her in my own or any of the other enfranchised States. She does not condone even that phase of practical anarchy which submits without protest to the violation of law. Is the law good? Enforce it, and give the community the full benefits of all its possibilities. Is the law bad? Nevertheless, enforce it until public opinion shall have realized that its repeal should become a fact.

When the little son of a woman voter looks up at her asks, "Mamma, didn't you say there was a law against the shops being open on Sunday?" And she answers "Yes," and he looks at the open door and says, "Then it isn't a bad thing to disobey the law, is it? It doesn't make any difference whether you mind the law or not?" she is very apt to go home and do some hard thinking, call on a lot of

other 18 women, and inform them of her predicament. The probability is, that the next day the particular officials intrusted with the enforcement of that particular law will receive a visit from a sufficient number of mothers to make them realize that woman's suffrage is a condition and not a theory. And this kind of practical anarchy is beginning to die out. Laws are broken in Colorado, my friends, plenty of them, but they are better enforced than they used to be. The public conscience is more responsive to the sacredness of law. We have taken a few steps forward.

As to new laws, good laws, wise laws, not a few have been passed since 1893 as a direct result of suffrage. Some of them have originated solely in the women's organizations, having been introduced at the request of women by women legislators in Colorado. Before 1893 we had no State home for dependent children. Senate bill No. 1 of the very first session of the legislature convened after the enfranchisement of women, was a bill entitled, "An act to create a State home for dependent children." In a few weeks the bill was a law, and for years the home has been a divine fact of the Commonwealth of Colorado, a place where the children have not only been fed and clothed, and cared for, but loved and mothered, because the mothers of Colorado had decreed that the great State whose robes are of snow and gold, whose crown is the vast hallowed sapphire that we call the sky, and whose soul is freedom, should be a mother to every child who needed the shelter of her great heart. The State Industrial School for Girls is another product of the "I will" of Colorado women. Since then those words have meant that, in addition to the influence she possessed before, she has added power, and that in addition to being the power behind the throne, she has become the power that shares the throne.

The first bill in the history of the world to be introduced in a lawmaking body by a woman law maker was a bill to raise the age of protection of girls to 18 years. Until the men of Colorado said to their mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters, "Stand with us in all things; as we have been heart high let us now be bairn high, and share with us the right to have your opinion counted," the Colorado woman was not the joint guardian of her husband, of her own child, now she is. The women have stood for civil-service reform and have succeeded in educating public opinion on this point sufficiently to justify the belief that in the near future the merit system may prevail. The woman voter has often been accused of taking herself too seriously, and it is true that she did not enter lightly upon her new duties. The average woman, when enfranchised, had reached that supreme height of knowledge beyond which the philosopher said we can not go, she knew that she knew nothing at all. And she set to work to study. The leading bookseller of Denver is authority for the statement that in the first few months succeeding the enfranchisement of woman he sold fifteen times as many books upon political history, political science, political economy, parliamentary law, and kindred topic than he had disposed of during the preceding ten years.

The woman voter has really tried to fit herself for her duties. Scientific municipalism, despite its terrifying name, is a favorite subject of study in Colorado organizations of women, and many ordinance relating to the health of Denver are directly traceable to the efforts of the women, notably the ordinance compelling the use of smoke consumers in the principal buildings and the antisputting ordinance. 19 In proportion to the number of women voters in my State a larger percentage of women than men vote. At the two elections, with the details of which I am most conversant, one a State and the other a county election, the percentage of the woman vote was as follows: In the State, 51 per cent; in the county of Arapahoe, 52 per cent; yet, taking the whole State, there are 30,000 more men than women voters.

Before the granting of suffrage to women there were three counties in Colorado, which, under the workings of the local option law, had secured prohibition, now there are twenty-three.

There has been no great lust for office among the women, there never having been more than three women at a time in the house of representatives nor more than one woman State official—the superintendent of public instruction. Thirty of the counties have women superintendents of schools. One county has possessed a woman county clerk, and the first woman county treasurer has just entered upon the duties of her office. In none of the positions that she has occupied has the Colorado woman failed either in ability or integrity. Said a member of the last legislature at a public meeting, in reference to a certain bill involving a marked distinction between right and wrong, “There were only three members in the house about whose votes there was never a shadow of a doubt, and those three were the women. Every man of us knew that they would keep their anteclection pledges and vote on the side of righteousness.” But, when all is said, the most marked results are to be found in the character of the women themselves. The Colorado woman is stronger to-day than she was six years ago. She is broader, deeper, truer in every relation of life. She knows that, speaking scientifically, speaking absolutely, no mother's girl is safe, no mother's boy is safe, until every mother's boy and girl are safe, and she tries to hasten the day when such governmental conditions may obtain in the larger homes, the city, the county, the State, as will not completely neutralize the teachings she gives within the four walls of her individual home. She has learned to know that veritably those who live in one community are members one of another. She keeps abreast of the times because responsibility is the supreme educator, and she is more helpful to her child in his student life, to her husband in his business life, because she is also faithful to her country.

Of mothers like these there will not in the future be born men so illy adapted to their environments that they can not make a success in life. The true republic is simply the expression of absolute freedom, and the true republic will never have to answer the question that is asked of our half

Republic to-day, Will it live? When we incarnate the love of the woman, as well as the wisdom of the man, when we add her subtlety, tenderness, patience, dexterity, and mastery of detail to his splendid volition, generalizing scope, and creative energy, we shall have the human civilization, we shall be mothered as well as fathered. And the beginnings of this day of freedom may be seen on the heights where freedom, now as of old, loves to dwell. It is only sunrise, it is true, but it is the dawn of a day that when its sun shall have reached the zenith will show us the full possibility of a humanity that will express the meaning of the Holy City, a humanity that, because completely unified, will know itself divine. [Applause.]

Miss Susan B. Anthony. We have now had a presentation of the workings of municipal suffrage and of full suffrage in this country. 20 I will next present to you the subject of women in English politics, and though the person who is to address you was not born in England, but in this country, and is the daughter of the woman who signed the first proclamation of freedom and equality for women, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, she by marriage is an English subject; by birth she is a citizen of this Republic. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch will tell us of women in English politics, and there is no native-born English woman who has studied English politics more thoroughly than Mrs. Blatch.

Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Miss Anthony introduced me as partly English and partly American. There was an English friend of mine who on one occasion was listening to me speak, and he said that I mixed my pronouns so that he could not make out whether I considered myself as belonging to the land of my marriage or the land of my birth, so I watched myself after that and I found that this was my rule of grammar, that whenever I spoke of the virtues of America or England I said "our;" and whenever I spoke of the vices of England or America I said "your." Now, as I have a chance to stand in the position of claiming the virtues of both countries and of disclaiming their vices, why should I not do it?

We have heard about the suffrage in the West in America, and the reply always is: "Oh, that is all very well for that thinly populated country." But now I am going to tell you a little of the suffrage question in England, which is not a thinly populated country, with its 20,000,000 of people crowded in that small space.

Gentlemen of the committee, I would like to draw your attention to one thing, which is true in America as well as in England, and that is that nothing has been given to women gratuitously. They have had at each step to prove their ability before you gave them anything else. For the first time, in 1870, England passed a law, the education act of that year, which gave women the right to sit on the school boards and to vote for the school boards. It was the first time they had had elective school boards in England; before that all the education in England had been controlled by the church organizations, and there had been appointed boards of managers. Now, the women had been

appointed to those boards of managers by the church organizations. So admirable had their work been that when the law was passed in 1870 many women stood for election on the elective boards and were elected, and in three cases they came in at the head of the polls. Five years after that a verdict was passed upon the work of those women as school officials. In that year, 1875, women were allowed to go on the poor-law boards. In 1894 the poor law was further modified so that it contemplated the possibility of a larger circle of guardians. Before that, in 1875, there had been a high qualification—occupation of a house of a certain rental, etc. In 1894 that was all pushed aside. What was the result? Nearly one thousand women are now sitting on the poor-law boards of England; 94 on the great board of London itself.

Now, those of you who are familiar with the unfortunate history of the poor law in England know what an immense army there is in the pauper class, and can realize what responsibility rests upon the members of those local boards. They deal with the great asylums, the county asylums; they deal with the great pauper schools; they deal with the immense poorhouses, and, more than that, they deal with one of the largest funds in England, the outdoor and indoor relief. What has been the verdict of England upon the work of 21 those women on the poor-law board? In 1896 there was the question, when this law was extended to Ireland, whether women should be put on those boards. The vote in Parliament was 272 for the women being on the boards and only 8 against. Eight men only, so unwise, so foolish, left in the great English Parliament, who said it was not for women to deal with those immense bodies of pauper children, not for women to deal with this outdoor relief fund, not for women to deal with the unfortunate sisters or mothers of illegitimate children. Only eight unwise men left in Parliament! I think really that those eight men must have belonged to the great grumbling class, like the husband of a friend of mine. She was telling me about an earthquake that had knocked her house all to pieces—the terrible experience she had had—and she said it was the most delightful day of her life. In some surprise I asked her why, and she said, “Because it was the first time that anything happened in my home that my husband did not hold me responsible for it.” [Laughter.]

Now, those eight men looked about and held women responsible for everything that had done wrong on that school board, or any board, and therefore they voted against the women, but 272 men of the English Parliament voted in their favor. [Applause.]

