

WOMAN'S RIGHT AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

HOAR

JK1901
H67

Date Due

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE TRACTS. NO. 6.

WOMAN'S RIGHT

AND

THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE F. HOAR,

BEFORE A

JOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE,

APRIL 14, 1869.

BOSTON:

FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF "THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL,"

3 TREMONT PLACE.

1870.

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
-American

e tracts.

OFFICERS

OF THE

American Woman Suffrage Association.

PRESIDENT.
HENRY WARD BEECHER.

VICE-PRESIDENTS AT LARGE.
T. W. HIGGINSON, R.I. GEORGE W. JULIAN, Ind.
MRS. W. T. HAZARD, Mo. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Mass.
MARY A. LIVERMORE, Ill. CELIA BURLEIGH, N.Y.
GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS, N.Y. MARGARET V. LONGLEY, Ohio.

CHAIRMAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
LUCY STONE, N.J.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.
JULIA WARD HOWE, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.
MYRA BRADWELL, Illinois.

RECORDING SECRETARIES.
HENRY B. BLACKWELL, N.J. AMANDA WAY, Ind.

TREASURER.
FRANK B. SANBORN, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.
REV. AMORY BATTLES, Me. REV. H. EDDY, Wis.
AMENIA S. WHITE, N.H. MOSES COIT TYLER, Mich.
HON. C. W. WILLARD, Vt. MRS. A. KNIGHT, Minn.
CAROLINE M. SEVERANCE, Mass. A. K. P. SAFFORD, Arizona.
ROWLAND G. HAZARD, R.I. CHARLES ROBINSON, Kansas.
SETH ROGERS, Conn. AMELIA BLOOMER, Iowa.
OLIVER JOHNSON, N.Y. ISAAC H. STURGEON, Mo.
ANTOINETTE B. BLACKWELL, N.J. HON. GUY W. WINES, Tenn.
ROBERT PURVIS, Penn. ALFRED PURDIE, Fla.
MRS. HANSON ROBINSON, Del. MRS. GEN. RUFUS SAXTON, Oregon
MRS. TRACY CUTLER, Ohio. REV. CHARLES G. AMES, Cal.
LIZZIE M. BOYNTON, Ind. HON. J. C. UNDERWOOD, Va.

HON. RUFUS LEIGHTON, Wash. Ter.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
MRS. OLIVER DENNETT, Me. REV. CHARLES MARSHALL, Ind.
HON. NATHANIEL WHITE, N.H. HON. J. B. BRADWELL, Ill.
MRS. JAMES HUTCHINSON, Jr., Vt. LILY PECKHAM, Wis.
REV. ROWLAND CONNOR, Mass. LUCINDA H. STONE, Mich.
ELIZABETH B. CHACE, R.I. ABBY J. SPAULDING, Minnesota.
REV. OLYMPIA BROWN, Conn. MRS. C. I. H. NICHOLS, Kansas.
ANNA C. FIELD, N.Y. BELLE MANSFIELD, Iowa.
MARY F. DAVIS, N.J. REV. CHARLES J. WOODBURY, Penn.
MARY GREW, Penn. MRS. DR. HAWKES, Florida.
DR. JOHN CAMERON, Dela. FANNY B. AMES, Cal.
A. J. BOYER, Ohio. HON. A. M. FRETZ, Va.

GRACE GREENWOOD, D.C.

WOMAN'S RIGHT AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

I AM unfortunate, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I have to address a committee to whom this subject has lately been presented, not only by the most brilliant orator of the country, but by her who is, by common confession, the ablest advocate of the cause for which she is herself an embodied argument. I have not heard them, and so cannot even tell what topics to omit. But as I have been several times invited by the committee who have this matter in charge to state my views, although I am not vain enough to suppose I can present to you any new arguments, coming as I do from other studies, I thought I ought at least to come here and show my colors.

This age is remarkable for the dispassionate discussion on principle of the great fundamental laws which lie at the bottom of all human society. We have just gone through a struggle which has ended in emancipating, and giving the right of suffrage to, a race. And now, instantly, there comes upon us a renewed consideration of the rightfulness of excluding, by the whole material forces of the government, a little more than one-half of our population.

