

Womens Right

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

Illinois Association Opposed to
the Extension of Suffrage
to Women.

Corbin

CHICAGO

1906

1 3838 4

THE PUBLISHER.

FEB 1908

Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

OFFICERS

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN,
President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON,
1st Vice President.
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY,
2nd Vice President.
MISS J. C. FAIRFIELD,
Secretary-Treasurer,
587 Dearborn Ave.

MRS. A. T. GALT, Auditor.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MRS. GEO. W. SMITH.
MRS. RALPH N. ISHAM.
MRS. A. T. GALT.
MRS. WM. ELIOT FURNESS.
MRS. FRANCIS LACKNER.
MISS MARY POMEROY GREEN.

Ladies:

The official report of the Secretary states that 10,646 copies of our documents have been sent out officially during the past year, mainly to editors, legislators, librarians, college presidents and clergymen of all denominations, besides many others sent on private account.

On December 12th, 1905, the Chicago Charter Convention met and appointed its Committees, and commenced the preliminary work of framing the new City Charter. It was our first intention to wait till the hearing offered by the Committee on Municipal Elections, to whom the matter of granting municipal suffrage to women was referred, before making any statement of our side of the question. But our opponents took the field immediately and in force, so that we were obliged to issue our first *Protest*, which consisted of practical and statistical arguments covering nearly the whole ground in March. (Copy submitted herewith.) On May 28th the first hearing was held and we presented a *Remonstrance* signed by a Committee composed of the officers and the Executive Board of the Association and a few prominent members.

We supposed that this was to be the only hearing, but soon after the middle of October we received notice that a second hearing would be given October 23d. The ladies of the Committee who had been given charge of the work, were much scattered, two of them being in Europe and others out of town beyond reach in time for the hearing. We were told that our opponents would present a petition signed by ten thousand men and women; that they had the indorsement of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs numbering twenty thousand members, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union,

of the Illinois Federation of Labor, of the Chicago Woman's Club and several other local organizations. It was impossible to ignore the occasion and equally impossible to meet it with a united front. The only thing left to do seemed to be for the President to act upon her individual responsibility. It was a trying ordeal but the memory of twenty years of faithful anti-suffrage work in this community, and the deep conviction that in society as in nature it is often the silent influences which are the most uncompromising and the most unconquerable, sustained her.

The *Open Letter* printed on a later page was therefore prepared and sent to the Chairman of the Committee on Municipal Elections with the request that it should be read by the Secretary.

The reading proceeded quietly until the two paragraphs printed below in bold type had been concluded, when a lady of the opposite side rose to move that the paper be excluded on the ground of irrelevancy. Another lady gave the motion a prompt second. Professor Graham Taylor, Professorial lecturer on Sociology of the University of Chicago, a member also of the Committee, put the motion and it was carried amid some excitement. The attention of Professor Taylor was, however, called to the remaining lines of the paper. After reading them he moved a reconsideration and the paper was restored to its standing by a unanimous vote. The excitement, however, had not wholly subsided and the Committee adjourned to November 1st without taking a vote.

Meantime an earnest appeal was made to your President to put the question of the "irrelevancy" of her argument before the public on its merits. She therefore prepared a letter which was printed in the Record-Herald of Sunday, October 28th, and was sent the following day to the Chairman of the Committee on Municipal Elections, with the request that it should be filed as a part of the Anti-Suffrage argument. The Committee met November 1st and reported unfavorably upon the petition for Municipal Suffrage for Women by a decisive vote.

With this explanation the following letters are respectfully submitted:

AN OPEN LETTER.

To the Honorable the Committee on Municipal Elections, Appointment and Tenure of Office of the Chicago Charter Convention.