In regard to the building up of local government in England, on the district councils and on the parish councils women have been added and allowed to sit there with the same qualifications as men. They at one time sat on the great county councils. In London three women were elected to the county councils, but the law had not definitely specified in 1888 that they might sit there, so Lady Sandhurst had the misfortune to defeat some cantankerous man, and he sued for his place and got it because

the law had not mentioned women. But, gentlemen, those women had sat there already and had done such valuable work that the London county council, which really corresponds to one of our city governments—it governs a people of 3,000,000—petitioned Parliament to change the law, so they now have the women back again on the county council. [Applause.]

Now, I dare say, as members of a great representative body, you value the work of the quiet member, the silent member, the man who is not always talking on the floor of the House. There is room for such people, and I daresay there is more than enough room. It is not occupied at all. But where women go on these local boards they have proved themselves exactly that in English life—the silent members, the working members, the members who have been thorough in detail, who do admirable work in committees, every time.

Now, turn to the matter of voting. Women in England, qualified women, have every local vote, everything that would correspond with our State vote, our municipal vote, except the Parliament vote. I would like to repeat that with emphasis. Every qualified woman in England has every local vote, every vote except the Parliament vote. There is an impression here in America—and really among some people in England—that only spinsters and widows can vote in England, while the fact is that the qualification is such that often a wife can not get the vote. She is to be an occupier, and naturally, if she is living with her husband, of course he is the occupier, the recognized head of the house. But in many of the large industrial districts workingmen, skilled artisans, desiring to avoid jury duty, let the wife take the cottage in her name, so the wife becomes the voter and the man gets rid of his jury duty. The idea that marriage and voting are in some way mixed up is very general in England.

I was canvassing in Hampshire at one of the Parliamentary elections not long ago, and I went to an old woman's house—I thought it was her house; I thought the son was the father; I did not know there was a husband—and I asked about the vote of the son. I wanted to canvass him and give him a little political instruction, and the woman said to me, "E ain't got no vote; 'e ain't married"—the fact being that the son lived with the father and mother, and the rent of the house not being high enough to cover two votes, the son had no vote.

In England we have opponents, just as you have here, but I do not know whether they are more illogical or less so. But they certainly do one extraordinary thing—they are in favor of everything that has been won and take advantage of it. A large number of the 2,000 women who are sitting on the various local bodies in England are opposed to the Parliament vote for their sex. They are really in political life; and, gentlemen, if you want to have the women stop coming here, give us the vote and

then we won't come; give the antis the vote and then they will have the political life that they are really longing for. [Applause.]

Surely, I think, almost always, if you analyze the antisuffrage idea in either a man or a woman, it is antidemocratic. I have begun to believe that I am the only good democrat left in America. I believe in the very widest possible suffrage. Why do I believe it? Because I have lived and seen the other thing in England, and I have seen that as democracy broadened in England politics purified every time. That has been the history right from the beginning of the century. No politics in the world were more corrupt than English politics at the beginning of this century, but as democracy has come farther and farther into the political field England has become one of the politically purest nations in the world. [Applause.]

Miss Susan B. Anthony. We have a paper prepared by an English woman, the editor of the English Woman's Review, Miss Helen Blackburn, with regard to the British Isles, New Zealand, and South and West Australia, where women are voting, and I want to ask that that little part shall be added in the printed report of this hearing, as Mrs. Blatch did not want to take more time than to talk of English politics.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN THE BRITISH ISLES—THE LESSON OF A CENTURY.

Miss Helen Blackburn. At the opening of the nineteenth century there was nothing in any act of Parliament, or in any local characters granting electoral privileges, which barred women from voting for members of Parliament. The qualifications of voters were always expressed in generic terms.

(The earliest statutes regulating the election of Knights of the Shire (7 Henry IV, c. 15) expressly mentions suitors as persons qualified to be electors, suitors being freemen who owed suit to the country court.

The next statute on the subject (10 Henry IV, c. 2) uses the words "people dwelling in the county and having freehold of 40 shillings."

The 7th and 8th William III, c. 25, uses the words "all freeholders there and then present." The act 18 George II, c. 18, says no person shall vote without having a freehold estate of 40 shilling, while the old charters of boroughs used such terms as "inhabitants paying 23 scot and lot." "Burgesses, freemen, and inhabitants being householders and not receiving alms." "Citizens and freemen," and so forth.)

As regards parochial offices—vestries, by common law—consisted of minister and parishioners paying scot and lot. This was changed by later legislation to persons rated to relief of the poor (13 and 14 V, c. 41).¹

1 Women have been eligible as overseers since the act of Queen Elizabeth (43 Eliz, ch. 2), which enacted that overseers be appointed from “substantial householders.”

Nevertheless, though there was no bar at law, custom had created a strong barrier and great discouragement to all women against their taking part in any public duties. Many influences had combined through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to bring this about, and the civic rights women had possessed from early times were suffered to pass into oblivion and disuse; so that the mere suggestion of a woman voting was looked on as a sort of absurdity.

Opportunities for university education, or even classes for higher education, did not exist for women when the nineteenth century began. Here and there the exceptionally able daughter of an exceptionally liberal-minded father might be found pursuing higher studies at home, along with her brothers, but even so they were taught to keep their attainments as hidden as possible, and for the mass of women there was no solid instruction of any kind available. The occupations of women outside domestic service were limited to needlework and teaching, and even for these no means of training were provided.

The property of a married woman was entirely in the hands of her husband unless fenced about by marriage settlements. In that case the management of her inheritance was intrusted, not to her, but to a trustee. Her earnings could be claimed by her husband, and she could not bequeath her property except with his authority. Her rights to the custody of her children were nil.

To ignore the duties and responsibilities of women to the state was not inconsistent with such a condition of affairs. When women were held to be incapable of following any serious pursuit which required education and training, and to be devoid of responsibility in regard to the management of their own family and their own property, there was a show of reason in refusing them the franchise on the ground that they were so placed as to have no wills of their own. The representation of the people act of 1832 really reflected the general attitude of public opinion of that day when it made the innovation of introducing the qualifying term “male person” in defining the new franchises enacted by its provisions. That act gave the force of law to a limitation which hitherto had received only the sanction of custom.

But if the nineteenth century learned that lesson from the spirit of the eighteenth, what lesson has the twentieth century to learn from the spirit of the nineteenth? Surely a very different one.

How different may be to some degree estimated by a glance over the steps, which one by one have widened the energies and raised the status of women in their educational, industrial, legal, and political relations during the past fifty years; for it was not till toward the middle of the century that the undercurrent of disconnect with the narrow scope of women's lives, which had gradually gained strength in the minds of many thoughtful persons, manifested itself in definite action.

24

The legislation of the first reformed Parliament was retrogressive as regards women. The ancient right of a widow to one-third of her husband's estate as dower was taken away in 1833 (3 and 4 William IV, c. 105). The municipal corporation act of 1835 (5 and 6 William IV, c. 76) followed the example of the representation of the people act, and, notwithstanding the generic terms used in all the old charters, restricted the municipal franchise to male persons.

The earliest legislative restriction of the industrial work of women was in the coal mines regulation act of 1842, when the manifest unsuitability of work in the mines for women obscured the disadvantage of dealing with industrial hardships by disabling legislation, and women's work underground was prohibited.¹

1 Subsequent factory acts, consolidated and extended in 1878, and amended in 1891 and 1895, have enacted restrictions on women's labor as regards hours of work, and of overtime and prohibition of work at night, but these are rather disabling than enabling enactments.

The first statutory enactment of the century for the relief of women was the act commonly known as Talfourd's Act (2 and 3 V., c. 54), by which the lord chancellor is empowered to grant the custody of her child to the mother up to the age of 7 years.

It was at the close of the "forties" that the first colleges were opened for women, and Queen's College (opened in 1848), and Bedford College (in 1849), both in London, provided places of instruction where women received professional teaching. The schools of art, which were established throughout the country as a result of the great industrial exhibition of 1851, were everywhere open to women. The interest created by Miss Nightingale and her band of nurses in the Crimean war opened the way to a properly organized system of nursing and proper training for nurses.

Meantime the great hardships of the law relating to married women were arousing widespread attention, and in 1855 petitions, signed in large numbers all over the country, started the agitation for the improvement in the married women's property laws, which were effected in course of time by the acts of 1870, 1874, and 1882.

Side by side with this the necessity for more remunerative work for women was increasingly felt, owing in part to the development of the factory system, in part to the disparity between the numbers of men and women in the country, which was one of the results of the emigration of men to the colonies. In 1900, when every large town in England has its technical schools, open equally to men and women, besides domestic-economy schools and classes in connection with town or county councils, it seems striking to look back on the class for bookkeeping for girls, opened by the Society for the Employment of Women, in London, in 1860, and to remember that that was the only class in the Kingdom where girls could receive proper technical training in book keeping.

In 1866-67 the representation of the people bill for extending the franchise to householders in boroughs centered the attention of the pioneer workers for women on the effort to obtain the political voice, which lies at the root of any lasting improvement, and an organized movement was begun which has worked continuously from that time forward. The first fruits of that organized movement were visible in the municipal-reform act of 1869, when the lost right of women to the municipal franchise was restored (32, 33 Vic., c. 55). Then in the following 25 year the school-board system was inaugurated and women placed on the same footing as men both in regard to electing and being elected. That year of 1870 also saw the first married women's property act (33, 34 Vic, c. 93), an act which fell short in many respects of the bill that had been proposed, but which, nevertheless, gave all married women complete control over their own earnings.

In 1875 the efforts of some earnest-minded women to improve the treatment of the poor in our workhouse led to the revival of their too long forgotten right to be elected as guardians of the poor. One lady was elected in that year; in this year (1900) the number of women guardians, though still few in comparison to the whole number, is just about 1,000.