I suppose this is always so. An individual cannot subject one action to the test of duty, without, from that time forward, finding it difficult to escape the application of the same test to other questions of life. Take any man who has been educated frivolously, thoughtlessly, who has fallen into bad habits, and let there come to him, in a time when he is to act in some important matter, the question, Is it right? and let him experience the luxury of obedience to the law of duty, and, from that time forward, he can govern himself easily and comfortably by no other law. And so, when our fathers began their struggle with England by discussing simply the limitations of parliamentary power, they ended by the immortal

declarations of human rights contained in the opening clauses of the Declaration of Independence. In England, to-day, the party which has just come into power by extending the rights of suffrage to the laboring classes commits itself, as its first public measure, to the enfranchisement, voluntarily, and because it is right, of the people of Ireland from the dominion of an alien and aristocratic church. And therefore it is a fitting sequel to the victory which we have just achieved in this country, that we should turn our attention to the question that is before us to-day. As I have said, a little more than one-half of the population of this Commonwealth is excluded from all share in its government, — kept out by the whole force of the national power. That this is just has been taken for granted, without reflection, by the large majority of all mankind in all ages; or, rather, let me say, that the large majority of all mankind and all ages have established their forms of government without considering the question whether it was right or not. Certainly no graver question than this can present itself to the statesmen of this Commonwealth. It is to be discussed dispassionately, and without heat.

Now, in turning in my own mind what I ought to say to you here to-day, I have failed to think of a single reason which I can give why you or I should have the right of suffrage which does not include women; and I think I may safely challenge any human being to come forward, and state why it is that I am permitted to cast my vote, — to give any general rule which shall define the qualities or capacities or interests which should entitle a person to have a share in the administration of the government, from which women are excluded. I shall assume, as the foundation of my argument, that you believe that every man has this right. I am speaking to the representatives, to the statesmen, of a people who believe that. The framers of our government, Mr. Chairman, understood perfectly the principles of constitutional liberty; but they did what you often see done by the inventor of a new machine, a new principle in mechanism. The idea dawns upon the inventor; he turns it over in his mind until he sees the truth of his newly-discovered principle, the capacity of his newly-discovered force. That he understands and sees clearly. But when he comes to put his machine into actual operation, and to adjust the details of its mechanism, it very often takes the experience and the labor of years to bring to perfection the conception of the workman's brain. Not because there is any error in his principle, but because the mechanism in its details, which he at first tries, is not adjusted, is

not consistent with the principle, and is not symmetrical or harmonious in all its parts. Now, that is precisely what the framers of our Constitution did in regard to the principle of human government. They state in the Bill of Rights a series of comprehensive fundamental principles, no one of which, as far as I am aware, has ever been disputed by anybody from the time of the organization of the Constitution until to-day. There have been changes made, — changes in the details, in the mechanism, of our government. The framers themselves expected these, and provided a simple and convenient method of revising and altering the Constitution. But in the statement of fundamental principles laid down in the Bill of Rights, so far as I have read the history of this Commonwealth, no living person, no person who has lived under them, ever has attempted to make a change. Now, in regard to this matter of the principle which our fathers, using the pen of John Adams, announced as the rightful principle governing us in the adjustment of the government, it is this. They state, let me first observe, in one of the sentences of the Bill of Rights — not that they did not expect that the details would be frequently changed, for, as I said before, they provided a method for a convenient and easy change from time to time — but they state, "A frequent recurrence to these fundamental principles of the Constitution is absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty, and to maintain a free government. The people ought, consequently, to have particular attention to all these principles, and to require of their lawgivers and magistrates an exact and constant observance of them." Now, what do they say as a principle, in the ninth article of the Bill of Rights? "All the inhabitants of this Commonwealth, having such qualifications as they [that is, all the inhabitants] shall establish, have an equal right to elect officers, and to be elected to public employment. Each individual of this society has a right to be protected by it in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and property, according to standing laws. He is consequently to contribute his share to the expense of this protection; and no part of the property of any individual can with justice be taken from him, or applied to public uses, without his own consent, or that of the representative body of the people." They say also, as another principle, that "No man, or corporation or association of men, have any right to obtain advantages, or particular and exclusive privileges, distinct from those of the whole community;" and that "the idea of a man being born a magistrate, lawgiver, or judge, is absurd and unnatural." That is the principle; every inhabitant of the Commonwealth has a