GENTLEMEN:—The opponents of woman suffrage as represented by the Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, have already had the honor to lay before your honorable body two papers expressing their views concerning the granting of municipal suffrage to women. These two papers cover in a general way the grounds for their belief that to impose such political duties upon women would be unjust to the women, uncalled for by public opinion, a menace to the best interests of our social and domestic life, and to the civil and political power of the community. One important phase of the subject, however, has been given but slight attention, and that is the relation of woman suffrage to the propaganda of revolutionary Socialism, which is at present the acknowledged and most active and strenuous foe of Christian civilization. The undersigned, therefore, on the occasion of this second formal hearing of the subject, begs leave to call the attention of your honorable body to the following facts which must be briefly stated in this paper, but can be readily substantiated.

It is a matter of public record that the Social Democratic party has from its first inception demanded the recognition of woman as a political factor. Every one of its platforms in Europe and this country for the past thirty years has declared for universal suffrage without distinction of sex. The emancipation of women from all laws and customs which make her position in society different from that of man has also been generally demanded. Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, a well known woman suffragist, who was a delegate from this country to the recent International Woman Suffrage Alliance held at Copenhagen, writing to the Boston Transcript of August 11, 1906, says very explicitly:

"The movement to emancipate women is in many parts of

Europe in the hands of Socialists, not the moderate type which for the most part represent Socialism in America, but the radical and extreme class, who would overthrow absolutely the existing institutions, including marriage."

No better witness than Mrs. Harper could be desired, both for impartiality and for actual knowledge of the situation. What the effect of this so-called emancipation of woman would be upon our domestic and social life becomes in view of such testimony a subject demanding the most profound and careful consideration on the part of both men and women, for both are interested in the maintenance of the laws and institutions which protect the home and ensure the operation of those refining and spiritualizing influences which proceed from it. It requires very little study to see that these doctrines, if carried into effect, would completely revolutionize the position of woman in society.

Marriage, as at present constituted, unites her to the father of her children by a legal tie, which cannot be broken except by legal process, gives her certain vested rights in his property, a legal claim upon his labor for her support and a moral claim upon his love and protection during the years of her maternity and those later years when age incapacitates her for self support. All these recognized and established rights Socialism sweeps away at a blow. Under its sway woman becomes an independent citizen, laboring for her own support precisely as a man does, at the same tasks, for the same pay, bearing the same political responsibilities, amenable in short to all the duties of the outside world, in addition to those which nature places upon her in the bearing of children. Such an arrangement, we believe, would be most unjust and oppressive to women, a high-handed invasion of the rights and immunities secured to them by the customs and traditions of civilization and by the government under which we live. The maternal burdens of woman as a sex were placed upon her by Almighty God, and men either in their social or political capacity have no power to relieve her of them. The devotees of Socialism may, as they propose to do, tear down the walls of the home, destroy all its legal safeguards; they may turn

women out into the world, leaving their weaker physical nature defenseless against the selfish instincts and passions which ever control men except as they are influenced and governed by the refining experiences and memories of the home life; they may make that virile strength which nature intended to be the safeguard of woman's virtue, the protection of herself and her babes against rapacity and wrongdoing, of none effect for these purposes; but those sacred functions which the home was created to shelter and protect they can never abrogate. Any economic scheme therefore which puts woman upon a utilitarian equality with man, and makes her his competitor in the market places of the world, to the destruction of her value as a home maker, which deprives her of that virtue which alone fits her for the inestimably important and holy duties of motherhood, by abrogating marriage and encouraging promiscuous relations between men and women, must expect that this fact will be taken into account in the world's judgment of it.

With Socialism as a political party we have at present nothing to do, but the influence which it is already exerting in our schools and colleges, upon our social and domestic life and upon public opinion comes legitimately within our province for criticism. This influence extends over the whole of Christendom and is, so far as the relation of men and women are concerned, and especially in regard to the purity of woman and the stability of the home, most demoralizing. Many indications prove this drift. We cite but two specific instances.

When it was discovered that Maxim Gorky, the Russian Socialist, was accompanied to this country by a woman who was not his wife but who assumed that relation, and the two were consequently ostracized, the outcry which arose from their sympathizers that such treatment should not be meted out to them on account of a "slight irregularity" in their marital relations was peculiarly significant. And the statement which was no doubt true that in the advanced circles of European Socialist society such an instance of puritanism would be considered ridiculous and archaic, indicated a coarse contempt for American loyalty to all that is decent and Christian

in family life. It is this spirit which everywhere accompanies Socialistic teaching concerning the emancipation of women, and which today is threatening the stability of the home and the sacredness of the marriage relation.