In 1876 the medical-qualification act(39 and 40 V., c. 41) removed restrictions against granting women the qualifications necessary for registration as medical practitioners.

In 1878 London University obtained a new charter to enable it to confer degrees on women, and the best comment on that step is that now (in 1900) over 1,100 women are graduates of that University, while the Victoria University, the Royal Irish, the Welsh, and Scottish universities bring up the total of women who are university graduates in the British Isles to a little over 2,000, and 1,500 more hold certificates from Oxford and Cambridge universities.

In 1881 the Isle of Man gave women property holders votes for the election of its ancient legislature—the House of Keys. This was extended to woman ratepayers in 1892.

In 1882 the married women's property act (45 and 46 V., ch. 75) consolidated and amended the acts of 1870 and 1874 and enabled a married woman to acquire property, dispose of it by will, enter into contracts, sue and be sued, as fully as if she were unmarried.

In 1886 the guardianship of infants act (49 and 50 V., ch. 27) greatly improved the status of mothers by making the surviving mother joint guardian in addition to any appointed by the father, and also by enabling her to appoint a guardian to act in case of the father's death or incapacity.

In 1888 and 1894 the local government acts (51, 52 Vic., ch. 41, creating county councils, and 56, to 57 Vic., 73, which was supplementary thereto) added county, district, and parish councils to the local administrative bodies in which women could vote. The latter act rendered them eligible as members of district and parish councils.

In 1895 the first woman factory inspector was appointed and the number has been gradually increased to 6; moreover women have been increasingly appointed as sanitary inspectors, and in the educational department women are inspectors of needlework and cookery.

In 1896 women were made eligible as poor-law guardians in Ireland (59 Vic., ch. 5), while in 1898 the Irish local government act (61, 62 Vic., ch. 37), by which the system of local administration in Ireland was recognized, gave to women in Ireland all the local franchises and rendered them eligible for rural and urban district councils, and already between eighty and ninety women are serving as district councilors and poor-law guardians.

Though the lesson the eighteenth century bequeathed was that women had no independent influence, and therefore were incapable of being intrusted with representation, the nineteenth century has gradually learned a quite different experience, and the lesson it bequeaths is that 26 women have a large amount of well-proved capacity for taking a proportionate share in the many-sided activities of civilized communities.

Therefore, unless representation in the twentieth century ceases to reflect the spirit of the time, women will be enfranchised, and that speedily.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Jessie Cassidy Saunders. —In various forms and in different degrees woman suffrage is already established in the larger part of the Continent of Europe and in nearly all parts of the British colonies.

The women of Denmark, Holland, and Belgium are beginning organizations to agitate for the political franchise. In Greece and Italy, Spain and Portugal, education and the general development are not so far advanced, but the atmosphere is becoming affected by the conditions in more progressive countries, and the women of southern Europe will one day follow the example of their sisters farther north. The women of Turkey, of the harem, are indeed the only women in Europe who as a whole, are entirely content with things as they are, but Turkey is more truly Asiatic than European.

The political agitation in Europe which marked the middle of the century just closing resulted in some cases in new constitutions being adopted or new laws being passed, and so effecting compromises between the ancient forms of government and the modern demand for individual representation. As property holders, in some cases, notably in the German and Austrian empires, women also have profited by these changes. In other cases direct agitation has secured women a greater or less degree of suffrage.

In both the German and Austrian empires while certain classes of women have some degree of suffrage, they can exercise it only by a masculine proxy, nor are they eligible to any elective office. As the proxy is free to cast the vote according to his judgement, neither empire shows any results due to woman suffrage.

Norway is rather more liberal. She grants woman school suffrage and permits her to vote in person, if she pays the school tax, and in the country districts also allows her to vote on school questions not involving expenditure, if she has children, even though she pays no school tax. Women may be elected members of school boards, and in this capacity are doing excellent work wherever elected.

Sweden allows women to vote on all question in the rural communes, if they have the required property qualifications, so long as they remain unmarried. They also vote indirectly for the members of the Upper House of the Swedish Parliament. They are eligible to the municipal poor-relief committees and to the school board of Stockholm.

Finland goes one step further and allows women ratepayers to vote both in rural communes and town elections, if either unmarried, widowed, or divorced. They are eligible to the office of guardian of the poor.

Iceland also permits widows and unmarried women to vote in the rural communes. Information is not forthcoming regarding the eligibility of women in Iceland. Probably in that thrifty rural island schools are small easily managed and poor-law guardians may be unnecessary.

Russia brings us back to a condition partly similar to that in Germany 27 many and Austria. The women of the upper classes and of the nobility vote by masculine proxy, so that their suffrages have not produced any characteristic results. But a peasant woman, if she be the real or temporary head of a household, can vote and speak in the meeting of the rural assembly, or mir. The Coming Nation gives the following account of the effect of woman suffrage in one section of Russia:

A veritable little state, inhabited and governed almost entirely by women, exists in the province of Smolensk, in western central Russia. It is about 10 miles square and contains a large number of populous villages, and the region is one of the most fertile in the Czar's domain.

In that part of Russia it is called "Women's kingdom," because the male population, almost to a man, emigrates en masse each springtime to Moscow and the other great cities not far distant in search of employment. The most remarkable feature of this "Women's kingdom" is that the government of the various villages is entirely in the hands of the sisters, wives, and mothers of the absent men, and remain so, in many cases, even after the men have returned. Each town has its "lady mayoress," who presides at all meetings of the village council, and whose members are likewise women.

Questions of public interest are debated and decided upon as in other legislative assemblies, and there is no more jealousy and bickering than is ordinarily the case when the legislative body is composed of men.

The political and financial condition of the "Women's kingdom" is as flourishing as that of any province in the Empire. It is a curious fact that in most other provinces in Russia there is said to be bribery and corruption on every hand, and a public office is considered a legitimate source of plunder. But among these women "purity in politics" is the rule.

France has recently given women engaged in trade or commerce on their own account, provided also they are not married or are widows, the right to vote for judges of the tribunals of commerce. The grant was made in 1898, and, considering the strength of French prejudice against political equality for women, the first election was most satisfactory.

The total number of persons in Paris whose names are on the register as qualified to vote for judges of the tribunals of commerce, taking men and women together, is 50,188. Of the whole number 14 per cent voted; but of the women entitled to vote 33 per cent voted.

In some towns, it is said, no women have registered; in others, a good many. Doubtless it will be found that in some towns there was a contest over the election of a judge of the tribunal of commerce, while in other towns there was none, there being perhaps only one candidate in the field.

The women voted most numerously in the mairies of the Halles and of the Louvre. At the latter the presiding officer remarked that the women voted as if they had been doing it all their lives.

At each mairie, besides the presiding officer, who is either the mayor or his delegate, four assessors are chosen from among the voters, the two oldest and two youngest present when the office opened, and at Fontainebleau the arrangement resulted in four women being the assessors.—Alice Stone Blackwell.

Throughout England and her colonies there is unlimited and over-whelming evidence of the good effects of woman suffrage—rural, municipal, and even parliamentary.

In all of the British Isles—that, England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland—women, whether married or unmarried, now have the right to vote in the local parish meetings for poor-law guardians and members of the school boards. Resident owners and occupiers other than married women also have municipal suffrage and can vote for members of the county councils. Women are eligible as poor-law guardians, to the school boards, and to both urban and rural district councils. They have served most successfully in all these capacities. In England alone there are nearly 1,000 women serving as guardians, and in Ireland's 28 first election, last January, 85 were elected. Over 160 women are serving in England as rural district councilor and a number were also elected last year in Ireland. Mrs. Perey Widdrington, a talented young Englishwoman, who lectured in this country recently, gave the following account of woman's work in English local government:

Guardians of the poor have much more to do in England than in the United States, because we have more pauper lunatics, the aged poor, the infirm, the tramps, and a vast number of pauper children. In 1894 the boards were recognized, and a democratic suffrage was substituted for the old narrow one, and working men and women were enabled to vote and to serve. The service of women as poor-law guardians is admitted by all to have been pure again. Men are not interested in the intricacies of domestic management, and, without meaning to be neglectful, they let many little abuses creep in. Woman's influence has everywhere tended to a more humane system, to abolish the pauper uniform, to give little outings, little treats, a more abundant and varied diet; to let aged

couples stay together instead of parting husband and wife—small things to the ratepayers, but great ones to the poor.

Women on the boards have helped to revolutionize the treatment of pauper children. They used to be herded together by hundreds in bare buildings, fed on a meager diet, clad in a pauper uniform, taught at a separate pauper school, with no individual care and no effective means to prevent the spread of physical and moral diseases among them. When this system was recognized as unsatisfactory the children were boarded out in respectable poor families, in the country as much as possible, and inspectors, were sent around the see that were well treated. But this took a great deal of inspection, and even in respectable but rough workmen's families the children were not surrounded by the atmosphere of the best family life. Within the last three or four years this system has fallen into disfavor, and cottage homes are being substituted. From eight to sixteen children are placed in one cottage, with a matron to act as mother to them. We are able to pay pretty good salaries and to secure a superior class of matrons. In the case of the boys the matron is a married woman, whose husband shares the care with her. There is nothing outside of the cottage home to show that it is a pauper institution. The children wear no uniforms and they go to the public schools. Children of Roman Catholic parents are sent to the Catholic schools, those of Church of England presents to the voluntary (church) schools, etc. Medical and dental officers inspect them regularly. Children convicted of crimes are sent to industrial schools.