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American
tracts.

right to an equal share in its government. Every inhabitant of this Commonwealth, bound to contribute his or her share to its protection, cannot have his or her property taken away, except by leave. And no man or association of men, whether it be one man or a body of men, have a right to exclusive advantages distinct from those of the entire community. Now, how did our fathers carry out this principle? Let us see. All the inhabitants having an equal right to be eligible to office, no person shall be a senator who is not seized of a freehold in this Commonwealth of the value of two hundred pounds at least, or possessed of personal estate to the value of six hundred pounds. In regard to the election to the House of Representatives (every inhabitant having this equal right as a matter of principle), every male person only, being twenty-one years of age, having a freehold or estate within the town of an annual income of three pounds, shall have a right to vote for representative of said town. No person shall be eligible to the office of governor, unless he shall at the same time be seized of a freehold of the value of one thousand pounds. Having declared this principle fundamental, absolute, that every inhabitant is entitled to an equal share in the administration of the government, they proceed to say that such inhabitant shall only be elected governor if a male person, and possessed of a freehold of a thousand pounds. One generation has stricken out the latter inconsistency, and has so far perfected the machine. Now the question is, what we will do with the other. We are here to say that this declaration of John Adams is not a lie, and that the fundamental principle of the Constitution is right, and the rule and detail of its administration is wrong.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we admit frankly that woman differs from man. Is the difference such as affects her qualification for the vote? Is the difference such as affects her need of the vote? Is the difference such as affects the public's need of her vote? The answer to these three questions exhausts this argument.

What ought the voter to have to entitle him or her to this prerogative? Three things, it seems to me, are essential, and three things only. The voter should have, in the first place, a desire for the public welfare; he should have, in the second place, the capacity to judge of the character of the persons proposed as candidates for public office; he should have, in the third place, the capacity to judge of the effects of proposed measures. I can think of no other test. I have never seen stated by jurist, philosopher, or statesman, any other test, any other requisite or essential, but

these three,—love of country, capacity to select its servants, capacity to appreciate its necessities. These make up, it seems to me, the right to share in its administration. Now, I admit, if we could be quite sure that any class in the community lacked either of these, we should claim the right for the State to exclude it from its administration. We are quite sure that infants have not the two last; and therefore, drawing a line which from the nature of the case must be more or less arbitrary, we exclude them from a share in the government. We have thought, we were quite sure, that citizens of foreign countries could not have that supreme devotion to the interests of ours which would make them willing to live, and, if need be, die, for her service. And so we have claimed the right to impose upon them a term of probation before admitting them to this exalted prerogative. But which of these essentials does woman not possess? In the first place, the desire for the public welfare. Does she not love every thing that is best for the State? She loves peace, she loves quiet, she loves order, she loves the security of the home, she loves and appreciates the principle which distinguishes a republican from an imperial government. The most valuable distinction between this government and most others upon earth in its theory that I know of, is this: that whereas other governments make it their ambition to create national strength, run a career of glory, a brilliant military career, to press with an iron heel upon the weak, and encounter with iron front the strong, the republic seeks and finds its success in the multiplication of happy homes, in the development of individual character, and, to use the simple phrase of the Declaration, in the pursuit of happiness.

I believe that woman will bring to the administration of the State an earnest desire for this, in which the public welfare, on the true American theory, consists. I do not think that it will be claimed by anybody, that our sisters or wives will, fall behind us in this first essential requisite to a share in the control of the State,—desire for its welfare. Cannot she equal us in love and devotion to the State who surpasses us in capacity for love and devotion wherever she is permitted to indulge them? Man chiefly values the objects of his affection for the dignity, the comfort, and the happiness they are capable of conferring upon him: woman values herself for the dignity, the comfort, and the happiness she is capable of bestowing on the objects of her affection.