The second example comes nearer home. Before citing it we beg to quote a few lines from the Socialist Campaign Book of 1900, issued under the auspices of the National Campaign Committee of the Social Democratic party.

"Today an organization of college Socialists has branches in almost every institution of advanced learning in the country and counts its total adherents by the hundreds. The day is now almost at hand when the American universities, like those of Europe, will be centers of Socialist propaganda."

From an article entitled "The Adventitious Character of Woman" in the American Journal of Sociology for 1906, issued by the University of Chicago, we quote the following lines, premising that they form but a brief portion of a paragraph too long to be transcribed:

"There are thousands of girls leading irregular lives in our large cities, whose parents think they are in factories, stores and business positions, and many of them will return to their native communities or drift farther, and be married and make good wives—uncommonly good wives some of them, because they have had their fling. 'If you drive nature out at the door she will come back through the window,' and this interest in greater stimulation, is, I believe, the dominating force in determining the choice, or rather the drift, of the so-called sporting woman. She is seeking what from a psychological standpoint may be called the normal life."

These words scarcely need comment from us. That girls of loose lives make "uncommonly good wives," and that a more or less extended experience of life in the under world of society is necessary to the psychological completeness of the normal woman, are surely strange discoveries to be made by an Associate Professor of Sociology in a great Christian institution like the University of Chicago. Such language, we submit, can hardly be accounted for except by the sup-

position that the writer is in active sympathy with socialistic views concerning the emancipation of woman. The wonder grows when we consider that to this institution the sons and daughters of Christian families are sent to be instructed in the principles of right living, and that the article is published under the imprint of the University.

The aegis of free speech is invoked for the paragraph which we have quoted. But there can be no monopoly of free speech. We who claim to represent the interests of womanhood, of those silent women at the fireside who are the presiding spirits of the home, and the guardians of morality and public opinion, may as justly claim its protection as our opponents. There are no legitimate privileges of free speech which are not ours as well as theirs, and we make our appeal to public sentiment and the public consciousness of right and decency, with as strong a claim for fair play and just judgment as they.

And this appeal we lay before you, gentlemen of the Committee on Municipal Elections of the Chicago Charter Convention, today. We ask that you will remember your mothers, your wives, your daughters, the women of your homes, and by your action protect them from the evil designs of Socialism; that you will carefully guard them and all good women from a forced participation in the outdoor life of political strife and contention, whose atmosphere would tend so surely to reduce them to the coarse and materialistic level of the Socialistic conception of womanhood.

Hon. Lessing Rosenthal, Chairman of the Committee on Municipal Elections, etc., of the Chicago Charter Convention.

DEAR SIR:—I do not know much about parliamentary law, but I am told that a personal explanation is always in order. Since, as I understand, my Open Letter to your Committee was thrown out of court upon a charge of "irrelevancy" and only restored to the record as a concession to the principle of free speech, it seems to me that I have the right to clear myself

if I am able of the original charge and to do it as publicly as the affront was administered.

I have the honor, therefore, to submit to your honorable Committee the enclosed printed letter and to ask that it may be filed in addition to the other papers which represent our side of the hearing concerning Municipal Suffrage for Women. All these documents will be incorporated, together with this letter, in my official report to this Association.

Very respectfully yours,

CAROLINE F. CORBIN,

President Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

October 29, 1906.

CHICAGO, Oct. 25.—To the Editor of the Chicago Record-Herald: I have been asked by a gentleman who was present at the hearing Tuesday, October 23, before the Committee on Municipal Elections of the Charter Convention, to explain the alleged irrelevancy in some parts of my letter read on that occasion. I take pleasure in acceding to his request, although for want of space the argument must be briefly rehearsed.

