

whose seat was not bought either by himself or for him. That Colorado is now represented in the United States Senate by only one Senator instead of two is attributable to the interesting detail that no one could be elected without buying his election, and in view of the woes of Lorimer, no would-be purchaser quite dared to "come through" with the needful legal tender. The men of Colorado are either discouraged or case-hardened. The women are neither, and the most potent force now at work for the political regeneration of the Centennial State is the votes of women.

For ten years a fight has been waged for an eight-hour working day in the hazardous occupation of mining, in which men only are employed. A decade ago the people of Colorado so amended their State Constitution as to empower the legislature to enact such a law and make it compulsory. The mining interests prevented such legislation and the Cripple Creek strike with its tragedies and usurpations followed. The legislature, lately adjourned, belatedly enacted the laws necessary for putting that constitutional provision into operation and it was the women of Colorado and not the men who forced the issue upon legislative attention. They descended upon the State senate in two divisions, one Republican and the other Democratic, and made a man-to-man canvass for this wise and humane measure and got it. They did it because it was right.

Furthermore, public questions are nowhere else, in Colorado, so thoroughly discussed and painstakingly studied as in the women's clubs of that State. Women—such women as are intelligently interested in anything else, in church or school or home—give to the consideration of public issues that fidelity and service that so characterizes womanhood in the home and the church, with the result that such women, at least, vote more understandingly than men commonly do. Men are inclined to take the newspapers for their guides, whereas many women do genuine research work before they vote and are not content to vote unless they understand what they are voting for and why.

One result of this is that the tendency to discharge the duties of electors with fidelity and patriotism is, in Colorado, a growing tendency, especially with that generation of youths that has come under the tutelage of an enfranchised womanhood. During those plastic years in which boys are in the hands of women, either as mothers or as teachers, the mothers and women teachers of Colorado are talking and thinking of civic affairs and it is impossible that their patriotic enthusiasm for civic Right Things shall not be communicated to, and become a part of, the characters of the men of the Colorado of the future. The political millenium has not been brought to Colorado through women's voting. It will be long, long on the way, but if it comes it will be anyhow as

much through the enfranchised womanhood of the State as through that of its manhood.

* * *

A MORAL WEAKNESS IN OUR GOVERNMENT.

Charles H. Ingersoll in the *New York Times* of January 16, 1910.

Woman's right to vote I accept as a matter of course and irrespective of any conclusions as to public policy. The fact that this right inheres in woman implies that the exercise of it would broadly benefit civic government, and the denial of it, purely as an act of injustice, implies a moral weakness in governments likely to be fundamental.

And it is along these general lines that my convictions on this subject are based, for in considering the details of woman's fitness in the qualities contributing to best citizenship there is too much that is speculative to make deduction profitable.

One rather negative but quite effective point might be that if we men are to concede Bryce's charge against our government of cities,* consistency and frankness would indicate a resort to the assistance of women in improving our work; could they do worse than we have?

Is it not quite possible that the questions raised as to woman's eligibility for governmental honors proceed from that same obliquity that makes us failures as governors? If so, may we be temporarily endowed with moral courage to summon women to our aid! As a somewhat literal believer in democracy I cannot but deplore the disfranchisement of a large half of our citizens, especially so respectable a half as chivalry insists that women are.

We listen with reverence to orators' apostrophization of the sacred right of franchise, and with approval to the rebuke of men who fail to exercise that right, never thinking of our participation in the universal paradox of denying this sacred right to half of humanity! It is perhaps questionable if woman has more civic intelligence than man, but, accepting Bryce's conclusion, I doubt if any one will claim she has less, and there are many indications that with opportunity she would not only develop more aptly in this direction than has her master, but that she might pull him with her to higher levels.

The fact that we don't know because we have never tried her, and are, therefore, compelled to deal purely in theory, is strictly up to us. It has been shown on numerous occasions where the bars have been dropped that women are at least capable of direct positive action. These instances

*Mr. Ingersoll's allusion is to the opinion expressed by the Hon. James Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," that their city governments constituted the one conspicuous failure of the American people.

have afforded a glimpse of possibilities which might at once settle woman's status in civic matters, and also account for the many conservative fears as to letting her vote.