In the next place comes the capacity to judge of character. We all know that that is woman's instinct. If there is any one thing

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American

tracts.

in which woman may claim to be our superior, it is, that when she sees a person who asks for her confidence or ours, and we are reasoning about it, and speculating about it, the infallible and unerring instinct of the woman gets at the truth. How many times every man who has put his confidence in somebody, and suffers by it, remembers too late the warning that he had received at home!

Now, in the third place, the capacity to judge of the effects of proposed measures. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, that wherever woman has been permitted to appear in the sphere of public life, she has proved herself, in this essential particular, fully equal to the average of men in the same position? Since the Reformation in England, there have been three queens regnant, who have come to the throne by inheritance, — Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne, and Queen Victoria, — the worst of whom has been fully the equal of any king that has in the same time inherited the English throne, and the other two immeasurably the superior. In the list of great names of the sovereigns of Europe, few in number, there are none brighter than those of Isabella of Spain, Maria Theresa, and Queen Victoria. Then, wherever woman has appeared in the sphere of politics, either as responsible director or as counsellor and companion of man, has not her duty been well performed? In that mighty parliamentary struggle, one of the most interesting chapters in English history, in which, at the age of twenty-four, the genius of the younger Pitt overcame a hostile majority in the House of Commons, and, what was perhaps a more formidable obstacle, the combined antagonism of Burke and Fox and Sheridan, his chief confidant and counsellor was his mother.

Just think, Mr. Chairman, in considering this question of the capacity of woman, of the education which she has had in the duties to which we have confined and consigned her. Do you think, if you had spent your whole life in rocking the cradle and darning stockings, that you would contribute as much as you do now to the administration of the State? I undertake to say that no man whose experience has enabled him to see women who have had an education which has tended to develop their faculties equally with those of men will deny that, in the kind of mental power essential to the administration of the affairs of the State, they have proved themselves fully equal to men. In the studies which require the reasoning powers, the mathematical faculties, woman has often proved herself superior to most men. In the town where I was born and educated, and where we had pretty good schools and pretty good scholars, the girls were always at the head of the classes. My

friend who has preceded me [James Freeman Clarke], and my friend who sits on the committee [A. G. Fay of Concord], perhaps could tell you something of a lady who fitted me for college, of whom it was said by the late President Everett that she could fill any professorship in Harvard College. Under her tuition, the university used to place students who were suspended for a time; and she kept them up with their classes in every study, doing a work which would have been divided among a dozen male teachers in the College. She was one of the few persons in this country who are said to have read the "*Mécanique Celeste*" in the original, without the assistance of the translation of Dr. Bowditch; a Greek and Latin scholar to whose studies *Æschylus* and *Homer* and *Virgil* were familiar; well acquainted, too, with the languages and literatures of modern Europe; who could tell naturalists, like *Tuckerman* and *Gray*, some things about their own studies which they were glad to hear. Yet that instructed brain, that could have taught the best railroad engineer the most difficult principles of his art, could not be permitted in Concord to express a choice for the highway-surveyor who should mend the road past her door! The woman to whose teaching some of the best intellects in the State owed their best accomplishments could not be trusted to attend a town meeting to aid in the selection of a committee-man for the district school to which her grandchild was sent!