That all Socialists are woman suffragists may be taken as proved by the fact that universal suffrage without distinction of sex is a plank in all their party platforms, usually the first plank. Also by the testimony given by Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, a delegate from this country to the convention of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance held at Copenhagen during the past summer, that the movement for the enfranchisement of women in Europe is largely in the hands of the revolutionary Socialists, who aim at the overthrow of all the existing institutions, including marriage. Mrs. Harper also states (see Boston Transcript, Aug. 11, 1906) that the president of one of the National Woman Suffrage Associations in Europe is an advocate of free love doctrines in their most radical form.

Furthermore, a study of the Marxist doctrines, which dic-

tate all the party work of the Social Democratic party here and abroad, demonstrates that the whole system is founded upon the absolute equality of the sexes. Equal work, equal pay, equal political privileges, equal freedom from all legal and moral restraints which conflict with individual freedom.

So woman suffrage is a *sine qua non* to Socialism; it is a thing without which Socialism cannot exist. That this is understood to involve the overthrow of marriage, of social purity, of parental care, may be abundantly proved by references to their published works. For present purposes I quote from an editorial in the New York Mail and Express of October 20, 1906, last Saturday. I have no idea who wrote it; it came to me haphazard. I quote it simply because it is accurate and up-to-date. It is entitled, "Apostles of Free Love," and relates to a book recently published by H. G. Wells, a well-known Socialist. It reads:

"When he comes to his description of the inevitable consequences of the complete substitution of Socialism for our present competitive system he does not stop at generalizing about the beatific effects upon society at large. He shows the certain consequences to the individual, the family and the home. He shows that all present relations of man and wife, parent and child, and our entire moral code must be swept away by the installation of Socialism.

"Speaking of the present day as past, he tells how 'the old-time men and women went apart in couples, into defensive little houses, like beasts into little pits, and in the 'homes' they sat down purposing to love, but really coming very soon to jealous watching of this extravagant mutual proprietorship. All freshness passed very speedily out of their love, out of their conversation, all pride out of their common life. To permit each other freedom was blank dishonor.'

"Not so when the universal brotherhood idea rules the world. 'We four from that time were very close, you understand; we were friends, helpers, personal lovers in the world of lovers.' And in the new world theory this is no isolated case of household promiscuity, for one and all 'float upon a sea of love.'

"All this is nothing new to real students of the Socialistic creed. The European Marxites are frank in their attack on present sex relations, in their recognition that monogamy will not be enforced if Socialism succeeds, and in their acceptance of the unavoidable consequence of state control of children. The tacit agreement of the propagandists in England and this country, however, has been to hide this portion of their creed from the people they wish to convert. Mr. Wells has been more candid than his fellow Socialists believe is expedient at present. All the more does he deserve our thanks."

With all these facts it may readily be seen that the paragraph I quoted from the article in the American Journal of Sociology is thoroughly in accord. Its low estimate of womanly purity, its palliation and even praise of free license in the relations between men and women, bear the true Socialistic stamp, the stamp of a theoretic state of society to which woman suffrage is vitally necessary. My claim is, therefore, that every vote for woman suffrage is a qualified vote for the Socialistic conception of womanhood, and for free license in social and domestic relations.

That women should be debarred, on account of any local interests which may be injured thereby, from expressing their indignant protest against such an assault upon their personal honor, upon the dignity of their position in the home and in society, and the high responsibilities which rest upon them as wives and mothers and the court of appeal in all questions of domestic and social morals, is manifestly absurd and atrocious.

There are women in Chicago who do not propose to allow such assumptions to pass unchallenged, nor will they withdraw their protest till the question is definitely settled whether Christian civilization or Socialistic anarchy is to prevail. They deeply feel that not only their own honor is involved, but the preservation of society and the permanence of the nation.

CAROLINE F. CORBIN,

President Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of
Suffrage to Women.