Women are serving on all our largest and most important school boards. It is looked upon as a mark of backwardness for any large town to be without one. The woman member of a school always looks especially after the women teachers, tries to raise their social position, their qualifications, and their pay, and to increase the girls curricula and secure them all the privileges that are open to boys. When a swimming tank is provided for the schools, for instance, if there is a woman on the board she sees to it that the girls, too, are taught to swim; otherwise it is apt to be the boys only that are given the use of the tank.

Besides these elective offices there are many Government appointments open to women in England. They are factory inspectors, and a constant cry for more women inspectors goes up to the home secretary from the factory districts. Women serve as sanitary inspectors and medical officers, appointed sometimes by the State, sometimes by town or urban district councils.

Every year, we find more women taking an intelligent and rational interest in public affairs, and realizing that good town government means happier homes for average women. We find that our women are broadened and strengthened by their interest in politics, and they are not robbed of any of their distinctively womanly qualities.

In answer to questions Mrs. Widdrington said that the women had been greatly interested in the housing of the poor. One woman of the St. Pancras vestry practically drew the plans for the municipal lodging houses and got several blocks of notoriously bad buildings torn and replaced by model tenements.

The Hon. Daniel Tallon, lord mayor of Dublin, was also in Boston this autumn, and he published the following account of the Irish election:

In Dublin previous to the local government act we had only about 8,000 voters, none of whom were women. Now our voters' list numbers about 45,000, of whom about 15,000 are women.

Women in very large numbers availed themselves of their new privilege or rights 29 in January, and I have every reason to believe that their votes helped to secure the election of candidates pledged to important social reforms.

As regards the manner and conduct of the election, not alone in Dublin, but also in Ireland, they were most orderly and well conducted; no disorder of any kind took place at any of them. This was certainly unique, as it was the first occasion on which the masses of the people exercised the franchise, and the sudden enfranchisement of an entire people might not have been expected to work smoothly on the first occasion it was exercised.

Women can be elected members of the urban councils, rural councils, and boards of poor-law guardians, and the enactment did not remain a dead letter even on the first occasion of its application. The talented wife of a foremost merchant of Dublin, Mr. Maurice Dockrell, was elected a councilor of the urban district of Blackrock, and on the first meeting of the council she was unanimously elected deputy chairman. I have every reason to believe that the presence of Mrs. Dockrell in the Blackrock urban council is for the good of the council and that the womanly dignity of Mrs. Dockrell has in no way suffered, but, on the contrary, has been enhanced.

In Templemore Mrs. Bracken, a graduate of the Royal University of Ireland, was elected chairman. I think the lady was the only member of the council possessed of a university education.

But the bodies to which the largest number of women were elected were the boards of guardians. I myself nominated a lady long distinguished for her charitable and philanthropic work in Dublin for the position of poor-law guardian. She was elected. Eighty-five women were elected guardians. As the guardians control the poor houses, the poor hospitals, and the administration of medical relief

to the poor, I am satisfied that the election of women on these boards is for the advantages of the community.

In conclusion, I have no reason to think that the women who voted or were elected councilors and guardians in any way suffered a loss of dignity or domesticity, but, on the contrary, I think the entire community is better and richer by the new powers accorded to women, who are so devoted to the social amelioration of the human race.

A correspondent says:

Throughout Ireland upward of 75 per cent of the women electors exercised the franchise intrusted to them for the first time. They almost invariably supported the candidates who advocated temperance, and took their privilege in a very serious, business-like spirit, showing a keen appreciation of the personal merits of the different candidates.

Between England and Ireland lies the Isle of Man, where all women who are rate payers have full suffrage, local and parliamentary.

As to the colonies, five provinces of Canada, namely, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia, give widows and unmarried women with property municipal suffrage. For school matters every taxpayer can vote, and women are eligible as school trustees.

In Australasia, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania likewise grant women municipal suffrage; and lastly, New Zealand, South Australia, and Western Australia grant women full suffrage and eligibility to the local parliaments. What has been the effect of granting woman the suffrage in these countries?

Mrs. Mary Lee writes from Adelaide, South Australia, that at an election which took place on January 22 the women voters "out-numbered the men, and showed greater interest in the proceedings." When we recall that in South Australia, as in all Australasian colonies, women are in the minority, this speaks much for the value of their recently acquired power of voting.

Mrs. K. W. Sheppard, writing from New Zealand, says:

Since the enfranchisement of women most of the boisterousness and horse play that formerly characterized elections has disappeared. Since September, 1893, I have witnessed two elections in New Zealand and one in England, and I must say that for quite orderliness the former compared greatly to the advantage of the latter.

One of the results of woman suffrage in New Zealand has been to secure equitable divorce laws. Hitherto New Zealand law has followed English law, by which infidelity on the part of the wife entitles the husband to a divorce, but infidelity on the part of the husband does not entitle the wife to one unless gross cruelty can be proved in addition. New Zealand, where women have attained parliamentary suffrage, has now abolished this injustice, and has made the divorce law the same for husbands and wives.—(The Woman's Journal.)

Hon. W. P. Reeves, agent-general for New Zealand, lately gave an address in London on "The effect of woman suffrage in New Zealand and South Australia." He said in part:

Not many weeks' journey away woman suffrage is an institution to-day; not a story of Utopia, or of the planet of Mars, or of some coming race, but one of the ordinary, every-day facts of life among people who speak your language, who belong to your blood and race. It is true that these two venturesome colonies are young and are far away. They are young, but it does not follow because a colony is young that everybody is young in the community; young colonies have their share of old heads.

Awful pictures were drawn of neglected babies, uncooked dinners, judicial separations, a plentiful crop of divorce suits, deserted domestic hearths. We were told that women did not want the franchise, and yet it was said that no sooner did they get the franchise that they would be so enthralled, so enthusiastic, that they would neglect all the duties of domestic life.

In social life things are very much as they were. In fact, the complaint of the old prophets of evil now is, not that the skies have fallen or that the country is upside down, but that there is so little change. Well, if female suffrage had only proved that so great and important a constitutional change could come into being so smoothly and easily that the only complaint of its opponents was that it had not revolutionized the country, it would have proved a great deal; if it had only proved that women can go to the pools without being insulted, that when they get the franchise they use it, and that because they take an interest in the State they do not cease to take an interest in their homes and families, I think woman suffrage would have proved something. But it has proved more than that to anybody who has eyes to see or ears to listen.

It has distinctly affected legislation. Laws have been passed because of it; other laws have been modified; changes have been made in the administration of public service; changes are being made in public opinion outside of public service; altogether, people are beginning to look at customs and institutions with different eyes.

It is true that, for the most part, women do vote not against their husbands and families, but with them; that they usually do stand with their class interests. No one, except an anarchist, could have expected anything else. But it does not follow that they do not exercise a distinct influence in politics; they do, and they bid fair to influence politics still more.

In addition to that, it is not merely the influence of women upon public life that we have to look at; it is the influence of public life and fuller responsibilities upon women. No one can deny that already the possession of the right of citizenship has begun to influence women's life and thought and brain in New Zealand, and that that influence is altogether for good.

On the whole, the part they are taking is quiet, but it is none the less real. They do use the franchise; they do discuss, they do join associations; they do read, and listen, and reflect, and they do learn; and it is this that widens their lives, brightens their intellect, makes their lives fuller and more useful to the country, and none the less charming to their domestic circle.

One of the commonest *à priori* objections to woman suffrage is that it will cause family dissensions. "A priori now means," says Dr. McCosh, "proceeding from principles embedded in the mind and independent of experience." New Zealand has had the actual experience of woman suffrage for seven years, and the Hon. Hugh H. Lusk, formerly a member of the New Zealand parliament, has given this summary of the effects of equal suffrage in New Zealand:

We find that equal suffrage is the greatest family bond and tie—the greatest strengthener of family life. Under equal suffrage the family is taking the place of the individual. People are coming to vote as families. The persons whom they approve when they talk it over in the family are those whom they vote for when they go to the polls. The members of a family generally vote alike, though it is impossible to swear to this, as the ballot is absolutely secret. But we see it in the changed character of the men who are elected. The men who are successful now are not the same sort that were successful before. Character is more regarded than cleverness. It is asked about every candidate, "Has he a good record? Is he above suspicion, an honorable man, a useful citizen?" That is the man who, under the combined suffrage of men and women, gets the largest number of votes and is elected.

This is the greatest benefit that comes from suffrage. I do not deify suffrage. I can see no use for the ward heeler in connection with ladies, no influence for the saloons and public houses. I have been shocked and disappointed by what I have seen in cities of the United States. The hope that it may be altered depends, in my mind, very much on the success of this movement. Suffrage for

women would do more good here than in New Zealand, because there is a greater amount of evil to be removed.

Woman suffrage in foreign countries.