Does the difference between man and woman affect her need of the ballot? Now, I do not propose to go over this ground fully. You all know how very unequal the laws have been and still remain, though much improved, regarding the right of husband and wife. The husband still retains the control of his wife's person absolutely as the brutality of the common law ever gave it to him. He can give away all the property which is the proceeds of the joint earnings of both; he can give away his own property from her; while she cannot give away her shares in corporations, or interest in land, without his consent. It used to be said, when we were proposing a man of large property for office, "He has a stake in the country." But what stake in the country is like that which a mother has in her child? But it is said politics is not a woman's business. I do not suppose it is a woman's business. Politics is not anybody's business in this country. It is not a clergyman's business; but you give a clergyman a vote. Politics is not the physician's business; but he is none the worse citizen for that. Politics is not the mechanic's business; but it is the power by which he is enabled to prosecute his business, and to make it safe and

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American

e tracts.

profitable and free. Now, if you give me the ballot to protect my business, to secure just laws and efficient administration of them, that my counting-room or my office may be safe from the burglar, shall not woman have a right to protect her child, to protect her business of educating a citizen and a voter, from the rumseller or tempter, in any form which is proper? Shall she not protect her property from being unjustly taxed? Shall not the eighty per cent of the teachers of our schools who are women be entitled, when they become wives and mothers, to a share in the administration of the school-system which they know infinitely more about than their husbands or their brothers? Shall she not have something to say about an equality of wages between the two sexes? We all know, that, for precisely the same result, the woman gets her \$400 or \$500 a year, while her brother gets his \$800 or \$1000 a year. Now, if you put the ballot into the hands of women, that injustice will be remedied. You got your ten-hour law soon enough, or your ten-hour system without legislation soon enough, when the workingman asked for it with the ballot in his hands; and you will get full compensation for woman when she demands it by the same power.

Then, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me also that society needs that woman should have the ballot. Not only is she capable of it, not only does she need it, but it needs her. This has been said here already better than I can say it. I believe that this thing is true — that, wherever any law is to apply over the largest amount of population, to apply to the largest number of possible instances, the simple natural law generally prevails, and the disturbing forces disappear. The statistics which you will recollect Mr. Buckle collects in one of his volumes, and which he calls to the aid of a vicious and unsound theory, contain statements which are true. The question whether you will drop a letter into the post-office this morning without directing it depends upon the purest accident in the world. But, in the kingdom of Great Britain, the number of persons who will do that year by year, will vary with the population. The question whether a single individual in Paris will commit suicide seems to depend on his temperament, the accidents of his life, or his course in life. But, throughout the French empire, the number of suicides rises and falls with the price of wheat; and so, in this matter of government, the simple law is that the interests of the nation will be the governing motive in the administration of the government. Now, you give the government to one man, and the disturbing cause, personal ambition or want

of capacity, comes in, and you do not get your good government. You give it to twenty men, and you have got twenty interests to control this disturbing cause. Still, these twenty will be liable to have some prejudices and some interests unlike each other; and the larger number you get, the less likely the disturbing causes are to operate, and the more likely to control one another. You add one hundred per cent to the voting population of this country, and you decrease the disturbing forces operating to overcome the simple law of the interests of the nation, which should direct and control its government. You make it harder to buy up voters to corrupt a community. The passion on one side is neutralized by the passion on the other. The rogues do not predominate, because rogues do not agree. One rogue may have one motive of a selfish nature, and another has a different one. I think in this case, Mr. Chairman, the truth of this has been seen in your own experience, when, as the suffrage has extended in this Commonwealth, where it is as extensive as anywhere in the world, public measures have been discussed and decided more and more on the principle of right and wrong, and less and less on other grounds. Do you now hear what you used formerly to hear on our platforms and in our caucuses, an appeal to the prejudices of one class against another, attempts to excite contempt and derision toward poverty or ignorance, or jealousy and envy toward wealth and education? There are exceptions, of course; but the questions which are asked to-day on our political platforms as to the measure which comes there for discussion are Is it right? is it just? is it humane? and no speaker touches a public audience better than the one who appeals to the best, purest, and highest motives in our nature. We need woman for this reason. We need her also to give variety to the interests, to the characters, which are to take a part in the administration of the government. There were two lines of Pope which John Adams loved to quote, which expressed this idea: —

"Jarring interests, of themselves, create
The according music of a well-tuned state."

We want woman for that also. And we want the special qualities which woman will bring, which are hers alone. We want her modesty, we want her love and her purity, to help us determine all questions which affect the good order of society, the regulation of the public morals. We want her love of peace to deal with questions where the angry masculine passions are excited, which would

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American

e tracts.

urge the nation into war. So I say, that not only does woman need the ballot, but she is fit for the ballot; and we ask for the change on the ground that society needs that she should have the ballot.