Address of Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell,

CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION OF THE 3D JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, AT CHICAGO, JULY 8th, 1896.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee on Resolutions :

I scarcely expected when I heard the cause of Woman Suffrage presented at St. Louis to the Republican Convention, that I should be forced to protest against it before your honorable body ; for it was distinctly stated at that time that the suffragists either were, or were willing to be, Republicans ; and that women suffragists everywhere, had worked to save the country from what they then termed "Democratic and Populistic misrule." This fact is substantiated by the plank that they succeeded in getting into the Republican platform ; which was written by a prominent suffragist, was approved by all of the suffragists present, and which runs :

"The Republican party is mindful of the rights and interests of women. Protection of American industries includes equal opportunities, equal pay for equal work, and protection to the home. We favor the admission of women to wider spheres of usefulness, and welcome their co-operation in rescuing the country from Democratic and Populistic mismanagement and misrule."

And now they ask you, who they claim have mismanaged and misruled the country, to give them the franchise that they may still further work against you. If they were honest in their wording of the Republican plank, then they would have no right to appear before you ; if they were *not* honest, then they certainly have no right to appear, because one of the reasons for which they ask the franchise, is that they intend through it to purify politics ; and if this be the manner of purification, it must be based upon the homeopathic principle of *Similia Similibus Curantur*.

You know enough about politics, gentlemen, to take at its true value the assertion that women, by voting, could change the existing condition of things. But if they could, would you want your wives or your daughters, your mothers or your sisters, to take active part

in the primaries and caucuses, at the polls, and even in the conventions, for the purpose of making them what it is claimed they would be "social centers?" And after politics were purified by women, who would purify the women? Is it not true that womanhood would suffer more than political morality would gain? And while the purification is going on who is going to do the home work, and the charitable work, that now so fills the lives of good women that they are often overburdened, and break down beneath the strain? It is to build up homes, not to break down their walls, and quench the light upon the hearth stone, that women's best energies should be directed.

Mrs. Stanton-Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, said in a published article, that it was better to let home suffer in order that women should gain economic freedom. "Let the women" she said, "who have not the taste for domestic work turn their children over to other women's care." We have too many servant mothers to-day; and the true duty of woman to woman, as well as to man, is to encourage and upbuild the home life from which we are so sadly drifting; and it is only as women yield themselves to the elevating and purifying influence of Christian teaching concerning marriage and home, that they rise to a higher moral level, and bring men up to that plane with them.

I appear before you unwillingly; but as the representative of the many millions of women who have hitherto proved the "silent majority." I come from New York State where there are only 1600 enrolled suffragists out of nearly 7,000,000 people, or, 29 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population. I have also been asked to represent the home-loving women of Massachusetts where there are but 51 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; of Pennsylvania where there are only 14 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population; of New Hampshire where there are but 5 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of Connecticut where there are only 23 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of South Carolina where there are but three suffragists for every 100,000 of her people; of Arkansas where there are only three suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; besides being asked to speak by women of prominence in California, where there are but 33 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Illinois where there are but 13 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Michigan where there are only six suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Kentucky where there are but 32 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Iowa where there are only six suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Virginia where there is but one suffragist to every 100,000 of her people; in Maryland where there are only six

suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Maine where there are but 12 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Ohio where there are only 11 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people, and in New Jersey where there are but eight suffragists to every 100,000 of her people. All these requests coming to me unsolicited.

These statistics are taken from an address delivered by Mr. Catt, husband of the National Suffrage organizer, before the National Society, at their annual meeting last January; and published in the *Woman's Journal*, the suffrage organ edited by Henry B. Blackwell,—better known as the husband of Lucy Stone,—and his daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell. I make this statement so that it may not be subject to contradiction by anyone present.

What are the reasons given for asking you to help the cause of Woman Suffrage?