Partial. Full. Parish and district council or rural commune. Poor-law guardians. School board. Municipalities. County council or similar body. Assembly of the nobility. Imperial Parliament. All offices and questions with same qualifications as for men. Russia ¹ (²) (³) (³) (³) Austria ⁴ 1849 (⁵) 1873 German Empire ⁶ (⁵) 1872 Sweden ⁷ 1862 1889 1889 1862 1862 1862 Finland ⁸ 1865 1889 1873 Norway ⁹ 1889 Iceland ¹⁰ 1882 1882 England ¹¹ 1869 ¹¹ 1869 ¹² 1870 ¹¹ 1882 ¹¹ 1888 England ¹² 1894 ¹² 1894 ¹² 1870 ¹¹ 1882 ¹¹ 1888 Wales ¹¹ 1869 ¹¹ 1869 ¹² 1870 ¹¹ 1882 ¹¹ 1888 Wales ¹² 1894 ¹² 1894 ¹² 1870 ¹¹ 1882 ¹¹ 1888 Scotland ¹² 1894 ¹² 1894 ¹¹ 1881 ¹¹ 1889 Ireland ¹² 1898 ¹² 1898 ¹² 1898 ¹² 1898 ¹² 1898 ¹² 1898 Isle of Man ¹³ 1880 Isle of Man ¹³ 1892 Guernsey ¹¹ 1892 Guernsey ¹² 1894 New South Wales ¹² 1867 Victoria ¹² 1869 West Australia ¹² 1871 ¹² 1899 Queensland (¹³) Tasmania ¹² 1884 New Zealand 1877 1886 1893 South Australia 1880 1894 Canada: Ontario 1850 1884 Nova Scotia (12) 1887 New Brunswick (12) 1886 Manitoba 1887 British Columbia 1888 North west Territory 1888 Quebec ¹¹ 1889

1 *Russia*. —A peasant woman, if head of a household, can vote in person in the peasant assembly. Women above the peasant order, if possessed of sufficient property, vote by a proxy for the territorial assemblies, the city councils, and in the assembly of the nobility.

2 Always.

3 Eighteenth century.

4 *Austria*. —Women of the large landed proprietor class vote by proxy for the provincial diets and the Imperial Parliament, and in many of the provinces in the rural communes. In 1891 women in Lower Austria obtained the right to vote in person in the rural communes.

5 Various dates.

6 *German Empire*. —Some provinces, viz, Brunswick in 1850, Prussia and Westphalia in 1856, Schleswig-Holstein in 1867, and Saxony in 1878, gave women possessed of sufficient property the right to vote by proxy in the rural communes and for the rural diets.

7 *Sweden*. — Unmarried women ratepayers vote in person. Their vote is only indirect for Parliament. Stockholm did not give women municipal suffrage until 1872 and 1883. Women are eligible to all municipal poor relief committees and to the school board of Stockholm.

8 *Finland*. —Widowed, divorced, and unmarried women ratepayers. Women are eligible as guardians of the poor.

9 *Norway*.—All women who pay the school tax can vote on school matters. In the rural communes, women who have children can vote on some school questions even though they pay no tax. Women are eligible to town school boards and as school inspectors.

10 *Iceland*.—Widows and unmarried women, with property, vote in person.

11 Unmarried women and widows with property qualifications.

12 All women who have individual property qualifications. In Great Britain women are eligible as poor law guardians, to school boards and to rural and urban district councils. In the colonies they are probably eligible to similar positions.

13 *Isle of Man*.—In 1880 given to women property owners. In 1892 extended to all women ratepayers.

32

Miss Anthony. I now present to you Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, of New York City. She is the chairman of the national committee organization, and during the last five years she has traveled through every city, I think, in the United States, and has aided the women who are in favor of our cause to organize and to put themselves in shape to work with the respective legislatures, etc. So, whatever Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt may say, I want you to feel that she speaks whereof she knows. She is to speak upon the latest phase of the woman's movement.

WHY WE ASK FOR THE SUBMISSION OF AN AMENDMENT.

Carrie Chapman Catt. A survey of the changes which have been wrought within the past hundred years in the status of woman—educational, social, financial, and political—fills the observing man or woman with a feeling akin to awe. No great war has been fought in behalf of their emancipation; no great political party has espoused their cause; no heroes have bled and died for their liberty; yet words fail utterly to measure the distance between the “sphere” of the woman of 1800 and that of the woman of 1900. No race, or people, or sex ever gained so much in rights and privileges in one century as have the women of the United States in the past one hundred years. How has the transformation come? What mysterious power has brought it?

On the whole, the men and women of 1900 rejoice at every right gained and every privilege conceded to women. Not one jot or tittle would they abate the advantage won; yet when the plea is offered that the free, self-respecting, self-reliant, independent, thinking women of this generation be given the suffrage, the answer almost invariably comes back, “When women as a whole demand it, men will consider it.” This answer carries with it the apparent supposition that all the changes have

come because women wanted them, and that further enlargement of liberty must cease because women do not want it. Alas, it is a sad comment upon the conservatism of the average human being that not one change of consequence was desired by women as a whole, or even by a considerable part. It would be nearer the truth to say women as a whole have opposed every advance.

The progress has come because women of a larger mould, loftier ambitions, and nobler self-respect than the average have been willing to face the opposition of the world for the sake of liberty. More than one such as these deserve the rank of martyr. The sacrifice of suffering, of doubt, of obloquy, which has been endured by the pioneers in the woman movement will never be fully known or understood. For sixty years and more a vigorous agitation has been waged in the United States to establish equal rights for women with men. Under its influence, and guided by the brave leadership of brave men and women, the evolution of the rights of women has moved on without a break. Though Congress and legislation have turned deaf ears and unseeing eyes toward it, yet the people have listened, discussed, and considered. With the bold demand for perfect equality of rights in every walk of life the public have compromised. Not willing to grant all, they have conceded something; and by repeated compromises and concessions to the main demand the progress of woman's rights has been accomplished.

There may be two kinds of restriction upon human liberty—the restriction of law and the restraint of custom. No written law has ever been more binding than unwritten custom, well supported by popular opinion. At the beginning of our century both law and custom restricted the liberty of women. It was the edict of custom which prohibited women from receiving an education beyond the rudiments, engaging in occupations, speaking in public, organizing societies, or in other ways conducting themselves like free, rational human beings. It was law which forbade married woman to control their own property or to collect their own wages, and which forbade all women to vote. Under the influence of the storm and the sunshine of agitation, custom has dissolved and melted away, leaving women at the end of the century individualized, self-reliant, human, thinking beings. The evolution stops only when it meets the opposition of constitutional law. The changes have not come because women wished them or men welcomed them. A liberal board of trustees, a faculty willing to grant a trial, an employer willing to experiment, a broad-minded church willing to hear a woman preach, a few liberal souls in a community willing to hear a woman speak, these have been the influence which have brought the changes.

There is no more elaborate argument or determined opposition to woman suffrage than there has been to each step of the progress of the rights of women. Scientists measured heads and weighed brains to prove that girls could not master a college education. Clergymen read the Scriptures to prove that they must not, and public opinion echoed the deductions of both. But girls did master

the college curriculum. When the world recovered from its astonishment, scientists investigated anew and discovered that measurement and weight could determine little of the quality of the human brain; clergymen reinterpreted the Scriptures, and public opinion adjusted itself to the new conclusion. Each step of the way has been bitterly contested, and that there has been advancement in the rights of women at all is due entirely to the fact that the few, not the many, possessed the authority to insure the change. Had it been necessary to submit the question of coeducation to popular vote before the experiment had been tried there would not be 40,000 young women studying in our colleges and universities to-day. The consensus of public opinion in 1830 was that the brains of women were quite incompetent to receive a college education; that their physical health could not endure a four-years course of study, and that a college educated woman was an anomaly alike repulsive to men and women. Had a vote been taken, coeducation would have been overwhelmingly defeated.

In 1840, before women had studied or practiced medicine, had it been necessary to obtain permission to do so by a vote of men or women 8,000 graduated women physicians would not now be engaged in the healing art in our country.

In 1850, when vindictive epithets were hurled from press, pulpit, and public in united condemnation of the few women who were attempting to be heard on the platform as speakers, had it been necessary to secure the right of free public speech through legislatures or popular approval, the voices of women would still be silent. Audiences would never have been instructed by the logic of a Stanton or an Anthony, exalted by the eloquence of a Dickinson or a Livermore, charmed by the sweet appeal of a Stone, convulsed with laughter by the wit of a Shaw, nor uplifted by the moral suasion of a Willard. The rights of women have come in direct opposition to the popular consensus of opinion. Yet, when they have one become established, they have been wanted by women and welcomed by men.

There are a few fanatics who, if they could, would force the women of this generation back into the spheres of their grandmothers. There are some pessimists who imagine they see all natural order coming to a speedy end because of the enlarged liberties and opportunities of women. There are sentimentalists who believe that the American home, that most sacred unit of society, is seriously imperiled by the tendencies of women to adopt new duties and interests. But this is not the thought of the average American. There are few intelligent men who would be willing to provide their daughters no more education than was thought proper for their grandmothers, or who would care to restrict their daughters to the old-time limited sphere of action. Thinking men and women realize the American home was never more firmly established than at the present time, and that it has grown nobler and happier as women have grown more self-reliant. The average man and

woman recognize that the changes which have come have been in the interest of better womanhood and better manhood, bringing greater happiness to women and greater blessings to men. They recognize each step gained has rendered women fitter companions for men, wiser mothers, and far abler units of society.

The public acknowledges the wisdom, the common sense, and practical judgment of the woman movement until it asks for the suffrage. In other words, it approves every right gained because it is here, and condemns the one right not yet gained because it is not here.