There are two or three objections which I shall ask permission to refer to in this connection. It is said, if a woman votes, of course she must be elected to office; and a great deal of very good wit is expended in holding up to ridicule the incongruity of the duties of the nursery and the bench or the senate-house. Now, I do not understand that the right to vote implies the right to be elected to office. The right to vote implies exactly this: that a voter shall be elected to such office as his business will permit him to discharge the duties of, and his fellow-citizens think he is more capable of than anybody else; and it is not at all likely, because women are elected to office, that women with families demanding their attention at home will be called to preside over the deliberations of our supreme courts, or to lead armies in the field, although, for that matter, when slavery demanded its pound of flesh which was secured to it by our national compact, I think we should have preferred the ruling of Portia to that of Taney. [Laughter.] Perhaps, also, Joan of Arc might have given a few wholesome lessons in generalship even to Gen. McClellan. [Renewed laughter.]

Then it is said, and this applies to that also, that the home duties of women would be neglected. We should expect of our public servants only such attendance to politics as is compatible with such duties. I think you did your duties at home, Mr. Chairman, before you came here, and do not come here unless you can do so consistently with those duties.

Then it is said that the giving of this power to women would create discord in families; that husbands would be found of one political creed, and the wife of another; and an angry, bitter strife, which grows up between neighbors sometimes in this way, would grow up in the family circle. Now, we all know how this thing would work. The husband and wife would be found ordinarily agreeing in political opinions. Brothers, men of the same family, are generally found to belong to the same political party. That community of tastes and similarity of education, that love of the same common objects, which induces the husband to select one woman for his wife, and induces the woman to take him for a husband, will operate in this matter, as in all others. You do not deny your wife the right to her own opinion about matters of religious belief, about which men differ fiercely; and I suppose the cases are rare where the husband is found belonging to one reli-

gious faith, and the wife to another. Still, such cases are frequent enough to show that it creates no discord in the family circle. But, on the contrary, it seems to me that the admission of the wife to a share in what in a free republic must be the most interesting, the most sacred, and the most absorbing of the husband's interests and pursuits, will in itself unite a family. What a comfort to be able to find at home a trusting, sympathizing counsellor, from whom one-half of your heart shall not be hid! What a comfort to be able to consult with her, with whom you consult about your own interests and the interests of your children, about the interests of the State, dearer to you than your own interests or those of your children! I remember Robert Browning says,—

"God be thanked! the meanest of his creatures
Boasts two soul sides; one to face the world with,
One to show a woman when he loves her."

And Walter Scott said, when Lady Scott died, "What shall I do with that part of my heart which I have been accustomed to show to her, and to nobody else?"

This will tend to enlarge that sacred and tender domain in the husband's heart to which the wife is admitted. It will tend to throw about the national interests a sacredness and tenderness which is associated now only with those of the family. Now the wife has no interest or share in the highest duty of her husband.

It is also said that woman does not ask for the ballot. I thought she did ask for it. I thought the petitions on your table showed that many women asked for it. Certainly this argument cannot be applicable to them. In regard to all women, this argument, which is the one most urged in private and in public, must, it seems to me, stand or fall with the others. If what we have said be true, if it be true that woman is capable of exercising this duty, if it be true that she needs this right, if it be true that the best interests of society require that she should have it,—and, if it is not true, we have nothing to say, because our whole case must fall,—if this be true, then it is the gravest charge that can be made against your existing institutions that she does not ask for it. You do me a great wrong if you deprive me of my vote: you do me a greater wrong, if you deprive me of my wish for my vote. If God has given to woman the love of country, it is her right to indulge that love by laboring for its advancement. If he has given her the capacity to judge of the public weal, it is her right and duty to exercise that judgment; and she is criminal, and you are accomplices in her crime, if you

welfare.
ore a Joi
setts leg
American
e tracts.

permit her, even if she will, to refrain from the performance of that duty, and the development of that faculty.