First; That women who pay taxes should have a ballot. In answer we assert that the women who pay taxes do not want the ballot. That taxes are not conditioned upon the right to vote. That there is no discrimination against women in taxation. That taxation is the price the citizens pay for the protection of their property, their life, their liberty. That many men are taxed who have no vote,—the wealthy minor, and the man who living in one town owns property in another. That the woman who pays taxes will receive no benefit from the ballot which will not be an hundred times counteracted by the ballot of the women who do not pay taxes. That what is needed for the benefit of the tax-paying woman is not an increased but a restricted ballot. That while there are in New York State 144,000 women who pay taxes, there are at least 1,500,000 women who do not pay taxes; and the granting of suffrage to these women would more than duplicate the evils from which the tax-payer now suffers.

Second: That when women have the ballot, they will be employed constantly and at higher wages. The answer is shown in the fact that men vote and are yet unemployed. That no employer is going to pay an increased wage because the employee has the franchise. That while there are, as in the factories everywhere, long lists of girls waiting to be employed at nominal figures, no employer is going to raise the pay of his employees because they ask an hour off to vote on election day.

Third: That the cause of temperance will be helped when women vote. I admire the women who are working for temperance, and wish them God speed, but feel perfectly sure that they are mistaken if they expect to be helped by the granting of suffrage to all women North, South, East and West. Statistics tell us that while the population of the United States has increased but 20 per cent in

the last two decades, the dram drinking and drug taking women have increased 500 per cent. The Christian Advocate is my authority for the statement that before the high license law in Philadelphia, Penn., out of 8,034 saloon licenses 3,696 were granted to women. In Boston, Mass. last Spring, out of 1,100 liquor licenses 491 were applied for by women. The same condition of things prevails nearly all over our country. Would these women work for prohibition?

Let us look carefully at what is asked for: "Equal pay for equal work." That sounds equitable and consequently reasonable. But if the question of wages were to become a matter of legislation, would you be willing to say to the already overburdened and unemployed workman that you believe that his wages should be cut down to those received by women? For it is a fact beyond dispute that the wages paid is always a question of demand and supply; and women have entered nearly every field of labor once a man's sole province; and, by being willing and able to work for lower wages than men, who have families to support, have crowded them out. Now if equal wages for equal work means anything at all, it means that no man shall be paid more for his work than the women are begging to receive. For instance, if that law could be passed and enforced, the merchant could say to his male employe that he could fill his shop with girls at half the price he was paying him, and while he preferred keeping the man at the higher rate, he must either discharge him or lower his wages to that which women were asking to receive. But the whole thing is a farce. You do not ask, in fact, I doubt if any of you care, how much the workman is paid who makes your clothes. I know that women do not; otherwise they would not haggle over prices, and gloat over bargains. This is hard common-sense. It isn't poetic nor imaginative. It is more, it is truth, and you are here to deal with truths and not with fallacies.

The number of votes cast at the general election in 1892 was 12,034,858. To grant suffrage to women would be to more than double that number. Do you believe that at this time, if at any time, when industries languish, and our farmers are being pushed to the wall, while our bankers and merchants go into bankruptcy, that it would be wise to add this immense increase to the voting population?

The facts for the suffragists to prove are that suffrage is necessary for the protection of women, and that it would be beneficial to the State. They have not and cannot prove either. To-day in New York State, and in many of the other States, a woman is protected better by the laws that men have made, than by any she could make herself. A husband cannot sell his real estate unless the wife joins in the deed. He cannot deprive her by will of right of dower. The wife can by deed or will dispose of her entire estate, real or

personal, whether the husband consents or not. A father cannot now apprentice his child or make a valid appointment of a testamentary guardian without the consent of the mother, if she be living. The wife can carry on business on her own account, and is entitled to all the profits and earnings in that business, and may contract as if she were unmarried. Every profession is open to women, and every occupation also. Then what do they want, what will they gain by having the ballot? If men are not capable of managing the affairs of the State and the Nation according to the highest and best ideas of the race, that is of both men and women, will you permit me to respectfully inquire what proper and adequate share of this world's work you can perform? What is your natural place in the order of society? Are you mere hewers of wood and drawers of water? You cannot bear citizens; you cannot care for them in infancy and rear them to manhood. If you cannot govern them with wisdom and justice when they are given into your hands, what is your reason for being? It strikes me that these women who want to retain all the privileges of their sex, and secure besides those, all that they think a man has; who want to be men and yet remain women; have much hardihood in coming to you and saying: "You do not know how to make laws; how to govern the people; you are corrupt and misrule the nation. Give us the suffrage that we may supplant you" And they say this not for themselves alone, but for all the women in this great nation, North, South, East and West, without regard to education or morality! They are to purify politics!