Had it been custom or statutory law which forbade women to vote the suffrage would have been won by the same processes which have gained every-other privilege. A few women would have voted, a few men and women would have upheld them, and, little by little, year after year, the number of women voters would have increased until it became as general for women to vote as it is for men. Had this been possible the women of the United States would be voting to-day in every State in the Union; and undoubtedly their appearance at the polls would now be as generally accepted as a matter of fact as the college education. But, alas, when this step to advancement was proposed, women found themselves face to face with the stone wall of constitutional law. Women could not vote until a majority of men should first give their consent. Indeed, the experiment was tried to gain this sacred privilege by easier means. The history of the voting of Susan B. Anthony, of Rochester, in 1872, is familiar to all, but the court decided that the Constitution must first be amended. It therefore becomes a necessity to convert to this reform a majority of the men of the United States.

It is for these reasons, gentlemen, that we appeal to you to aid in the submission of a sixteenth amendment. Such an amendment would go before the legislatures of our country where at least the grade of intelligence is higher than we should find in the popular vote. When we recall the vast amount of illiteracy, ignorance, selfishness, and degradation which exists among certain classes of our people the task imposed upon us is appalling. There are whole precincts of voters in this country whose intelligence united together does not equal that of one representative American woman. Yet to such classes as these we are asked to take our court of final resort. We are compelled to petition men who have never heard of the Declaration of Independence, and who have never read the Constitution, for the sacred right of self-government; we are forced to appeal for justice to men who do not know the meaning of the word; we are driven to argue our claim with men who have never had a thought in logical sequences. We ask men to consider the rights of a citizen in a republic and get the answer in reply, given in all seriousness, "Women have more rights now than thy ought to have;" and that, too, without faintest notion of the inanity of the remark or the emptiness of the brain which conceives it.

When we present our cause to men of higher standing and more liberal opinion we find the interests of party and the personal ambition for place is an obstacle which prevents the better man from asserting the advocacy of a question concerning which there is the slightest doubt as to its popularity.

The way before us is difficult at best, not because our cause is not based upon unquestioned justice, not because it is not destined to win in the end, but because of the nature of the processes through which it must be won. In fact, the position of this question might well be used to demonstrate that observation of Aristotle that "A democracy has many striking points of resemblance with tyranny."

It will be remembered at the close of the war the desire of the Republican party to enfranchise the negro, and that all its political power was bent too accomplish this purpose; yet, with all its prestige, it was found to be impossible by any other method than this. State after State where abolition sentiment had been strong submitted the question to popular vote, and in no State was an amendment carried. It was only when this question was submitted to picked men, such as we may find in the legislatures, that it was found possible to carry it. It matters not at this day whether the enfranchisement of the negro was a mistake or not (there is a difference of opinion on this point), but certainly American women, the representatives of American homes, public schools, colleges, and institutions, should be entitled to as fair a chance to gain political liberty as was given to the negro.

By a Congressional act the way has been opened for the Indians on the reservations to gain the same right of citizenship, but no such easy process is open to women.

Gentlemen, though you yourselves may doubt the expediency of woman suffrage, though you may questions the soundness of our claim, yet, in the same of democracy, which permits the people to make and amend their constitutions, and in the name of American womanhood, prepared by a century of unmeasured advance for political duties, we beg your aid in the speedy submission of this question. We ask this boon in the direct interest of the thousands of women who want to vote, who suffer pangs of humiliation and degradation because of their political servitude. We ask it equally in the indirect interest of the thousands of women who do not want to vote, believing their indifference or opposition to be the same natural conservatism which led other women to oppose the college education for woman, the control of property, the freedom public speech, and the right of organization.

Years ago George William Curtis pleaded for fair play for woman. It is the same plea we are repeating. We are aware, gentlemen, that you have no power to grant the privilege we ask; therefore

we only 36 petition for fair play. Fair play means the submission of our question to the most intelligent constituency which has power to act upon it.

If we shall win, the Constitution will have been amended by the American will. If we shall fail, we will abide by the decision. That is, we will wait till courage has grown stronger, reason more logical, justice purer; when we will again petition a future Congress to grant us another opportunity to test the growth of the American intellect. Since right will prevail, we rest content in the positive knowledge that our cause will eventually triumph. Now, we ask that the American people, through their legislatures, shall be given an opportunity to record their opinion upon the question. As the daughters of Zolophedad appealed to Moses and his great court for justice, so do the daughters of America appeal to you, gentlemen, for fair play. [Great applause.]

Miss Susan B. Anthony: In closing I would like to give a little object lesson of the two methods of gaining the suffrage. The one to which we have been recommended is by what is termed a popular vote of the State—that is, that the State legislature shall submit to the electors the question of the proposition to strike the little adjective “male” from the suffrage clause. We have already tried the experiment in that direction in seventeen different elections and in thirteen different States. Four States of the Union have had campaigns and voted on it twice over, and of those four that have voted twice over Colorado is one, showing that during the seventeen years intervening the two elections the men of Colorado have become sufficiently educated in the laws of justice, a good many of them, to vote for the measure. The other States have been one way and the other. We have had four where, as has been said, the question has been carried at the ballot box. I am going to illustrate by South Dakota.

South Dakota in 1890 submitted the question for the first time. That was just after there was an influx of Russians and foreigners who were not able to read or write a single word of the English language. We made the best possible campaign, an educational campaign, trying to show the men of the State why it was their duty to grant suffrage to their women. I will not speak of the hard work of going through that then new State. They had had droughts for three years. There was not a spear of grass to be seen anywhere nor scarcely a tree with a leaf on it anywhere in that State; every apple, every particle of fruit and grain upon which the people of that young State fed that year was brought from the outside; every chunk of coal was brought from the outside and in large quantities presented by the railroad corporations. It was a famine, you might say, the year of the canvass, and when the election day came the returns showed that there were 30,000 foreign-born men, just naturalized within the last few months, many of them, not to say years. There were 40,000 American-born men in that State. Of the 40,000 American-born men, 24,000, sir, voted in favor of the amendment and for the enfranchisement of the women, but, unfortunately, the American-born

men divided and 16,000 voted no, yet you perceive that of a vote of 24,000 to 16,000 we should have had the privilege of voting granted to the women of that State, but when the 30,000 foreigners votes were counted in they went over with the 16,000 opponents and lost us the victory.

Now, that is an extreme illustration, because at that moment there was a much larger ratio of foreigners and of newly come foreigners 37 than in any other State. In that young State there were hundreds and thousands of women teachers who had moved there and take up their claims, widows and single women, because they felt it was to be a free State, and those foreign-born men just over from Russia could go to the ballot box and vote solidly that American-born, property holding, tax-paying women should have no right in that State, where very many of those men did not feel that they had performed their husbandly duty if they had not flogged their wives at least once a week.

Now, that was the condition in that State. It is next to impossible to carry a State by the popular vote.

Take New York. More than one-half of the voters are foreign-born men. You can hardly believe it, but if we should ever go to the ballot box with this question in New York, and even if the Democratic and Republican parties alike should put woman's suffrage in their planks, and should try to have those foreign-born men vote in favor of any equality of rights to women they could not be gotten to do it, because they came to this country not for liberty for anybody but themselves. Every man comes here to get more money, and more freedom, and more liberty, and he never dreams that his wife should have a particle more than she had at home, nor quite so much, and especially he never dreams that the women of America—women who are born here—shall have equal rights with himself.

Let me give you a little illustration of the olden times, before you were a member of the Senate, Mr. Chairman, and before any of these women can remember. There used to be a distinguished person in the city of New York. His name was John Morrissey. He was the very king of gamblers. He had a most splendid and magnificent gambling palace at Saratoga Springs, where all of the Southerners, who had lots of money in those days before the war, used to come to have a good time. He was either a member of the New York State legislature or of the Congress of the United States. Since I have been coming to Congress I have stood and plead before John Morrissey, the king of gamblers, for my right—for him to vote to give Elizabeth Cady Stanton and all the great women of the State of New York as much right in the making and shaping and control of the governments of the cities as John Morrissey possessed.

Now, John Morrissey represented the Seventh Congressional district of New York, the very slums of New York City; the very district where gamblers and blacklegs and ignorance prevailed. By this process you will perceive, first, you have to pass the resolution submitting the question to the

legislatures to be voted upon. Congress can not decide it. All Congress can do is to give the women of the different States of this Union an opportunity to appeal to the big men of the States in their respective legislatures instead of going down in John Morrissey's Congressional district and pleading with every individual fisticuff there. And while in the early days Mrs. Stanton and I had our choice, and humiliating as it was to go before John Morrissey in Congress, to get the question presented before the legislature and get him to vote for the ratification of this proposition for a sixteenth amendment, it was nevertheless a thousand times less humiliating than it was to be compelled to go down into the saloons and slums of New York City and beg of very individual man there to give us a little chance in the making and continuance of society.

38

And here is all we ask of you gentlemen, not that you can do anything in the world, is to save us women from any more tramps over the States, such as we have made now seventeen times over. In nine of those State campaigns I myself, have made a tramp from county to county. In my own State of New York at the constitutional convention in 1894 I visited every county of the sixty—and I was not then 80 years of age, sir, but 74—and I have been through Kansas, through every county in the State of Michigan when that State had its campaign, and also South Dakota.

Our last and most glorious campaign was in California. There, during that campaign, 110,000 of the big men of that State voted for the amendment, but unfortunately for us there were 137,000 who voted the other way. Now, that 137,000 was made up largely of the foreign-born men of the State of California. It is not the native-born men. It was not the men who understand our republican and democratic institutions. It was the men who cared for nothing but self.