Then it is said, Mr. Chairman, that we seek to expose the State to an incalculable peril; that there is a danger that the ignorant and depraved women will outvote the others. It is the old story. There has not been a step in the history of civil liberty, of human effort, or human education, that we have not been met—that friends of progress have not been met—with that precise argument. You cannot give men the suffrage because the men of the Five Points, or the thieves, or the scoundrels, will outnumber the honest men in voting. You cannot give men light, you cannot teach men to read, because they will read bad books. You cannot allow men to think for themselves, because the tendency to infidelity will develop itself. It is the old story. Now, the ignorant and depraved women bear no greater proportion to the whole of their sex than the ignorant and depraved men do to theirs; yet the experiment of universal suffrage, as applied to our sex, is a complete success. No, Mr. Chairman: the safety of freedom is in movement. I remember a Democratic orator, some few years ago, compared this nation to the Wandering Jew, and said our destiny was, to "March, march, march." Where Gen. Cushing would have had us march to may be somewhat questionable; but there was a profound truth embodied in the statement, that the safety of freedom is in constant movement. The moment you place in a reservoir or a cistern the waters of liberty, that moment they become stagnant and offensive. The love of liberty is a perpetual fountain, which must run free, and will not stay. The safest place for the hero is in the thickest of the fight. What is animal in him will be safer where his soul will rust in ease and security; but that which makes him a hero is safe, the heroism in him burns and glows, when the body and the life are in danger. So the safest place for the nation is when it is on the move in the pursuit of justice. Did you ever hear, or read in history, of a nation perishing from within when it was struggling to do justice and to do right? Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, if there is any truth, either in the lessons of history or the teachings of religion, you cannot put this nation in peril, or this Commonwealth in peril, by any measure you adopt when you are trying to do justice.

Then it is said that women will be unwilling to go to the polls in cities; that the places are not fit for their presence. I think that also is the old argument. You could not admit women to the banqueting-hall of the German nations to which Mr. Clarke has re-

ferred, where there were scenes of revelry and drunkenness. But after the time that women were admitted to the dinner-table, and took its head, the license, the drunkenness, the revelry, disappeared; and in their stead came the festival of the New-England or the English home, graced and refined and purified by her presence. I have seen a great many mean men in my time; but I never yet saw a man mean enough to insult a woman at the polls. And if there were such, I think that would be an argument for excluding the male sex from the franchise, and not the other. [Laughter.] Do you believe that the merchants of New York, the Grinnells and the Astors, would allow the voting to go on in that city just as it does now, and that men would cast their votes in beer-shops, or through a hole in a shutter, if their wives had a share in the elective franchise? It seems to me that it would purify the ballot, and not degrade woman. What comes to woman from without cannot defile her.

Mr. Chairman, we are just on the threshold of constitutional liberty. These last eighty years, crowded with history, crowded with stirring events, full of growth as they have been, how short they are compared with the future to which we are looking forward! The life of a man, a generation, the terms of presidential office—they are but the pulsations of an artery in this mighty national life! And we must not think that we have learned the whole secret of government, or have explored all the treasures which liberty has to bestow upon us. I have always been touched with the familiar sentences, known by heart, I dare say, to almost every one within the sound of my voice, which John Robinson uttered to the departing Pilgrims on the beach at Leyden—

"We are now ere long to part asunder, and the Lord knoweth whether we are ever to see each other's faces again. I charge you, before God and his blessed angels, to follow me no longer than I have followed Christ. If God shall reveal any thing to you by any other instrument, be as ready to receive it as you have been to receive any truth by my ministry. I am very confident that the Lord has more truth and light to break forth out of his Holy Word."

That sentence, Mr. Chairman, is the key-note of New-England history. "More truth and more light!" More truth is to break out of nature. The new powers of galvanism and electricity, the new adaptations of the mechanical forces, I believe, are to raise up the laborer; so that it will be the fate of no man, in the republic that is to come, to do mere drudgery. Why, already, within the memory

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American
e tracts.

of living men, there has been created a power through the invention of steam-engines, which gives to the people of England to-day a force in their service equal to the entire population of the globe. The work of eight hundred millions of men is accomplished by the machines worked by the forces of steam to-day. More truth and light are to break out of revelation. Instead of the hard texts of the Old Testament, or the chapter where Paul sends back Onesimus, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule claim their rightful ascendancy over the heart of man.