Gentlemen, a large number of the leaders of the suffrage party became a revising committee to give to the world what is known as the Woman's Bible. At the present time they have only dealt with the Pentateuch. I need only to quote from its columns to show you its character. It is said: "The utter contempt for all the decencies of life, and all the natural personal rights of women, as set forth in these pages"—the Bible—"should destroy in the minds of women, at least, all authority to superhuman origin, and stamp the Pentateuch at least as emanating from the most obscene minds of a barbarous age." The story of the creation is said to "have been manipulated by some Jew in order to give heavenly authority for requiring the woman to obey the man she married." When it was found that the Christian women all over the land raised their voices in protest, at the National meeting of the suffragists, it was voted to repudiate the Woman's Bible as a suffrage work, but only by a majority of twelve. They then cast the onus of revision upon Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who is more to be honored for her truthfulness, than are the many women whose names are found among the revising committee, and who betray their leader. Nearly as many of the articles are written by Lillie Devereux Blake as by Mrs. Stanton; and the character of

them will be seen when I tell you that she covers much space to prove that "the chief point of interest in the parable of Balaam and his ass, is that the ass belonged to the female sex."

These are the women who are going to give us better laws than those founded on the Mosaic code, and who are going to purify politics! Do you wonder, gentlemen, that the mothers appeal to you; the mothers who have builded their homes upon the truths laid down in the Bible; and who have taught you to reverence it? There is little enough of reverence left in the world to-day. Take away from men and women that belief in the Bible that causes them to strive to do right for righteousness sake, and what have you? History tells you.

The suffragists speak of what has been accomplished by woman suffrage in a hazy sort of way. Let us have facts:

Cheyenne, the capital of Wyoming, where women have voted for a quarter of a century, has a population of less than 12,000. I am told that in Cheyenne there are 25 licensed gambling houses, and that saloons are as numerous as any other kind of stores; and it has been stated that not a single act of legislation aimed at the betterment of the human race, has been passed in Wyoming through woman's influence. Gen. Thompson, who managed the Democratic campaign in Wyoming, in 1892, said:—"The women's vote is the easiest thing in the world to get, and the easiest thing to keep, and the easiest thing to manipulate of any element in politics." After six month's residence in Wyoming, divorce may be obtained for any one of eleven reasons!

The history of woman's influence in the legislative halls of the other States where woman suffrage obtains, is not a glowing tribute to their intelligence or probity, and has been in existence too short a time to be given as precedent for the States East and South. The partial suffrage referred to is also a thing not to be boasted of by the women who desire the suffrage. The record of the Massachusetts vote is that in Boston in 1888, 20,252 women registered in the interest of school suffrage, and most of them voted, for it was a warfare of religious sects; a Protestant and a Roman Catholic fight, such as would appeal to most women. The next year the number of women registering was reduced nearly one-half. In 1891, 6,008 women registered and 5,428 voted. The same thing was tried in Connecticut and not two and one-half per cent of the women entitled to vote exercised that right. Do you imagine for a moment that they would do better if a full franchise were given them? Who are the women who would go to the polls in stormy weather? I do not need to prove to you gentlemen that the women who would vote "early and often" are not the women to whom you would trust the ballot in case of need.