I want to say to you, sir, that there is an army in this nation that stands out solidly against the enfranchisement of women in whatsoever State we go. In California, just ten days before election, they held what they called a liquor dealers' convention—the saloon men, the manufacturers, and all of the men interested in the sale of liquor, met together in San Francisco and passed resolutions against giving women the right to vote, and they issued a circular letter to every dealer, manufacturer, and drinker throughout the State begging of him to be at the polls early, so that he should not only vote himself, but to stand there all day and use his influence and get every other man to vote against "amendment 6," as it was called, against the enfranchisement of women, that was possible.

Now, they did that. They worked all the day long in that way, and all of that class of men voted solidly against us. There is an old saying of Napoleon's, I think, "Watch your enemy and see what he wants you not to do and go and do it."

There is an enemy of the homes of this nation, and that enemy is drunkenness. Every one connected with the gambling house, the brothel, and the saloon has voted solidly against the enfranchisement of women, and, I say, if you believe in chastity, if you believe in honesty and integrity, then do what your enemy wants you not to do, which is to take the necessary steps to put the ballot in the hands of the women of this country. I know there are some men and some women who are not gamblers or liquor dealers or low-down people, who are not yet sufficiently educated in the principles of government to believe that if you have a woman's opinion counted at the ballot box it will destroy her womanliness, and we all know from the women we have had presented to us to-day, Mrs. Bradford, who is from a voting country, Mrs. Blatch, who is here from England, and if we had with us the wives of some of your Senators here this morning from Utah and Idaho, our youngest State, and from Wyoming, you would see that voting does not make women less lovely. It simply makes them more self-respecting. Oh, I love to meet a woman who comes from Colorado or Wyoming. I used to be in olden times with the grangers. They were the first class of workingmen who ever granted to women equal rights in their granges and lodges. Away back in 1877, when I traveled in Iowa, I could tell a granger woman the moment she stepped in. How did I tell her? She walked with head erect, and 39 with self-respect, and looked as if she felt just as good as a man—and there is nothing in the world so desirable to a woman as to feel that she is as good as a man; that her opinions will count just as much when weighed in the ballot box.

As you know, every election in this country is the solution of a mathematical problem. You put into one political scale all the many, many interests of railroad monopolies, salt monopolies, coal combines, the great liquor interests of the country—if you put all those material interests in one of your political scales, then you put into the other political scale the religious interests of the country, the charitable interests of the country, the educational interests of the country—

A voice. And morals.

Miss Anthony. And the moral institutions, you know, Mr. Chairman, that have the repairing of the damages to society are all turned over to women, and consequently when we speak of the church, of the home, of the school, and of the charities we simply mean that nine out of ten of the people who are at work to repair the damages to society or to mold the conditions of society would make them higher and better if in the hands of women.

Now, when you put all those elements, religion, home, church, charity, into one political scale, without a vote, and all the other material interests of the country into the other political scale, with votes, what is the result? Why, the material interests pull down the scale as against the moral, the charitable, and the religious, and everything which is for the spiritual uplift of the nation kicks

the beam every time, and there is no alternative. Ever since the close of the war, ever since the reconstruction, this nation has been in a perfect deadlock in morals, and you see for yourselves men on the floors of both Houses who are growing worse and worse all the time. I do not believe it, but I have to take your word for it. [Laughter.]

Here is a philosophical fact that I present to you. It is just as impossible for this nation to go forward in the way of morals, or an uplift, until women are enfranchised as it was impossible in the war. Nations never do anything from pure love of justice. I am sorry for it, but they never do. Governments never do, whether England or America, or where it is. There must be some practical reason given, some practical end to be obtained by the doing of the justice. But as we all know, there was a military necessity during the war that compelled Lincoln and Congress to declare the abolition of slavery, and everybody knows that this Government could never have put down that rebellion in all the years of the world if the South had been left with its slaves to have supplied the sinews of war, to furnish the bread and keep the homes and supply the armies. The only possible military necessity or tactics that could be resorted to by the Government was to take away their supplies or their means of supply, and that was by the abolition of slavery.

Then at the close of the war we were at a perfect political deadlock. The election was to come off in 1867 and something had to be done to insure the success of the Republican party. Now, I do not say that some did not work to bring this about from principle, but the vast army of the men who favored the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution cared no more for the negroes' rights to vote than most of them care not for the women's right to vote. [Laughter].

40

But it was a political necessity, and so those amendments were put in the Constitution, right or wrong, as Mrs. Chapman Catt has said. Those two great acts of justice to the negro race were brought about by a military necessity and a political necessity.

Now, I appeal to you gentlemen of the committee that you will present your report in favor of this amendment to the Senate at the earliest possible opportunity; that you will do it because you feel and see with us that there is no hope of solving this problem except by the enfranchisement of the women of this country, and I pray you, sir, that you will give this matter your serious consideration. I pray you to think of it as you would if one-half of the people who are disfranchised were men; if we women had absolute power to control every condition in this country and you were obliged to obey the laws and submit to whatever arrangements we made. I want you to speak and act and report on this question exactly as if your half of the people were the ones who were deprived of this right to a vote and voice in governmental affairs. You would not be long in knowing how you would bring in report if you were the ones who were disfranchised and denied voice in this Government. I say

to you if instead of these being the women, the mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters of the men who compose the Government of this nation; if it had not been women, but any class of men; if it had been the farmers of this country, the manufacturing class, or any class, of men who had been robbed of their inalienable rights, then, sir, we would have seen that class of men rising in rebellion and the Government, perhaps, shaken to its very foundation; but being women, being the mothers, daughters, wives, and sisters of the men who make the aristocracy we have to accept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am through. All we ask is that you will present this proposition to the Senate, and that you will move a discussion and have a vote upon the question, and we will then find out at least how many friends we have on the floor of the Senate.

Before I take my seat, and before I say we are through, I want to say that I hold in my hand a little pamphlet that contains the essence of all the reports that have been made on the floors of the two Houses of Congress in favor of a sixteenth amendment. It commences with the report of Benjamin F. Butler and comes down to Senator Lapham, of New York, and Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, all the way through both Houses. I think there are nine or ten favorable reports. These take no notice of the adverse reports that have been generally presented, for we have not sufficient funds to print all that our opposition says. It is all we can do to get money enough to print what is said in our favor. I present these this morning. They embrace the reports that have been made by Congress, and I brought them this morning in order that they might be distributed among the members of the committee and our friends who have come here.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this courteous hearing, individually and on behalf of our entire association. We have present about three hundred voting delegates from the different States of the United States, and I thank you in behalf of all of them for your patient and courteous hearing. [Applause.]

The Chairman. The committee has been much pleased to hear the views of you ladies, which have been so ably and eloquently expressed, and will take your wishes under consideration.

41

Miss Anthony. May I ask you will, at your early convenience, make a motion on the floor of the Senate to print as large a number of these remarks as possible?

The Chairman. We will consider your wishes and will probably comply with your request.

Miss Anthony. I refer to the speeches that have been made her.

The Chairman. Oh, yes; that will be done. I desire to say that there are few ladies present who desire to submit some remarks in opposition to the woman's suffrage movement, and I will recognize Mrs. Dodge. The hours between 10 and 12 o'clock to-day were accorded to the ladies who favored this proposed amendment. At some future time that will be convenient to the members of our committee we will accord a hearing to the ladies in opposition.

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge said: Gentlemen, we appear before your honorable committee by direction of the "Associations opposed to the extensions of the suffrage to women" to protest in their behalf against the proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States, advocated by the petitioners who have appeared before you. We opposed the amendment on the ground that it is unnecessary. The object sought can be accomplished without any amendment whatever to the Constitution whenever public opinion in the several States shall be pronounced in its favor.

Any amendment to the Constitution requires the approval of three-fourths of the States of the Union. If that proportion is in favor of the extension of suffrage to women it can be indicated by their action at any time without applying to Congress for Constitutional amendments. While it is probable that if three-fourths of the States should enact the desired legislation, the remaining one-fourth might fall into line; still, if any of them should refuse to extend the suffrage to women it would be manifestly impolitic and unjust for the other States to attempt to coerce the minority on a question dependent upon the expression of public opinion alone.

There would seem therefore to be no possible justification for the effort now being made to secure Federal interference with the reserved rights of the several States. So far as the reasons given by the petitioners are purely sentimental, they should have no weight in so serious a matter as amending the Constitution of the United States. The mere fact that this amendment is asked as a complaint to the leading advocate of women suffrage; on the attainment of her eightieth birthday is evidence of the emotional frame of mind which influences the advocates of the measure, and which is scarcely favorable to the calm consideration that should be given to fundamental political principles. With all the admiration which is felt for the vigorous character and consistent effort of Miss Anthony, it is absurd to suppose that the complicated machinery required to be put in motion in order to amend the Constitution of the United States should be started because this venerable woman has achieved length of days and enjoys the respect of so many persons.

The question of suffrage is dealt with in the first article of the Constitution, which was adopted after long and patient discussion, in which various left the qualifications for suffrage with the several States. This regulation of the suffrage was regarded as a sovereign right of the States, of which they could not be deprived without destroying republican institutions. It is in fact the very essence of

home rule, which is ingrained in our institutions as the palladium of civil liberty. During more than a hundred years, in which we have lived and prospered under the Constitution, no effectual attempt has ever been made to limit the suffrage in any respect whatever. The fifteenth amendment, which deals with the subject, simply registered the result of the greatest conflict in our history, by which slavery perished and the involuntary servitude specified in the Constitution ceased to exist. It did not extend the suffrage in any way, but it prevented its restriction by reason of a condition which no longer existed.