And so, Mr. Chairman, in civil government I believe more truth is to break out, if we will but see it. We remember the long years in which the whole active forces of this government were on the side of slavery, — when the provisions for human liberty were simply dead restraints, and not active living forces. Our fathers said, in the Declaration of Independence, that, to secure these rights of liberty, equality, &c., governments were instituted among men; and they fought out a seven years' war on that issue. They instituted their government: and the next generation proceeded to show that that government was instituted to secure the rights of slavery, and to expound the Constitution on that hypothesis; and the grand purposes declared in the preamble of the Constitution, and the injunction that Congress should guarantee to every State a republican form of government, were entirely forgotten and ignored. The declarations of rights contained in the Constitution were deemed, at best, but as walls, marking the boundaries of federal legislation, or against which the forces of State power should beat themselves in vain. We are beginning to find out that these great provisions declare objects of affirmative and active exercise of national power and sovereignty, just as much as the regulation of commerce or maintaining the national territory. So, out of our Constitution, out of the principles contained in this Bill of Rights, out of the eternal principles of republican liberty, more truth and more light are still to break forth. And, in the blaze of that light, woman shall come to the side of man, bringing to the administration of government her love, her purity, and her truth!

Date Due

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

American Woman Suffrage Association.

PREAMBLE. — The undersigned, friends of Woman Suffrage, assembled in delegate convention in Cleveland, O., Nov. 24 and 25, 1869, in response to a call widely signed, and after public notice duly given, believing that a truly representative national organization is needed for the orderly and efficient prosecution of the Woman Suffrage movement in America, which shall embody the deliberate action of the State and local organizations, and shall carry with it their united weight, do hereby form The American Woman Suffrage Association.

ARTICLE I.

NAME.

This Association shall be known as The American Woman Suffrage Association.

ARTICLE II.

OBJECT.

Its object shall be to concentrate the efforts of all the advocates of Woman Suffrage in the United States.

SECTION 1. To form auxiliary State Associations in every State where none such now exist, and to co-operate with those already existing which shall declare themselves auxiliary before the first day of March next; the authority of the auxiliary societies being recognized

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
American
e tracts.

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL.

Published every Saturday in Boston.

JULIA WARD HOWE, LUCY STONE, HENRY B. BLACKWELL, AND T. W.
HIGGINSON, *Associate Editors.*

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL.—The friends of Woman Suffrage who wish to keep the issue clear from entangling alliances with other reforms, and the endless host of individual whims and vagaries,—who would pursue it with the same singleness of aim that marks the movement in England, and the temperance and other special reforms in this country, have established a weekly paper, "THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL," published in Boston and Chicago, and edited by Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Lucy Stone, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, and Mr. T. W. Higginson, assisted by accomplished friends of the cause. "THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL" is a fair and attractive paper in appearance; while the variety and spirit of its articles, and the dignity, self-respect, good-humor, and earnestness of its tone, will show how profoundly mistaken are those who suppose that folly and extravagance are necessarily characteristic of the discussion of the question. THE JOURNAL is indispensable to those who would truly understand the character of the movement, and measure its progress.—George William Curtis, in Harper's Weekly.

One copy, one year \$2.50

Liberal terms to canvassers.

ST. LOUIS OFFICE.—Insurance Exchange Building, Room 18, cor. 5th and Olive Streets.

All communications for THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL, and all letters relating to its editorial management, must be addressed to MARY A. LIVERMORE, *Editor*.

Letters containing remittances, and relating to the business-department of the paper, must be addressed to WOMAN'S JOURNAL, Box 4297, Boston, Mass.

Date Due

welfare. Re-
ore a Joint
setts legis-
[American
e tracts.