It has been stated to you that I have no right to claim that I represent 1,500,000 women of New York. It has also been stated that 400,000 women of New York had signed the suffrage petition. The truth of the matter is, gentlemen, that two years ago when the suffragists made an effort to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution of New York, Miss Susan B. Anthony promised to offer a petition signed by 1,000,000 women of New York; and with that end in view, the suffragists canvassed New York State with that energy for which they are noted. I should not be surprised to learn that not one woman over 21 years of age had escaped having been tried to be cajoled or coerced into signing the petition. The result was a failure so great that they abandoned the idea of getting the women to sign, and so they asked men to come to their help. They paid for signatures sometimes as high as three cents. In one town there were sent in the signatures of more women than there were women in the town, over 21 years of age. They did not succeed even then; so they claimed to have the signatures of 200,000 members of the labor organization, and 50,000 grangers through their respective secretaries. Many members of both of these organizations have denied since then having known of the petition, and also denied having any sympathy with the woman suffrage movement.

They claimed also 75,000 W. C. T. U. members. I have personal friends who are members of the W. C. T. U. and who are bitterly opposed to the granting of suffrage to all classes and conditions of women.

But allowing for the sake of the argument that all these persons signed the petition, they then only claimed 426,000 names; as reported at the time. I quote from an article written by one of the leaders after their defeat before the Constitutional Convention. "We have 200,000 women's names encircled by the great arms of labor and clasped together by the strong arms of the farm", which is poetic at least, but which only claims 200,000 women.

There are 7,000,000 of people in New York State. It is fair to believe that one-quarter of that number are women over 21 years of age, that is 1,750,000. The truth is, that there are several thousand more women than men in New York State. But granting them those figures, I lay claim to only those women who refused to be enrolled as suffragists, when I say I represent 1,500,000 women of voting age in New York State, who do not desire to have suffrage thrust upon them. I am sorry to take up your time to prove my assertion: One more fact and I will close.

The Anti-suffragists have not tried to organize until recently; and then only because we were forced to protest against the cry of this very small minority that claimed "women do not oppose suffrage

even if they do not ask for it". In the city of Albany, N. Y., in one month's time 8,320 women signed the anti-suffrage protest. This will give you an idea of the feeling of the women. In this number were nearly every tax-paying woman in Albany as well as women who work for their daily bread. On my return home from St. Louis, I was delighted beyond expression when I went into one of our largest dry-good shops to have one of the women clerks thank me for the position I had taken at St. Louis, and before I left the shop every girl in the department had expressed her thanks. One of them said: "We signed the suffrage petition; we did not understand what it meant; but when we did we signed the anti-suffrage protest. When I marry I expect to get a husband who can be trusted to make the laws that are to protect me and my children, and until that time, my father will look out for me better than I could for myself."

It is said by the suffragists that I represent women who are slaves; and that we boast of our bondage. Well, gentlemen, if it is to be a slave to be a woman in this part of the 19th century, in the United States of America, where women are so protected by laws made for them by men, that they may enjoy every privilege a man enjoys without annoyance or effort; where men toil from morning till night to provide the women of their households with the luxuries of life as well as its necessities; where ninety-nine men stand ready to chastise the one man who may dare to insult a woman; where nothing that the womenly women ask for legally is denied them by men; then I am proud to belong to that class of women whom the suffragists dub "slaves"; and it is in the name of these women who are living the lives God intended them to live, whose even wholesome existence in the charm of youth, in the bloom of maturity, and in the calm decline of age, proves the wisdom and beneficence of the Creator,—your mothers, your wives, your daughters,—I ask you not to embody in your platform any resolution, that even by the greatest stretch of imagination, could convey a belief that you approved of and favored woman suffrage.

Officers of the Anti-Suffrage Association of the Third Judicial District of the State of New York:

MRS. J. V. L. PRUYN,
President.

MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE,
1st Vice-President.

MRS. WM. B. VAN RENSSELAER,
Secretary.

MRS. JOSEPH GAVIT,
Treasurer.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL, *Chairman.*

MRS. ERASTUS CORNING,

MRS. J. HOWARD KING,

MRS. WM. O. STILLMAN,

MRS. WILLIAM CASSIDY,

MRS. JOEL R. REED,

MRS. FREDERICK TOWNSEND,

MISS LUCY A. PLYMPTON,

Executive Committee.

Other leaflets may be obtained by applying to the Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.