If the view here presented commends itself to your committee it will be a waste of time to present any arguments either for or against the granting of suffrage to women, because this is a question not in issue at this time or upon this occasion. The proper sphere of discussion of this question is in the several States, and there is nothing whatever to prevent suitable legislation whenever public opinion shall demand it. It may be proper to add, however, that so far as we can judge there is no general demand for such legislation. We are convinced that if the proposition to enlarge the suffrage were submitted to the votes of the women of the United States it would be rejected by an overwhelming majority. We are convinced that what is termed a "right" of suffrage is rather a duty to be performed, and a duty of such a nature that women are disqualified for many reasons from assuming this responsibility. We feel that the exemption of women from the performance of this duty is a privilege which they are not prepared to surrender, and which has been conferred upon them as a compensation for limitations and duties imposed upon them by their sex, and which can not by any possibility be transferred to the domain of masculine service. We know that women are physically unable to perform the duties which men are compelled to perform under every well-regulated government. The enforcement of law involves not only the performance of jury duty, but in the last emergency the employment of military force, in neither of which can women discharge the responsibility of actual service.

No better illustration of the difficulties which would arise in case women were endowed with the duties of suffrage can be presented than the situation which has so lately existed in the State of Kentucky. Imagine women taking part in the strife of that State, involving insurrection, riot, bloodshed, and assassination as the consequences of a political dispute. If either one of the claimants of the office of governor had been a woman, it is perfectly obvious that confusion would have been worse confounded, and that in the last resort, under the Constitution, the Federal authorities would have been paralyzed by the necessity for using military force against the women of the State. The word "chaos" alone gives adequate expression to the state of affairs which would have existed in Kentucky if the women, as well as the men, had been compelled to take part in the unhappy controversy which has convulsed that State and might have entangled the General Government in its solution.

Further consideration will serve to show that the proposed amendment would in no respect promote the objects of the Constitution, which are declared in the preamble, “to form a more perfect union, establish justice, encourage domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

43

The “union” referred to was one of States, but if the phrase could be strained so as to refer to the union or harmony between men and women, it seems evident that the suffrage would not tend to perfect this union, but would produce strife that would render “domestic tranquillity” a by-word among the people, and would be far from promoting the general welfare. Women could not take part in the “common defense,” which is essential to establish justice. The extension therefore of the suffrage so as to include women would not merely be an invasion of the sovereign right of the State, but would tend to disrupt society.

It seems only necessary to present this brief statement of the actual condition of the question to convince your committee that the proposition to give the suffrage to women is a departure from the traditional conditions of the Constitution not justified by any compensating advantages whatsoever—a change not desired by a majority of the women of this country, and a measure liable to produce intolerable confusion, leading to the destruction of social order.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that we base this paper that I have read—and we are willing to rest it there—on the proposed change in the Constitution of the United States, which I observe was only mentioned once by any of the speakers who have appeared before your committee on the other side.

Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, Del., of the opposition, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, it is not the tyranny, but the chivalry of men that we American women have to fear. The men of America want to give us everything we really need, and the danger is that they will mistake a minority for a majority. That is why we are here to-day. We hold a brief for the silent majority who do not want the ballot. There are no doubt thousands of women who wish the ballot, and wish it earnestly, but there are millions who do not desire it.

The proof that we represent this majority may be asked for. It lies in this—that the suffrage movement must be against the opinions of most of our sex, since it has been pushed for fifty years by as able a woman and as popular a one as Miss Anthony, and yet still remains a minority movement. In these fifty years every other woman's movement really desired by women has succeeded. The educational movement (not necessarily the coeducational) is a magnificent

success. And, by the way, I may mention here that the presidents of four of the most prominent women's colleges are all antisuffragists. The movement for property rights is so successful that even married women now have more property rights than married men. The entrance of women into all occupations and professions has been so great that out of a possible 369 occupations over 360 had been conquered for our sex, according to the census of 1890, while a suffragist speaker at the conference this week claims that we are now represented in over 400 trades and occupations. And the club movement—well, gentlemen, wherever there are two women nowadays there is a club. The remotest hamlet is no exception to this rule. These movements have had no trouble in winning their way, and they have not taken half a century to do it, either. The woman-suffrage movement is the only woman's movement in existence that after fifty years' hard work finds itself not only in the minority, but with strong associations of women banded against it.

The suffrage movement is a minority movement even where it has succeeded. In Colorado, where I have been twice since the equal-suffrage law was passed, and where I have friends who are old residents, I have been assured that the majority of women did not desire to vote, and have been indifferent ever since as to casting their ballots. When I was going to Oregon last year, I had a most interesting talk with an Oregon suffragist, who sought to dissuade me from opposing suffrage. I asked her if she did not think that I represented the majority, and she said: "Why, of course; the majority of women here in the East are against us, and you will find the majority out there against us, too; but when they have to vote, they will vote." And when I reached Oregon I found that she was right in her first remark, at least. The great majority of all the women I met there did not care a button for the ballot, and strong organization has been formed there against it. In this connection I may add, as the success of municipal suffrage in Kansas is often spoken of by the suffragist, that one of the members of the standing committee of this Oregon State association opposed to the extension of the suffrage to women, came upon that committee because, as she said, she had been living in Kansas under municipal suffrage, and was so disgusted with it that when she moved to Oregon she wanted no more suffrage.

The suffrage movement is a minority movement, too, in that the four States which have accepted suffrage are not representative of our large communities. Colorado by the census of 1890 had less inhabitants in the whole State than the city of Baltimore; by the last estimate made by its governor, it had just about 20,000 inhabitants in the whole State more than Baltimore, which is not much of a margin. Wyoming's total population is less than the foreign population of Maryland, and Maryland is not a land of immigrants by any means. The population of Idaho is far below the number of colored people in Maryland. Utah (where the admission of women to the suffrage can hardly be said, in view of the recent events, to have elevated the character of the candidates) has less population than there are negroes in Arkansas; and altogether the four States that have equal suffrage, all put together,

have fewer people in them (700,000 fewer) than Chicago and not half as many as New York City. Gentlemen, results from such States even if they were conclusive and positive, would still be minority results.

But even in these States the results are negative.

Colorado has no advance in legislation to speak of, no purification of politics, no improvements of municipal conditions, no raising of working women's wages, no tokens of the millennial dawn whatever Utah has sent Mr. Brigham Roberts here, but he has been returned with thanks (through the efforts of the women without the ballot), so that Utah's effort to uplift the country goes for nothing.

Wyoming has had equal suffrage for thirty years, yet nothing important has happened any more than in Idaho, which has just begun the experiment. Negative results such as these speak powerfully against suffrage to our mind.

I may be asked by what authority I speak for Colorado. I have here letters from Colorado men, signed with their names and giving their opinion as to the negative or evil results of suffrage in Colorado. It may be said that you would prefer to hear from the women, and I also have a letter from a Denver woman who signs her name to it and who shows up the same evils.

I will read extracts from some of the letters I have received. I have here a letter from R. S. Morrison, of Colorado, in which he says:

The most important question to-day in the local politics of Denver is how much of a popular uprising will it take to remove the present political control of this city, holding, as it does, the large vote of 2,000 women who vote under police surveillance. * * *

I have conversed with a large portion of the politicians of this city and they are unanimously against it. Still in public utterances and in private letters they are not willing to commit themselves to that view. They have talked with me fully because they know I will reveal no names, but they recognize the danger of provoking a vindictive vote when there is no issue on the subject to bring out the vote on the other side. * * *

The phrase "purity in politics," as produced by the woman vote, will raise a laugh wherever mentioned. They have quickly brought to the polls the power to ape the vices of men and have produced no countervailing virtues. They have been indicated for ballot stuffing and charged with

repeating, and when the subject is mentioned to that class of women who still advocate the right, because to them the right means power, the common answer is "we are no worse than the men."

This answer is doubtless true, yet, madam, it is a fearful fall from the promises they made when they appealed for the ballot, that they would elevate and purify the polls.

If the question were to be resubmitted to-day, it would be overwhelmingly defeated.

Yours, respectfully, R. S Morrison.

Now, they will say that that is a Denver man. I have just one word to read from a Denver woman's letter to me—Mrs Joel T. Vail. She says:

He would be a bold man indeed who should claim that the municipal affairs of the city of Denver are to-day in the hands of cleaner or more disinterested politicians than before the days of woman's suffrage.

In conclusion, gentlemen, if you will excuse a personal detail, I wish to say that if any woman in the United States needs a vote, I ought to be that woman. The suffragists ask for the ballot in the name of the self-supporting woman, who must be a bread winner, not only for herself but often for others; they ask it for the property-owning woman, who needs it on account of taxation; they ask it for the temperance woman, so that she can save those nearest and dearest to her from the saloon; they ask it for the club woman, because her intelligence and interest in public affairs deserve it. And above all, they ask it for the poor downtrodden single woman, who has no one to look out for her or take care of her interests. Well, gentlemen, by a freak of coincidence I happen to be a single woman myself, a club woman, a temperance woman (though not a prohibitionist), a small property owner, and a self-supporting woman these many years. And yet, though I ought to have thus fivefold longing for suffrage, I have never yet been so situated that I could see where a vote could help me. If I felt that it would, I might become a suffragist, *perhaps*, but as it is I remain with the majority of my sex, and I beg you to believe that we do not want to vote and that Miss Anthony, whose courage, whose devotion, whose interest, whose determined perseverance we sincerely admire, is nevertheless not backed by the women of America, but is leading a minority movement only.

Without hearing further remarks at this time, at the hour of 12 o'clock m. committee adjourned.