As an instance, in South Orange, N. J., a referendum vote, including women, passed an appropriation of nearly \$200,000 for school purposes which had been unfavorably considered for a decade by the man government. Women have in many ways shown their contempt of a myriad of "considerations" that weigh heavily with professional and business men and politicians who have given American municipalities their unenviable reputation, and there is much to encourage the hope that they would disturb enough well-established precedents to make requisite an appendix to Bryce's history.

Municipal questions are essentially home questions, and as such essentially concern the women whose exclusive business is at home; woman's concentration is, therefore, in the direction of municipal affairs, while man's is in the direction of business, which in itself often disqualifies him for public service. The business man has pretty thoroughly proved his incapacity for public office, and has contributed his full share to municipal disrepute. This is the natural result, first, from preoccupation with money getting, but most important from his deep-seated bias toward private, personal, financial and business considerations when weighed against purely public interests; he of all others is most susceptible to ulterior influence.

Thus municipal governments are left largely to professional politicians, who legislate ruthlessly against the home and community, and make a business of government. Can we doubt that the real householders will work at least some improvement in this condition?

Woman's suffrage is not so vital a matter under existing voting methods, but with the various improved systems that are doubtless coming in the various guises of direct primary, short ballot, commission government, initiative, referendum and recall, and preferential voting, which will bring the people again in touch with their government, there will come an era of civic intelligence and progressiveness inconceivable from our present viewpoint; then will more democracy cure the present evils of democracy, and then will woman contribute her full share to real municipal government.

+ + +

THEODORE PARKER ON WOMEN IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

From Theodore Parker's Address on "The Public"
Function of Woman."

By nature woman has the same political rights that man has—to vote, to hold office, to make and administer laws. These she has as a matter of

right. The strong hand and the great head of man keep her down, nothing more. In America, in Christendom, woman has no political rights, is not a citizen in full; she has no voice in making or administering the laws, none in electing the rulers or administrators thereof. She can hold no office—cannot be committee of a primary school, overseer of the poor, or guardian to a public lamp-post. But any man, with conscience enough to keep out of jail, mind enough to escape the poorhouse, and body enough to drop his ballot into the box, he is a voter. He may have no character, even no money, that is no matter—he is male. The noblest woman has no voice in the State. Men make laws disposing of her property, her person, her children; still she must bear it "with a patient shrug."

Looking at it as a matter of pure right and pure science, I know no reason why woman should not be a voter, or hold office, or make and administer laws. I do not see how I can shut myself into political privileges and shut woman out, and do both in the name of inalienable right. Certainly, every woman has a natural right to have her property represented in the general representation of property, and her person represented in the general representation of persons.

Looking at it as a matter of expediency, see some facts. Suppose woman had a share in the municipal regulation of Boston, and there were as many Alderwomen as Aldermen, as many Common Councilwomen as Common Councilmen—do you believe that, in defiance of the law of Massachusetts, the city government, last spring, would have licensed every two hundred and forty-fourth person in the city to sell intoxicating drink? would have made every thirty-fifth voter a rum-seller? I do not.

Do you believe the women of Boston would spend ten thousand dollars in one year in a city frolic, or spend two or three thousand every year, on the Fourth of July, for skyrocket and fire-crackers; would spend four or five thousand dollars to get their Canadian guests drunk in Boston harbor, and then pretend that Boston had not money enough to establish a high school for girls, to teach the daughters of mechanics and grocers to read French and Latin, and to understand the higher things which rich men's sons are driven to at college? I do not.

Do you believe that the women of Boston, in 1851, would have spent three or four thousand dollars to kidnap a poor man, and have taken all the chains which belonged to the city, and put them round the court house, and have drilled three hundred men, armed with bludgeons and cutlasses, to steal a man and carry him back to slavery? I do not. Do you think, if the women had had the control, "fifteen hundred men of property and standing" would have volunteered to take a poor man, kidnaped in Boston, and conduct him